

Communication from Public

Name: Kristine Christensen

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 09:31 AM

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 lifelong resident of Venice
living within 500 feet of the the proposed project , I am writing to
express my strong opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project
and my support for the appeals filed against it. The issues of
Safety, Size, No Parking Required, all DEGRADES OUR
NEIGHBORHOOD, and will make our neighborhood an unsafe
place for our youth. SPY already has been a crime magnet. To
double the size and hours of operations of SPY, and then stick a
40 unit apartment complex with residents with mental instability
and at risk behavior on top of it with Zero safety precautions
required, is irresponsible. I have gone to Spy and spoken with the
director about their clients who were fighting in front of my home
and was told to call the police if there are problems with the
clients in the neighborhood. They have no way to control who the
adults they service now, and they know it, and they are very
resistant to taking any responsibility in the future. This puts a
huge burden on the neighborhood and police department. The size
of the proposed project is not in scale for this area, and without
any parking required, our neighborhood will have more noise and
parking issues. This alone DEGRADES OUR
NEIGHBORHOOD. I am concerned for the grade school and
church that has to share a property line with SPY and the
proposed development. Please consider the negative impact this
will have on them and Venice as a whole. This project is so out of
scale and dangerous, and asking too much of our community,
wasting huge amounts of money which will end up in big
developers pockets and help only a few. The NEGATIVE
IMPACT OF QUALITY OF LIFE for the neighbors of this
project is going to be great. I ask you to take into consideration
the very close proximity to houses and elementary schools and the
effects of the type density you will be putting there. It is too much
AT RISK density for one neighborhood to absorb without
detrimental impact. Kristine Christensen Resident of Venice
within 500 feet of project

Communication from Public

Name: Robert Hirsh

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:28 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Purchase/lease land and build simple wood cabins with heat and outhouses with hot/cold running water ("the Facilities"). This will establish a place for the homeless to go. Then, demand they leave the streets and go to the Facilities. If they refuse, arrest them. This will comply with the Ninth Circuit City of Boise decision because they will have a place to go. On Rose Avenue in Venice, acquire the property rights on the North Side of the street to the street and extend the fence, such that there is no room for the homeless to live there. Hire highly competent outside counsel to navigate the City of Los Angeles through these matters. The office of the City Attorney does not appear to be up to the job. Robert Hirsh:
310.275.7800 x109

Communication from Public

Name: Nichol Carlson

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:30 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: As a resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project for the following reasons: You have already shown us that you aren't able to manage any sort of solution for the homeless because of the disaster that the Bridge Housing has proven to be. The violence and deplorable conditions that have sprung up around the new Bridge Housing on Main have been nothing short of shocking, and no one is interested in fixing it or bringing a solution to the table. Additionally, this new 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Alan Shaffer

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:32 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, Alan Shaffer 40 Year Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:42 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Brennan Lindner

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:48 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Please make sure the zoom call and the 'listen-only' call line work this time. In the last meeting regarding this project I was instructed to hang up on Zoom after I spoke and then use the call in/listen only #. But when I called in on the listen only number, it was busy and I was unable to attend the rest of the meeting. This was of course frustrating and against any type of open meeting law. As the City has had ample time to prepare for this (and other calls), I do expect lines to be working for constituents.

Communication from Public

Name: Patricia procter

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:59 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Please seriously consider the safety of Venice families and seniors. I have lived in Venice most of my life. I attended Broadway Elementary School, Mark Twain middle school and graduated from Venice high school. I live in the same house I grew up in. My grandchildren are 4th generation Venice residents. I have seen my neighborhood go thru some major changes. For the past several years our neighborhood has declined in public safety and become more and more dangerous. Daily family errands and outdoor activities have become fearful events due to the continuing numbers of random assaults to residents. I have an additional concern regarding parking. When i did a remodel and added a single dwelling over my garage I was forced to move my project 15' from the alley to allow for required additional parking. What has happened to this requirement? I know of several bungalow style structures that were torn down and replaced with mansion style homes built on walk street properties with NO additional space allocated for parking. How does that happen? I sincerely hope you will consider the impact of your decisions regarding this project. There are just too many flaws in this plan that will negatively affect Venice residents for years. Thank you for your time and consideration. Patti Procter

