

Communication from Public

Name: Charles Deutsch
Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 06:18 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, Your Name Charles Deutsch & Leslie Brennan

Communication from Public

Name: Mary O'Connor
Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 03:36 PM
Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing concerning item #20 0858, the proposed Lincoln Apartments on Lincoln Blvd in Venice. I live within 500 ft of the proposed development and am against it for the following reasons. Height and size are not consistent with neighborhood buildings Only six parking places for almost 100 residents No sober living requirements No mental health services or job training proposed \$500,000 per apartment is excessive and designed to benefit developers Current Safe Place for Youth has increased crime in our neighborhood

Communication from Public

Name: Jordan Wyner

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 05:04 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I am urging the city planning commission to support the project to house homeless youth in Venice. It is absolutely imperative to get as many unhoused youth into affordable supportive housing as possible. We cannot leave these kids behind; what type of city would we be. There are currently 400 unhoused youth in Venice, while this 40 unit project could house one in ten. The NIMBY-arguments of St. Marks Catholic Church are despicable and deserve to be rejected on their face. Moreover, their attempt to block this project goes directly against the teachings of Jesus. I urge this commission to allow this project to house people to go forward. It is not too late to reverse course and become a planning commission which puts people's well-being above other concerns. Take this meaningful step to approve the Lincoln Apartments!

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 09:32 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: The Lincoln Apartments, proposed adjacent to St. Mark Parish Hall are an infringement on the neighborhood, St. Mark Church/School and the businesses on Lincoln Blvd. I have never been able to understand why this location, in close proximity to a church and school has been designated for this project. In the past few months a couple of properties on Garfield have been sold or leased and I'm wondering if this fact has been made known to the new owners/tenants! As a home owner on Garfield I am strongly apposed to this project. For the sake of all concerned, the St. Mark church and school, the neighbors and businesses as well as the future Lincoln Apartment guests, please reconsider and relocate!
JH

Communication from Public

Name: Michele Prichard

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 09:32 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: September 2, 2020 TO: Planning & Land Use Management Committee, LA City Council FR: Michele Prichard, Mar Vista Resident RE: Support for Lincoln Apartments by Venice Community Housing Dear PLUM Committee Members, I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed Lincoln Apartments that will create 40 units of desperately needed affordable, supportive housing for people who are chronically experiencing homelessness. Several Councilmembers know me as a long-time member of the executive staff at the Liberty Hill Foundation, which is a strong supporter of the urgent need for deeply affordable housing and services. I am also a 5-year resident of Mar Vista (near the intersection of Lincoln and Venice Boulevards), and a 15-year resident of Venice before that (near Lincoln and Rose Avenues), and can attest to the increase in the number of individuals and families who have lost their housing due to rapidly rising housing costs, low wages, and the lack of a social safety net. The housing development proposed by Venice Community Housing, an experienced, award-winning and premiere community development organization in the state of California, is a sound and humane investment for our neighborhood. The new apartments are located on a dense commercial strip on high-volume roadway (Lincoln Boulevard), next to a 24-hour McDonalds drive-in—not a quiet, residential street. There will be a live-in manager on site to monitor the residents, all of whom will receive professional health, mental health and social services to help them stabilize and regain their dignity and their lives. A large share of the apartments will be dedicated to young people who have no other family or support system, and who will be assisted by Safe Place for Youth, an agency that has capably provided these services at this location since 2015. This is permanent, supportive housing, and the people living there will not be transient or transitional—causing little disruption or threat to surrounding neighbors. I was a strong supporter of this housing development before COVID-19, but now more than ever, we need to provide humane, sanitary and supportive housing for people who are experiencing homelessness due to exorbitant housing costs, low and sub-minimum wages, and now mass unemployment. It is immoral and unconscionable to say “no” to a project that is so well-planned, strategically

located, and desperately needed. Thank you for doing everything you can to support the construction and opening of the Lincoln Apartments at 2469-2471 Lincoln Boulevard in Venice.
Sincerely, Michele Prichard

September 2, 2020

TO: Planning & Land Use Management Committee, LA City Council
FR: Michele Prichard, Mar Vista Resident
RE: Support for Lincoln Apartments by Venice Community Housing

Dear PLUM Committee Members,

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed Lincoln Apartments that will create 40 units of desperately needed affordable, supportive housing for people who are chronically experiencing homelessness.

