



WESTSIDE COMMUNITY PLANS UPDATE

Venice Community Plan Update

Community Plan Workshop

July 10, 2019

COMMENT SUMMARY

Los Angeles City Planning held a public Community Plan Workshop in Venice on July 10, 2019. The workshop brought residents and planners together to review initial land use ideas that were developed based upon input received from community stakeholders since summer 2018 (when the Community Plan Update kicked off). During the workshop, community stakeholders had the opportunity to provide feedback to planners about the various land use ideas, and how they further the vision and goals for the Venice Community Plan Area. Staff organized the comments received at the workshop into nine general categories and several subcategories to gain a better understanding of the most common concerns amongst the community. While comments varied widely, the general categories ranked in order from most popular to least popular are: Design and Scale, Mobility, Infrastructure, Housing, Land Use, Governance, Open Space, Amenities, and Services. The following is a summary of the comments recorded at that event.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Community Comments</i>
DESIGN AND SCALE Concerns about character and height made up a majority of the comments while the remaining comments focused on density, preservation, and transitions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments concerning neighborhood character largely focused on a desire to encourage the construction of low-scale housing utilizing non-contemporary architecture and discourage modern architecture housing styles, which community stakeholders perceived as being dominant in Venice.• Concerns about building heights revolved around a desire to encourage low-scale development and establishing height limitations, especially in a way that would restrict or prohibit construction of buildings with more than three stories.• Many community members expressed concern that their neighborhoods are becoming excessively dense while others hoped for increased density, particularly along major corridors.• Several stakeholders indicated that new construction would erase certain historic structures, sites, and streets that are of cultural significance to Oakwood's African American community, the local Tongva and Chumash indigenous communities, and Venice's car-free past• Comments regarding transitions generally centered on a desire for less abrupt changes in height and scale between higher-density corridors and lower-density residential areas.

MOBILITY

General concerns about road diets, non-automobile modes of transit (bicycle, pedestrian, bus transit, rail transit, and dockless) and congestion and connectivity.

- There were comments regarding road diets with some supporting alternative modes of transportation and improved road safety while others felt that the area has poor streetscape and roadway designs.
- Several comments called for more protected bicycle lanes and routes throughout Venice in addition to improved pedestrian infrastructure and neighborhood walkability.
- Comments regarding public transit focused on a desire for new and improved bus and rail transit routes in the area.
- Several comments addressed a desire for tighter regulations on where and how dockless mobility devices, such as e-scooters, can be used.
- While comments about congestion mainly included challenges with traffic, comments concerning connectivity were more varied and primarily called for increased multimodal and public transportation options in addition to improved intersections.

INFRASTRUCTURE

A majority of the comments focused on parking, while additional comments included ideas surrounding streetscapes (roads, traffic signals, sidewalks, and street trees).

- Many comments centered on a desire to establish parking restrictions in neighborhoods where there is an interface between residential and commercial zones in addition to a need for higher or lower parking requirements for new developments.
- Regarding the neighborhood's street network, several comments called for more traffic calming measures and activation of alleyways, as well as stop signs at a specific intersection.
- A number of individuals expressed concern regarding sidewalks in certain locations (especially along popular streets) being too narrow and in disrepair.
- Several comments revolved around a desire to plant more trees and improve tree maintenance both within the public right-of-way and in general.
- Miscellaneous comments mostly called for encouraging sustainable development and streetscape improvements.

<p>HOUSING</p> <p>An overwhelming majority of comments focused on general affordability while some comments centered on bridge/transitional/public supportive housing or home sharing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some meeting attendees shared their concern regarding a lack of affordable housing options and developments in Venice. ● Other comments focused on the need for more public supportive housing, especially for community members experiencing homelessness, as well as a need for more restrictions on home sharing.
<p>GOVERNANCE</p> <p>Many comments focused on transparency while others focused on outreach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Comments regarding transparency related to the writing process and word choice in the Community Plan itself while others expressed concern about specific government actions, such as a fear that the City would abolish the Coastal Commission. ● Comments related to outreach generally focused on the perception that Los Angeles City Planning has not adequately connected with the community throughout the ongoing Community Plan Update process.
<p>OPEN SPACE</p> <p>Comments mainly focused on parks, beaches, and natural habitats.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regarding the coast, stakeholders conveyed a desire for more natural habitats and open spaces to combat the negative effects of climate change. ● In regards to inland areas, many comments related to a desire for more parks, open spaces, and green spaces throughout the community.
<p>AMENITIES</p> <p>Nearly all comments focused on neighborhood-serving retail, affordable dining options and recreation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The majority of concerns regarding neighborhood-serving retail centered on a desire for increased protections for local shops and the need to prevent their closure or displacement by chain stores. There is also interest in preventing high-end boutiques from coming into the area. ● Comments concerning dining preferences called for more affordable options in the area. ● There is also interest in providing more recreational opportunities including a greenway where community members could exercise.

SERVICES

Homelessness and waste removal/street cleaning were major concerns.

- Comments about homelessness generally called for increased policing or restrictions placed on people experiencing homelessness and increased services for the local homeless population.
- Comments concerning waste removal and street cleaning centered on a shared desire for cleaner public spaces such as parks, public restrooms, and walk streets.