Communication from Public

Name: Michelle Lindner

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 03:07 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: As a 15 year resident of Venice, I am writing to express my opposition to Lincoln Apartments AND to support the appeals against the project. Rather than provide a lengthy email my points are below. 1) Parking - How can only 6 parking spaces be adequate for 100 residents, staff and volunteers? And in the Coastal Zone? 2) Safety - I am the parent of a 10 year old girl who was in lockdown due to one of SPYs clients. We live 5 homes from this project and since the arrival of SPY, we have had nothing but trash, open drug use, theft and the culture of fear emanated by SPYs clients. As my daughter aptly said last week, "I no longer feel safe riding my bike around here, I'd be safer somewhere else." Review the police reports submitted in the initial report. 3) Size of Project - this project is not compatible with the neighborhood. A 49' high project looming over 25' buildings is not compatible. This is a giant. There are NO projects over 25' on the south side of Lincoln within a half of a mile, and that project overlooks Marina Del Rey. 4) Cost - \$20 million for 40 units. This borders on stupidity. A large tent similar to bridge housing can house 100+ people at \$1 million. Do the math. These points alone should be enough to support the appeal and have the applicant look elsewhere for this project OR reduce their negative impact to the surrounding neighborhood (add parking, security and reduce the size). Michelle Lindner 1127 Garfield Ave.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 12:52 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, Bill Hartman Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Anna Sullivan

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 12:55 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, Anna Sullivan Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Christine K
Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:07 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 am a resident of Venice and live within 500 feet of the proposed project. I'm writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it for the following reasons: - VCH and SPY have well documented safety issues that were buried in the CPC report. As a nearby resident to SPY's current operations, I have also personally witnessed or experienced safety issues including drug use, vandalism and harassment of my children by SPY's clients gathering in front of their current operation. 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 (incl. for Assaults with a Deadly Weapon, Batteries, Burglaries, and Thefts). VCH's Horizon Apartments has similar egregious numbers of calls. 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. This project is not compatible with the two elementary schools and a nursery school within a two-block radius. - The Planning Commission failed to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote. The Planning commission also disregarded the legitimate and overwhelming opposition of the community. Over 1,000 letters from both nearby businesses and area residents were submitted opposing the project. The Venice Neighborhood Council also 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. - The project is out of scale and “monolithic”. At four stories, the building looms over the our residential neighborhood of one- and two-story homes, as well as the play yard of the school next door to the site. 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. 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, Christine K. Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Robert Henderson

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:22 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, Robert Henderson Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:23 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.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:25 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, Philipp Reker Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: John Baginski

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:27 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, John Baginski Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Noelle Kim

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:28 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 that is 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, Noelle Kim Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Garrett O'Neal

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:30 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I live 2 blocks away from this project and it should NOT be approved. It violates many of the promises that were made to the public when voting for the funds and putting severely mentally ill people next to 4 schools is just plain wrong. The shelter operators have shown that they do NOT run the type of facilities that are good neighbors and should not be given more units to oversee. See below for more details: 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, Garrett O'Neal

Communication from Public

Name: David Myers

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 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 and a direct
neighbor of the proposed Lincoln Apartments, 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, David Myers, Crestmoore Place Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Jimmy A

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:36 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, Jimmy A Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:40 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, Vincent G Nocera Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Laurie Gilbert

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:41 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, Laurie Gilbert Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Aimie Fruehe