Several Councilmembers know me as a long-time member of the executive staff at the Liberty Hill Foundation, which is a strong supporter of the urgent need for deeply affordable housing and services. I am also a 5-year resident of Mar Vista (near the intersection of Lincoln and Venice Boulevards), and a 15-year resident of Venice before that (near Lincoln and Rose Avenues), and can attest to the increase in the number of individuals and families who have lost their housing due to rapidly rising housing costs, low wages, and the lack of a social safety net.

The housing development proposed by Venice Community Housing, an experienced, award-winning and premiere community development organization in the state of California, is a sound and humane investment for our neighborhood. The new apartments are located on a dense commercial strip on high-volume roadway (Lincoln Boulevard), next to a 24-hour McDonalds drive-in—not a quiet, residential street. There will be a live-in manager on site to monitor the residents, all of whom will receive professional health, mental health and social services to help them stabilize and regain their dignity and their lives. A large share of the apartments will be dedicated to young people who have no other family or support system, and who will be assisted by Safe Place for Youth, an agency that has capably provided these services at this location since 2015. This is permanent, supportive housing, and the people living there will not be transient or transitional—causing little disruption or threat to surrounding neighbors.

I was a strong supporter of this housing development before COVID-19, but now more than ever, we need to provide humane, sanitary and supportive housing for people who are experiencing homelessness due to exorbitant housing costs, low and sub-minimum wages, and now mass unemployment. It is immoral and unconscionable to say “no” to a project that is so well-planned, strategically located, and desperately needed.

Thank you for doing everything you can to support the construction and opening of the Lincoln Apartments at 2469-2471 Lincoln Boulevard in Venice.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michele Prichard". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long, sweeping tail at the end.

Michele Prichard

Communication from Public

Name: Edward Collman

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 10:35 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Council file #20-0858 Lincoln Apartments Ed Colman, Venice homeowner for 35 years. I adamantly oppose the Lincoln Apartments. I live one block away. This is the wrong project in the wrong place. The size is hugely inappropriate for the area. It will dwarf the surrounding buildings and is twice as tall as permitted by the Venice Specific Plan. 40 units. NO parking. Where will all these people park? They will park on our streets in front of our homes. Why has this exception been granted? No sober living requirement or on-site security guarantees there will be drug use and crime on the property. It is adjacent to two schools. Drug use and school children is a horrific combination. VCH has a terrible track record with other properties they manage in regards to security and safety. There is no reason to believe this one will be any different. There are several documented incidents involving clients of the Safe Place for Youth harassing and intimidating school children. The Planning commission said we were 'alarmist' and objecting to 'what might happen'. This is happening right now. It is not hypothetical. The Venice Neighborhood Council has unanimously opposed it. The people who live near this project all strongly oppose it. Its primary supporters do NOT live in the area and won't have to cope with the aftermath of this ill-conceived monstrosity. No one in the City government who has the ultimate say lives anywhere near here. The Planning Commission had the arrogance to declare that they knew what was best for our neighborhood better than the people who live here. Do not approve the plan for this disaster-in-the-making and help protect our children, our neighbors and our neighborhood.

Communication from Public

Name: Stanislav Sedov

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 10:35 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: This is a blatantly expensive project. We should cancel it and look for lower cost options. Building at \$1,000.00+/- sq. ft. it unacceptable. There are much better methods to achieve the goal. For example, shared housing, tiny homes, container homes, and the SRO method of Michael Weinstein at Healthy Housing Foundation. Cancel this overly expensive project and use the force majeure situation due to Covid-19. The City of Los Angeles is broke and more than ever you must be financially responsible with our tax dollars and show a higher degree of intelligence and wisdom during this extreme financial crisis we are all in. Please consider rejecting this project.

