

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTENTS OF THIS FILE

Submissions by the public in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures (ROPs), Rule 4.3, are distributed to the Commission and uploaded online. Please note that “compliance” means that the submission complies with deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) AND the number of copies. Please review the Commission ROPs to ensure that you meet the submission requirements. The ROPs can be accessed at <http://planning.lacity.org>, by selecting “Commissions & Hearings” and selecting the specific Commission.

All compliant submissions may be accessed as follows:

- **“Initial Submissions”**: Compliant submissions received no later than by end of day Monday of the week prior to the meeting, which are not integrated by reference or exhibit in the Staff Report, will be appended at the end of the Staff Report. The Staff Report is linked to the case number on the specific meeting agenda.
- **“Secondary Submissions”**: Submissions received after the Initial Submission deadline up to 48-hours prior to the Commission meeting are contained in this file and bookmarked by the case number.
- **“Day of Hearing Submissions”**: Submissions after the Secondary Submission deadline up to and including the day of the Commission meeting will be uploaded to this file within two business days after the Commission meeting.

Material which does not comply with the submission rules is not distributed to the Commission.

ENABLE BOOKMARS ONLINE:

**If you are using Explorer, you need will need to enable the Acrobat  toolbar to see the bookmarks on the left side of the screen.

If you are using Chrome, the bookmarks are on the upper right-side of the screen. If you do not want to use the bookmarks, simply scroll through the file.

If you have any questions, please contact the Commission Office at (213) 978-1300.

SECONDARY SUBMISSIONS



Howard Robinson & Associates

To: Ira Brown
200 N. Spring St., Room 721
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Susan Steinberg
Howard Robinson & Associates
660 S. Figueroa St., Suite 1780
Los Angeles, CA 90017

RE: DIR-2019-6301-CDP-SPP-SPPA-MEL-1A / ZA-2019-6301-ZAA-1A

Dear Mr. Brown,

This letter is to request that, if the West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission approves of the revised plans submitted on Jan. 8, 2024, the Applicant would like to withdraw the following entitlement requests that are no longer required for the project:

1. Specific Plan Project Permit Adjustment to allow for an increased height of 32 ft. 11 in., for portions of the structures with a varied roofline, otherwise limited to 30 ft. in the Oakwood Subarea of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan area;
2. A Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance Review to allow for the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and detached garage and construction of a new three-story, 32 ft. 11 in. in height, 4,914 sq. ft. single-family dwelling including a basement level and roof deck, providing three parking spaces; and
3. A Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow for northerly and southerly side yard setbacks of 5 ft. in lieu of 6 ft. 6 in. otherwise required.

Please note that the Applicant will still require the Zoning Administrator's Adjustment for the reduced rear yard setback. The Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance Review request is withdrawn because the revised project is fully compliant with the Venice Specific Plan and, therefore, is now eligible for a Venice Sign Off.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Susan Steinberg

Susan Steinberg
Principal

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS



Planning APC West LA <apcwestla@lacity.org>

RE: June 5th Meeting—Item 6&7 (650 6th Ave Venice 90291)

Mike Bravo <miguel@bravo1.la>

Tue, Jun 4, 2024 at 11:33 PM

To: "apcwestla@lacity.org" <apcwestla@lacity.org>

Cc: "Ira.Brown@lacity.org" <Ira.Brown@lacity.org>, "SouthCoast@coastal.ca.gov" <SouthCoast@coastal.ca.gov>

RE: DIR-2019-6301 and ZA-2019-6302 ([650 6th Ave. Venice 90291](#))

Dear Members of the West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission and all relevant City Departments,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 350 Sixth Avenue, Venice, CA, and to voice my support for the appeal by the appellants. While I appreciate the revisions made to the project, such as reducing its height and floor area, the inclusion of a basement and two floors still makes this project excessive. The following points outline my concerns and the reasons for my opposition:

1. Lack of Community Outreach

The project at 350 Sixth Avenue failed to adequately involve the Venice-Oakwood community, especially generational families in this [unique coastal community](#), in its planning process. This violates the principles of meaningful engagement and public participation as outlined in the California Coastal Act Environmental Justice Policy. Moreover, the project was denied by the Venice Neighborhood Council (VNC) and never went through a proper community process. The audacious nature of this project demands thorough scrutiny through all channels and avenues, ensuring it meets the community's needs and standards.

2. Basement Concerns

Overall Bulk and Scale:

The inclusion of a basement significantly contributes to the overall bulk and scale of the project, exacerbating issues related to density, environmental impact, infrastructure, and community character. Maintaining the basement contradicts the claim of reducing the project's overall impact.

Subterranean Construction:

Potential impacts on groundwater, soil stability, and the foundations of neighboring properties due to basement construction are significant concerns. Subterranean construction often requires dewatering and can affect nearby structures, especially in areas with older buildings.

Safety Risks:

Subterranean construction poses potential safety risks, including flooding and impact on the structural integrity of adjacent properties. This is particularly concerning given that many surrounding homes belong to generational families that have lived in this community for generations.

Environmental Impact on Neighboring Properties:

The proposed basement construction threatens the integrity of neighboring properties, including a large tree on the east border of the project property. This tree is a vital part of the local ecosystem, and its removal or damage would harm the community's cultural and ecological integrity.

3. Zoning and Setback Regulations

They can still build something nice and beautiful without compromising the zoning and setback regulations that are designed to maintain community character and ensure safety. Allowing exceptions based on claimed hardships for self-imposed conditions undermines these regulations.

Rear Setback Concerns:

The 5-foot rear setback remains a significant concern. This is a sub-lot division, and maximizing the project at the expense of neighbors is unacceptable. LAMC Section 12.22.C.10 specifically mentions the rear yard, not the side yard. There is no "right" to be afforded the same options if one's rear setback does not abut an alley; no law supports that.

Atypical Conditions and Hardship Claims:

The terms "atypical conditions" and "substandard" are being used to suggest hardship. However, the property's substandard lot size and unique conditions were known at the time of purchase. The inherent limitations of sub-lot divisions should have been considered, and any claimed hardship resulting from these conditions is self-imposed.

4. Visual Context and Community Impact

The proposed "modern design" does not fit within the neighborhood's visual context and may alienate existing residents. As a long-time resident, I can clearly see that this project is driven by profit, not by a desire to build or enhance the community.

Personal Impact

As a multi-generational resident of this territory and neighborhood, I find it hurtful to see a project like this being pushed forward. All nearby homes on the intersection of 6th Ave and Sunset Ave, minus the multi-unit apartments south of Sunset, are one story. This project will stick out like a sore thumb and represents a negative, proverbial staking of a flag in the ground for more projects that seek to exploit, stretch, and erode the neighborhood's visual, infrastructural, and spiritual integrity.

I urge you to consider the points outlined above and deny the approval of the proposed development at 350 Sixth Avenue. This project is still audacious and does not consider the community's character, safety, or needs.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Miguel Bravo
611 Sunset Ave.
Venice, CA