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:48 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I am completely against the Lincoln Housing Project/SPY building. Our kids go to Coeur D'alene Elementary (a couple doors down) and we live one block away. This is unbelievable to me that they are putting so many kids at risk from drug addicted & mentally unstable people next to two schools, literally sandwiched between the two schools. The issues that will occur from this are horrifying to me. Ever neighbor we talk to is against this and is petrified it will happen! We've lived here for 15 years and love where we live, however, already since SPY has been there, we are scared to walk our kids down Lincoln Blvd due to the mentally/drugged out people lingering around the building. We are begging you to think of the children and families in the neighborhood and to NOT DO THE LINCOLN HOUSING PROJECT! Do the right thing for the community and please don't ruin our neighborhood

Communication from Public

Name: Melissa Verdugo

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:49 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I am baffled why the City Council is allowing Mike Bonin to destroy Venice. He seems to have a personal vendetta against its residents. Why? Did someone do something mean to him and now he has the authority to retaliate? Venice - with the complicity of the City Council - has become a dumping ground for the homeless, mentally ill mostly drug users. Why are we bearing the brunt of this social problem? Now he - with the backing of the City Council - wants to extend his phony battle for justice to school children? Mike has some serious psychological issues. Stop enabling his war of retribution.

Communication from Public

Name: Rachel Davis

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:52 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, Rachel Davis

Communication from Public

Name: Barton

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:56 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 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, Barton Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Josh Jefferis

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:06 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 with a child
attending Coeur d'Alene, 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, Josh Jefferis Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Jacqueline

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 02:15 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, J Gustafson Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Maria Coray

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 08:00 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: WDear 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, Maria Coray Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 12:16 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear City Council 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, Debi Lee (Venice resident around the corner from proposed Lincoln Apts project)

Communication from Public

Name: Lanore Larson

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 06:32 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 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. Even if the project benefits more than just the developers, but 98 adults, the risk to the 800 children who attend the adjacent school, their families and hard working citizens in the area far outweighs the benefits. Why does Venice seem to be the ideal dumping ground for treating the dangerously mentally ill? There are hundreds of miles of less development in LA county-so why in a dense area next to an elementary school? Is it because the developers and council members do not live anywhere near there? There must be locations for treating the mentally ill and homeless that are not adjacent to an elementary school.

Communication from Public

Name: anonymous

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 03:44 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,

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 04:02 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

Communication from Public

Name: Frank Thorpe

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 04:42 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 Frank S. Thorpe

Communication from Public

Name: Mary Marlowe

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 05:06 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Mary and I am a resident of Venice my whole life and live within 500 feet of the proposed Lincoln Apt. project. I and my family are in strong support of the appeal and opposed to the project. I would like to participate in the meeting Thursday but cannot due to the fact that I do not have a long distance provider. This also prohibited me from participating in the previous meeting which I feel was, and is unfair, and should be recognized. Attached is a letter I have written regarding our opposition to this project. Mary Marlowe