Communication from Public

Name: Alessandra Alma Alarcon

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 07:33 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. On a personal note, my children live a block from this proposed project, there are TWO schools on the same block as this project, and there is overwhelming OPPOSITION by the residents, the schools, the Archdiocese, and the local councils. How does this project make any sense for this area? How does putting mentally ill, possibly violent homeless people near children? It defies logic in every single way. There are open spans of space by LAX, plenty of unused land ... why place this in a population-dense neighborhood? Near children? It doesn't make any sense and it reeks of corruption. 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, Alessandra Alarcon Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: jonathan friedland

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 07:39 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, Jonathan Friedland 1139 Garfield Ave.

Communication from Public

Name: Vicki Halliday

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 07:40 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I urge a vote against approving The Lincoln Apartments project in Venice. The potential development is ill-placed next to St. Marks School. As a resident living near the SPY bridge housing project in Venice, the behavior of their residents has helped turn our neighborhood into a hell hole. The organization had no prior experience in residential management/counseling and I do not believe they've learned anything from bridge housing. Also, they are in violation of State AG filings for their non-profit status and have not paid taxes on their income. Please do not reward them with this project. Thank you for your consideration against this project application.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 07:48 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Please do not proceed with the removal of more affordable housing in your community (such as the Lincoln Apartments!) These measures (affordable housing) have long lasting effects on people's lives that are proven to help facilitate a safer, healthier community.

Communication from Public

Name: Stephanie Stephens

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 07:08 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 homeowner and long time
resident of Venice, I must express my opposition to Lincoln
Apartments along with huge support for the appeals against it.
Please do not allow this project to move forward for these reasons:
1. Well documented and constant safety issues caused by SPY -
that were hidden in the CPC report. 2. Planning Commission's
failure to provide a fair hearing as a result of conflicts of interest
by commissioners participating in the vote. 3. The violation of the
Open Meeting Laws 4. Inadequate parking - horribly inadequate
parking 5. This project is grossly out of scale Most of all, this
project is next to a Catholic Church and active Catholic preschool.
It is just a few doors down from a wonderful local elementary
school and two other preschools as well. If this project was
approved, then our children would certainly be at risk. This
particular developer has a terrible history of safety issues with
other buildings. The SPY facility at the end of my street has
generated a scary and ridiculous amount of police and fire calls
and presents a danger to all of us. Given that the people who are
behind trying to push this project through are not living locally in
the area that will be so negatively impacted - it hardly seems like
a fair and balanced consideration. This building would loom over
the local area and look completely out of place. It would set a
horrible precedent for future developers to build monstrosities like
it and ruin the look and feeling of our neighborhood. Venice and
its residents must be protected and not used to stuff projects like
this into neighborhoods where leaders don't care about the
"details" and only care about something that may seem altruistic
on paper. Please block this horrible project and protect our local
residents.

Communication from Public

Name: L.A.

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 07:10 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, I am concerned about several issues with this project, including the fact that the closest neighbors are schools/church that have already had difficulties with the current organization use. I am also concerned about the scale of the project which is totally out of keeping for the neighborhood, and there has not been parking provision inside the structure (other than a handful of spots). The guidelines, supervision, and rules for residents seems not thought out and ill-advised for this location. Also, it seems that neighborhood feedback has been sidelined or discounted and there are process issues. Obviously this project needs more study and especially more respect for the input of neighbors who want the project to be appropriate for the location. It would be good to have a smaller project with an appropriately supported small community of residents. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: SARAH FRANCES SPRAGUE

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 08:15 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" 6) I am seeing reports that ABH and SPY are operating with questionable business practices (<https://thevenicecurrent.com/2020/09/a-bridge-home-operator-faces-troubled-waters-with-doj/>.) 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, Sarah Sprague and Michael Fenster Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Judith Esposito

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 08:34 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: The city of Los Angeles must cancel this blatantly expensive project and seek lower cost options. Building at \$1,000.00+/ sq. ft. it outrageous. There are better methods such as shared housing, tiny homes, container homes, and the SRO method of Michael Weinstein at Healthy Housing Foundation. Cancel this overly expensive project and use the force majeure situation due to Covid-19. The City of Los Angeles is broke and more than ever you must be financially responsible with our tax dollars and show a higher degree of intelligence and wisdom during this extreme financial crisis we are all in. Please reject this project !!!!!!!!!!!

