

Communication from Public

Name: Janis Spire
Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 05:14 PM
Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee: I am a long time Venice resident, living within 500 feet of the proposed Lincoln Apartments project and continue to strongly oppose the project and the City Planning Commission's mishandling of the hearing held on May 28, 2020. I am in support of the appeals filed against it. First and foremost, this project will share a property line with St. Mark Elementary School. The design and funding streams to build this project, coupled with the track record of the developer, Venice Community Housing and the service provider, Safe Place for Youth, who will operate on site, blatantly ignore the safety of children and will adversely affect the public health and well-being of the immediate neighborhood. The concern for our children's safety is well-founded, not speculative as rebuked by the CPC. Their disregard for the documented evidence is alarming and perhaps they didn't even see it buried in the 2,000 page staff report. These records show that Venice Community Housing's permanent, supportive housing projects are not safe. Its Gateway Apartments (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence." These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth (SPY) currently operates drop-in services for clients and a free food pantry for youth ages 16-25 and their friends. SPY will continue to serve the public while providing support to residents of Lincoln Apartment. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and immediate area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. Contrary to the Entitlement Findings 1b in the CPC Letter of Determination, the project's location, size, height, operations and other significant

features will not be compatible with and will adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood and the public health, welfare and safety. The references regarding height, set back, zoning, scale and character compares existing uses and structures several blocks away that are along major intersections and not adjacent to single family homes. Lastly, spending \$20 million to build 40 small units that will get less than one tenth of one per-cent of Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable misuse of public funds. I urge you to look closer at this project and please do not allow it to move ahead as planned. Thank you, Janis Spire, Venice resident within 500 feet of the proposed project

Communication from Public

Name: A McKay

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 05:32 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: As a 31-year resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's

disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers’ pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, A McKay Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Andrea Boccaletti

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 02:49 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case File Number 20-0858 Case
CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real

and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers' pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, Andrea Boccaletti Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 03:13 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: ase CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood

Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers' pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Elizabeth Stringer

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 03:15 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case File Number 20-0858 Case
CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real

and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers' pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, Elizabeth Stringer Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Eduardo Navarro
Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 01:31 PM
Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case File Number 20-0858 Case
CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real

and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers' pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, Eduardo Navarro Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Peter Carpenter

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 01:34 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case File Number 20-0858 Case
CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real

and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers' pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, Peter Carpenter Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: 30 Year Venice Resident

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 01:35 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case File Number 20-0858 Case
CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real

and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers' pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, 30 Year Venice Resident Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Mike Penfold

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 01:36 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's

disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers’ pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, Mike Penfold Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Fausta Navarro

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 01:43 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case File Number 20-0858 Case
CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: 1) The Specific Adverse Impacts that preclude the necessary findings for a density bonus. VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. 2) The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote 3) The Violation of Open Meeting Laws 4) Inadequate parking 5) The project is out of scale and "monolithic" Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with an elementary school. I am therefore particularly concerned by the City Planning Commission's disregard for documentation provided showing Specific Adverse Impact based on the track record of Safe Place for Youth (SPY) and Venice Community Housing (VCH). The developer, Venice Community Housing, has a terrible safety record with its other buildings. Its Gateway Apartments supportive housing project (with only 20 units) generates more than 11 times as many police and fire responses as a market-rate building of comparable size on the same street (calls for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious calls. Records showing this were submitted to the CPC but were buried in the staff report. There is zero accountability. Prop 2 funding will be used for this project and will mandate the inclusion of "adults with serious mental illness...with symptoms of psychosis or violence," and VCH has refused to provide a security guard. These facts and records are not irrelevant to a project with two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. Safe Place for Youth currently operates drop-in services for clients three days a week. Over the last three years, police and fire departments have been called to SPY 117 times, for incidents ranging from Assault with a Deadly Weapon to Violent Mentally Ill, Burglary and Battery. A chain-wielding man from SPY caused a lockdown of St. Mark school in January. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted detailing these concerns. These are not hypotheticals. The adverse impact is real

and predictable and it is the reason the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project. The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Millman. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. That appeal also addresses the fact that the hearing violated Open Meeting Laws under the Brown Act. The public could not fully participate — many neighbors could not speak — because of busy signals, the lack of a local call number to join the meeting, or the fact that when people hung up after speaking, as President Millman directed them to, they could not get back into the meeting as it was full, at that point. As for the building itself: it will not be “visually compatible” with its surroundings but rather, at four stories, loom over the surrounding one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door. It will have only six parking spaces for some 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Finally, spending \$20 million to get little more than one tenth of one percent of the Los Angeles homeless off the streets is an unconscionable use of public funds. It lines developers' pockets while leaving the vast majority on the streets. It is not compassion, it is corruption. Indeed, the office of Mike Bonin, the councilman for district 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed. Thank you, Fausta Navarro Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Maurice Summers
Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 01:50 PM
Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case File Number 20-0858 Case
CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, I live two blocks away from the proposed Lincoln Apartments project. I strongly oppose this project for a number of reasons. First of all, the scale of the project, they want to build a 4 story building in an area where there are no other 4 story buildings. Lincoln blvd is primarily one story buildings, with a couple of 2 story buildings here and there. It would look totally out of place to have such a large building in the area. A major eye sore. In addition, the location is already a hot spot for homeless people and vagrants.. there is a McDonalds next door and there is always a group of homeless people with drug addiction and mental illness hanging out on that corner. There is an elementary school a half block away. The last thing this area needs is a massive housing complex for people with drug addiction and mental illness. Venice is already overwhelmed by the amount of homeless people coming here. Other parts of the city do not share the burden equally. Why not build this complex in Santa Monica, or Beverly Hills? A lot of people are starting to leave Venice because of this issue. I have a tremendous amount of compassion for homeless people, as a society they need to be helped, but Venice already does more than its fair share. Not to mention, many of the homeless people here come from out of state, they didnt grow up in LA or Venice. They come here because of liberal policies that allow them to setup camp and do whatever they want. There has to be a line drawn somewhere. Plus - it has to be sensible. Building a massive housing project for people with drug and mental issues right next to an elementary school is not extremely inappropriate. Furthermore.. the project does not provide adequate parking. It will have only six parking spaces for 98 residents, 25 staff, and 20 volunteers. According to the Venice Specific Plan, it should have 104. Increased density is meant to be self-sufficient, not a burden on the surrounding community. Venice is already a place strapped for parking. For this reason alone the project should be scrapped or massively reduced in scale. How can you allow a building to be built, to house 98 people, with 6 parking spots? Thats ludicrous by any standard. This is not about compassion, or housing homeless people. This is about a project that does not provide parking for its

residents. This is about a project that will bring people with drug addiction and mental illness a half block from an elementary school. This is about a project that is way too large in scale for the location and the neighborhood. Venice residents have had enough of this. If this project goes through, I am leaving Venice. I cant continue to watch my neighborhood decline like this. - Maurice Summers Venice Resident (Van Buren Ave)