

Communication from Public

Name: carmen carpenter

Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 10:23 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 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, Carmen Carpenter Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Kristian hansen
Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 09:12 AM
Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I vehemently oppose going forward with the project located next to st mark school and church as well as several other institutions that provide education for CHILDREN. I've been called names in front of my child after picking her up from school trying to get an ice cream at McDonald's. There have been instances where the school closed down because of dangerous behavior by homeless people. I truly appreciate what you're trying to do in concept but it's just not applicable here. There are children let me repeat that there are children and whether you think it or not they are in harms way. The thought of bringing together a bunch of people who just can't quite put it together and function normal in society is straight up wrong. I generally do have concern and love in my heart for the homeless people so please don't get me wrong but doing it near the schools and the children is 100% wrong dangerous and not the kind of people I want my daughter looking at or being approached by when she finishes school. The thing that makes me the most sad is obviously this is driven by some political agenda and not what is good for the greater community. I respectfully vote no and will do whatever I can to encourage others to vote the same. Thank you for your attention. Kristian hansen altabird@gmail.com 3104332009

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 09:21 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 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, Bjorn Venice resident

Communication from Public

Name: Bob Carlson

Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 09:21 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 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, Bob Carlson Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Cheryl Scaccio

Date Submitted: 08/30/2020 09:02 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 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, Cheryl Scaccio Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Jill Belasco

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:20 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. We are really tired of being the dumping ground for the Westside, but this is not the answer. Thank you, Jill Belasco Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Patricia Jones

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 10:38 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, Patricia Jones Venice Homeowner

Communication from Public

Name: Rebekah Haraczka
Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 07:07 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 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, Rebekah Haraczka Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Varsiann Amerian
Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 02:11 PM
Council File No: 20-0858
Comments for Public Posting: Please accept attached pdf as my official public comment to the appeal on case 20-0858 with regard to Lincoln Apartments. Thank you, Varsi Amerian

Dear Honorable City Council Members,

As a 17 year resident of Venice, Presidents Row to be specific, and a parent of a student at St. Mark School, I am writing in opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and to express my support of the appeal for the following reasons:

Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with St. Mark School which is an elementary school, kids who attend range in age from 4 to 14 years old. I am 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. I myself was one of these people. We were told to hang up and call back-when I did the first number I tried gave me a busy signal, and then I dialed the number from the 818 area code, which was busy. I then called the original number for the meeting and had to wait to be let back in-causing me to miss important information and lose my place in line to speak-which ultimately I was not able to do. 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. The current plan is to have a rooftop deck that will overlook the outdoor classrooms and entire school yard of St. Mark. VCH has stated they have made "concessions" with regard to this part of the design, but outside of removing the deck altogether, the issues of safety still remain. Which I also want to address that

VCH made no attempts at involving the neighborhood in their process, nor did they perform any meaningful outreach with the neighbors to instill measures of good faith as a potential neighbor. The impact this will have on parking and traffic in and around the neighborhood is excessive and irresponsible. 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. This issue alone causes me great concern. We have ridden our bikes to school for the last 8 years and have seen the increase in traffic throughout the neighborhood grow at an amazing pace. The impact this project will have on the flow of traffic is a major safety issue.

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. This is not compassion but corruption. The office of Mike Bonin, of CD 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. I urge you to please reconsider.

Thank you,

V Amerian

Communication from Public

Name: Varsiann Amerian
Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 02:12 PM
Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members, As a 17 year resident of Venice, Presidents Row to be specific, and a parent of a student at St. Mark School, I am writing in opposition to the Lincoln Apartments project and to express my support of the appeal for the following reasons: Critically, the proposed project shares a property line with St. Mark School which is an elementary school, kids who attend range in age from 4 to 14 years old. I am 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. I myself was one of these people. We were told to hang up and call back-when I did the first number I tried gave me a busy signal, and then I dialed the number from the 818 area code, which was busy. I then called the original number for the meeting and had to wait to be let back in-causing me to miss important information and lose my place in line to speak-which ultimately I was not able to do. I also want to address that VCH made no attempts at involving the neighborhood in their process, nor did they perform any meaningful outreach with the neighbors to instill measures of good faith as a potential neighbor. The impact this will have on parking and traffic in and around the neighborhood is excessive and irresponsible. 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. This issue alone causes me great concern. We have ridden our bikes to school for the last 8 years and have seen the increase in traffic throughout the neighborhood grow at an amazing pace. The impact this project will have on the flow of traffic is a major safety issue. 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. This is not compassion it is corruption. The office of Mike Bonin, of CD 11, has declined to turn over communication related to the project, despite a California Public Records Act request. I urge you to please reconsider. Thank you, V Amerian

Communication from Public

Name: Jeremy Colantonio
Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 12:48 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, Jeremy Colantonio Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Ron Orr

Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 04:22 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, Ron Orr Venice Canal Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Dylan Porter

Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 05:49 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

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

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

Communication from Public

Name: Zennon Ulyate-Crow

Date Submitted: 09/01/2020 05:56 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Dear PLUM Committee Members, I am writing to respectfully urge you to approve the Lincoln Apartments project and reject the appeal against it. Permanent supportive housing is nationally recognized as the absolute best tool we have in solving homelessness. As COVID-19, heatwaves, and ash from wildfires threaten the lives of our unhoused neighbors, some would have you believe that concerns like parking are more important. Those who oppose this project are not reflective of our community's values. Los Angeles is for everyone. No one deserves to sleep on the street regardless of their history or circumstances. Almost 40% of the unhoused population in Los Angeles is Black. Of the approximately 6,500 Supportive Housing units existing in the city of Los Angeles, just 42 units are in Venice. Of the 9,500+ planned new homes over the next three years, only 173 are in Venice. When I hear opposition to this project centering around racist dog whistles like "security concerns" or "those people" it makes me sick to my stomach. We need to end housing segregation in our community and apply an anti-racist approach to how we build our communities. The appellants will surely voice many things, but the effect of not approving this project is indisputable: further segregating our community and deepening our housing crisis. During the engagement process for this project VCH and Safe Place for Youth held weekly public meetings for months, and as you'll be able to see all concerns were addressed. Any further issue taken with this project is in entirely bad faith. I would like to thank you for your initial unanimous approval of this project and ask that you uphold that decision today. Thank you.