Communication from Public

Name: Lewin Wertheimer

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 02:28 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I have lived in Venice for 40 years and love my community and all it's diversity. Homelessness is an increasing tragedy in our already unfair society of haves and have nots, well and not well people. We need to support getting homes, care and safe places for people living on the streets or in their vehicles wherever and whenever possible. There is no one solution but this project is a wonderful and important addition to our Venice community, helping the most vulnerable to have a safe home. I strongly support this project and hope you will as well. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Mia Levy

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 02:31 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, My name is Mia Levy and I am a resident of Los Angeles. I am writing in support of the Lincoln Apartments in Venice. The people of Los Angeles are in dire need of affordable housing, and Venice Community Housing supports those in the community who need help the most. Approval of the Lincoln Apartments would mean so much to unhoused young people in the community. Thank you, Mia

Communication from Public

Name: jamie paige

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 02:51 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: A nonprofit organization linked to A Bridge Housing in Venice (ABH) and the Lincoln Apartment project, set to go before the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee on Thursday, has been put on notice by the State of California Department of Justice (DOJ). A California DOJ letter sent to Safe Place for Youth (SPY) states that the organization is delinquent in failing to submit a required annual report to the state's Registry of Charitable Trusts—a requirement for nonprofits that receive 501(c)(3) status. The result of this violation, the letter adds, is that SPY's nonprofit status is suspended and may be revoked. This would prohibit SPY from engaging in conduct that includes soliciting or disbursing charitable funds. Although it's not uncommon for an organization to be behind in filing tax documents, the timeline of the SPY filing begs the question: Why is SPY an operator at ABH—a temporary shelter funded by taxpayer money without 990 paperwork filed—and how is it part of a \$20 million project that is also partly funded by taxpayers?
<https://thevenicecurrent.com/2020/09/a-bridge-home-operator-faces-troubled-waters-with-doj/>

Communication from Public

Name: Joan williamson
Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 12:33 PM
Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers Harris-Dawson, Blumenfield, Price, Cedillo and Lee: I am writing to you as a 30 year resident of Venice. I have seen many changes in our neighborhood over these years, as you can imagine. But the one that is inexcusable to me is the exponential increase in unhoused people. I know that the reasons for this are many and varied – some as a result of actions by our federal and local governments, some as a result of a burgeoning national drug addiction crisis, some as a result of an economy that just doesn't work for everyone, etc. However, whatever the cause, it is up to us to fix at this point. And as a community we have voted for measures to alleviate the homeless problem. And I support the Lincoln Apartment project. I have listened to some of my neighbors who are opposed to the Lincoln project. They worry about safety, especially considering the proximity to two schools. They worry about parking in an increasingly dense area. And they worry about their property values. From my research, and as a parent, these worries are completely unfounded. First of all safety – We know that a housed community is safest. Living in an area where there are multiple persons living in tents is less safe than when they are housed. Lincoln Apartments will be permanent housing. It is NOT a shelter, rehab facility or temporary housing. All residents will be have a background check, a lease, an assigned case manager and other supportive services. And obviously, no sex offenders will be allowed to live in the apartments, as per law. This is not free housing. All tenants pay 30% of their monthly income, no matter how low. With a full time property manager on site, I will feel much safer knowing people are living in homes rather than on the street adjacent to my house. Venice Community Housing has been doing this work successfully for over 30 years. Their projects are near churches, schools, homeowners, families. People are safer inside. Safety is not a problem. Secondly, parking – unhoused people do not typically have cars. I have done the research and found out that of the 4 permanent supportive housing (PSH) nearby, there are a total of 3 vehicles out of 77 units. Parking is not a problem. Lastly, property values – When our Venice unhoused population is out of “encampments” and into permanent housing, our streets and sidewalks will be cleaner, safer and our property values will increase. This is simple. In summary, are we a

community who chooses to spend more money on routine “sweeps” and cleanups of unhoused encampments or do we do what needs to be done with the money that the community has already allocated for this work and build housing for those in need? I urge you to vote yes on this project.

Communication from Public

Name: Venice Community Housing on behalf of Loeb & Loeb

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 11:25 AM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Attached please find our submission to PLUM on behalf of the Venice Housing Corporation with respect to the appeals of the City's approval of its permanent supportive housing project at 2467 South Lincoln Boulevard.