MY NAME IS MARY MARIOWE AND MY MOTHER JANINA WOJCIK HAS OWNED HER HOUSE IN THE VENICE AREA ^{WITHIN 500 FT.} NEAR THE PROPOSED PROJECT FOR THE LAST 50 YRS. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS TOO EXPENSIVE (FOR THE TAXPAYERS), HAS NO PARKING (TO SPEAK OF) AND A LURKING DANGER TO ADJACENT CHURCH AND NEARBY SCHOOLS. WE ARE AGAINST IT! WE OPPOSE THE CHANGING OF THE ZONING CODES! THE WAIVERS AND THE EXEMPTIONS REQUESTED ARE NOT FOR THE BETTERMENT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD! WE SEE ONLY NEGATIVE IMPACT. 4-STORY BUILDING WITH FLAT ROOF ACCESS NEXT TO A "HOUSE OF WORSHIP" IS A DANGER WAITING TO HAPPEN! 4-STORY BUILDING OVERLOOKING SCHOOL WITH P.E. PLAYGROUND FOR CHILDREN IS A DANGEROUS PROPOSITION. 4-STORY BUILDING WITH ONLY 6 PARKING SPACES IS A "JOKE". WE ALREADY HAVE VERY BAD TRAFFIC CONGESTION ON LINCOLN BLVD AND ALL STREETS THAT MERGE TO LINCOLN BLVD BETWEEN VENICE BLVD AND WASHINGTON BLVD ARE CONGESTED TOO!! IN ADDITION, WE HAVE, SEVEN DAYS A WEEK, SHORTAGE OF PARKING ON ALL THOSE SAID RESIDENTIAL STREETS. ONLY THE STAY-AT-HOME ORDER DUE TO CORONA VIRUS PROVIDED SOME PROOF, EXPLANATIONS AND BIG RELIEF IN THAT RESPECT. BUT NOW, WITH THE THREAT OF RETURNING CORONA VIRUS HANGING OVER OUR HEAD, IT DOES NOT MAKE SENSE TO CREATE CONGESTION IN VENICE/CITY OF L.A., LIKE IT IS IN N.Y. CITY! WHAT WILL BE THE SHORT AND LONG TERM CONSEQUENCES ??? IF THE 4-STORY FACILITY GETS 50 CALLS TO POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT PER YEAR, WHERE WILL THE FIRE DEPT. TRUCK PARK THAT COMES ALONG WITH THE AMBULANCE AND THE POLICE? WHAT KIND OF CONGESTION WILL THAT CREATE ??? 4-STORY BUILDING WITH 40 APARTMENTS NEEDS SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS, VENDORS, MAINTENANCE AFF, DELIVERIES. WHERE WILL ALL THE VISITORS, GUESTS

F 2

2

PARK ?? Where will the contractors Park?
THIS IS NOT FAIR to the residents In the area.
Do we help "a Few" at the expense OF
many? THIS project as proposed will have
BOTH TEMPORARY and permanent negative IMPACT
on the community. Consequently we all will be
held Accountable for the decisions we now
make. Therefore, FOR allowing us to Express
some OF OUR concerns and views against
this proposed project, we thank you! in advance.

SUBMITTED BY THE
THE WOJCIK FAMILY
1138 AND 1140
VAN BUREN AVENUE
VENICE, CA 90291
(310) 266-4465
FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING
AS MENTIONED ABOVE.

Respectfully yours,

Mary Marlowe
Julia B. Wojcik
Dated: MAY 24, 2020

Communication from Public

Name: Steve Bradbury

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 05:55 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: This project is insane. 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 reject this project and not allow it to move forward where and as proposed.

Communication from Public

Name: Barry Peters

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 06:09 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: 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, Barry Peters Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Tracy Leinbach

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 06:20 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, Tracy Leinbach

Communication from Public

Name: Krista Hopkins

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 09:12 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, Krista Hopkins Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Bettina Adams

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 09:45 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Case CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI I am writing to express my opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and my support for the appeals filed against it. Most importantly, 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, VCH, 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 is outrageous! I am appalled that the CPC is approving a project to build housing for mentally ill homeless adults next door to a school. That goes against all common sense. The children in our community deserve better from our leaders and their interest are far more important than this project. 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. For all of these reasons, I urge you to take a closer look at this project, and not allow it to move forward here and as proposed. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Stefanie Cho

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 10:10 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 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, Stefanie Cho Grand Canal Venice CA 90291

Communication from Public

Name: Ingrid Miles

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 11:49 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Council File Number 20-0858 Case CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear PLUM Committee Members, As a Venice resident living in the immediate neighborhood of the proposed Lincoln Apartments project, I strongly oppose to the building of this project. Therefore I support the appeals filed against this project 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. Safety is the number one issue for our school kids and people in and around our neighborhood. School children have been exposed to violence and now experience anxiety. No longer does my elderly neighbor walk in that area, he is afraid. Police and fire departments have had large numbers of responses to the SPY address. I'm all in for establishing shelters, helping the homeless and mentally ill. However it is not safe to build this project at a location adjacent/next to two elementary schools and two daycares. 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, Ingrid Miles Venice Resident of 30+ years