ALLAN J. ABSHEZ
Partner

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
Suite 2200
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Direct 310.282.2099
Main 310.282.2000
Fax 310.919.3982
aabshez@loeb.com

September 1, 2020

Planning and Land Use Management Committee
Los Angeles City Council
City of Los Angeles
200 N. Spring Street, Room 532
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: September 3, 2020 Committee Hearing, Item 11, 2467-2471 South Lincoln Boulevard (CF 20-0858)

Honorable Members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

We are writing on behalf of our client, the Venice Community Housing Corporation ("VCHC"), which is the applicant for the above-referenced permanent supportive housing project (the "Project"). The Project responds to the continuing and escalating housing crisis by providing much needed affordable housing and associated services to serve young adults experiencing homelessness and those experiencing chronic homelessness. On May 28, 2020, the City Planning Commission unanimously approved the Project, and found the Project to be statutorily and categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). We respectfully request that the PLUM Committee recommend that the City Council deny all appeals and sustain the unanimous determination of the City Planning Commission approving the Project.

The City Planning Commission's determination approving the Project is based on substantial evidence in the record, as set forth in the findings and the administrative record. As noted by staff in its response to the appeals, none of the information provided in support of the appeals has established that the City Planning Commission erred or abused its discretion.

While all appeals should be denied as recommended by City staff, we provide the following additional analysis for the Committee's consideration, and ask that the City Council adopt the following additional findings in support of the Commission's Project approval:

1. The Project is a Supportive Housing Project within the meaning of Government Code Section 65651(a) and is subject to the statutory protections of Government Code Section 65650 et seq.
2. The City may only require the Project to comply with written, objective, standards and policies. Government Code Section 65651(b)(1).



3. Government Code Section 65653(a) mandates that local government shall approve a supportive housing development that complies with the applicable requirements of Government Code Sections 65650 – 66656.

4. Government Code Section 65654 prohibits local government from imposing any minimum parking requirements for the units occupied by supportive housing residents if the supportive housing development is located within one-half mile of a public transit stop. The Project is located on Venice Boulevard and is well within the required one-half mile of a public transit stop.

The Project is Protected by State Law (Government Code Sections 65650 – 65656)

The Project is a Supportive Housing Project entitled to the protections of Government Code Section 65950 et seq. The State legislature enacted Government Code Section 65650 et seq. to address homelessness by facilitating and expediting the delivery of permanent supportive housing. Among other things, this statute establishes permanent supportive housing as a “by right” use that is subject only to *objective* standards and policies. Under the statute, “[s]upportive housing shall be a use by right in zones where multifamily and mixed uses are permitted, including nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses where the requirements of §65651(a) are met.”

Significantly, Section 65653 expressly states that local governments “shall approve a supportive housing development that complies with the applicable requirements of this article.” Moreover, in light of the dire statewide need for supportive housing, Section 65653 mandates that local government, such as the City, complete their review of applications for supportive housing projects of 50 or fewer units (such as Project) within 60 days after an application is deemed complete. In this regard, and while appreciate the hard work of City staff and the unique problems created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the City’s approval of the Project has not met the timelines and is overdue.

While the City may impose standards and policies on permanent supportive housing projects, those standards must be objective. The City “may require a supportive housing development subject to this article to comply with objective, written development standards and policies; provided, however, that the development shall only be subject to the objective standards and policies that apply to other multifamily development in the same zone.” Gov. Code § 65651(b)(1) (emphasis added). In addition, the objective standards cannot “[p]reclude or limit the ability of a developer to seek a density bonus, including any concessions, incentives, or waivers of development standards, from the local government pursuant to Section 65915.” Gov. Code § 65655.

While, as discussed below, the City Planning Commission’s findings regarding the Project’s compatibility with other properties and uses are supported by substantial evidence, state law prohibits the City from applying subjective standards to the Project, or from denying it based on subjective standards. Therefore, as a matter of law, the City Council is precluded from overturning the City Planning Commission’s determination based on appellant’s subjective arguments regarding “compatibility” with other properties or uses.



State Law Prohibits the City From Requiring Parking for Permanent Supportive Housing Units

Not only is the Project's proposed parking waiver supported by the facts set forth in City Planning Commission's findings, but Government Code Section 65654 provides, "[i]f the supportive housing development is located within one-half mile of a public transit stop, the local government shall not impose any minimum parking requirements for the units occupied by supportive housing residents." The Project is located on Venice Boulevard and is well within the required one-half mile of a public transit stop. As noted in the City Planning Commission's findings, the Project is within *one-quarter mile* of a public transit stop, and thus, pursuant to Government Code Section 65654, the City is prohibited from imposing any minimum parking requirement on the Project's permanent supportive housing units.

The Project Is Exempt from CEQA Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.27(b)(1)

Appellant Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles (the "Archdiocese") asserts that the Project is not exempt under Public Resources Code Section 21080.27(b)(1) because "the project is a mixed use project containing a social service and referral center providing services to a broad range of clients in the community beyond the residents of the permanent supportive housing." This narrow reading of the exemption is entirely unsupported by the statute. Public Resources Code Section 21080.27(b)(1) broadly provides: "This division does not apply to *any activity approved by . . . the City of Los Angeles in furtherance of providing . . . supportive housing* in the City of Los Angeles." There is no dispute that the project meets the definition of "supportive housing," which definition requires, among other things, that the housing be "linked to onsite or offsite services that assist the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving their health status, and maximizing their ability to live and, when possible, work in the community." Health & Safety Code 50675.14(b)(2). Nothing in Public Resources Code Section 21080.27(b)(1) provides that the City's approval of the Project would cease to be "in furtherance of providing . . . supportive housing" because it also extends services to individuals who do not live on-site. There is no basis to conclude that the City erred in finding the Project exempt pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.27(b)(1).

The Planning Commission's Findings Are Supported by Substantial Evidence

While the City is precluded by Government Code Section 65650 et seq. from applying subjective standards to the Project or from disapproving the Project based on substantial evidence, the appeals provide no compelling basis for the City Council to overturn the City Planning Commission's unanimous approval. The appeals repeatedly rely on subjective arguments that the Project is not "compatible" or "harmonious" with adjacent or surrounding areas and would "adversely affect" other uses. In addition to the fact that these arguments are not supported by substantial evidence, these arguments rely on purely subjective assertions, which as discussed above cannot provide the basis for denial.

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, we respectfully request that the City Council reject the appeals, uphold the Commission's unanimous approval of this much needed Project, and adopt



the additional supportive findings set forth in this letter. We appreciate your consideration and look forward to answering any questions at the September 3rd PLUM Committee hearing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Allan J. Abshez', written over a circular stamp or mark.

Allan J. Abshez
Partner

Enclosures

cc: Hon. Mike Bonin
Len Nguyen
Juliet Oh

Communication from Public

Name: NIKKI SHALLENBERGER
Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 10:33 AM
Council File No: 20-0858
Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached letter. I OPPOSE this project.

Case File Number 20-0858

Case CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI

Dear PLUM Committee Members,

I VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE THIS PROJECT.

I am a long-time resident of Venice. I have 4 children and 3 of them attend St. Mark School. I am not a home owner because we cannot afford to buy a house in Venice. We can barely afford our rent. This was not always the case, but as you know, property values and costs of living in Venice have soared. It is one of the most expensive zip codes in California, per square foot.

This is just one reason why it doesn't make any sense to build this project, that will cost more than \$500k per unit to house just 39 out of 66,000 unhoused people - the majority of whom aren't even from Venice and have no ties to the community. Therefore I cannot be castigated as a NIMBY or a greedy stakeholder. I am only a stakeholder in the sense that Venice is my home and my community and it is where my husband works and my children go to school.

I have read and heard the arguments and inaccuracies that supporters of VCH and this project parrot, but the truth is well-documented with copious evidence.

- SPY does not, and will not screen for weapons at their drop-in site. This is unacceptable for a location that shares a property line with an elementary school and violates Penal Code 626.9 PC: The California Gun-Free School Zone Act.

- VCH will not screen for weapons at the proposed “Lincoln Apartments” residential facility
- VCH/SPY will not require this to be a sober facility.
- 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.
- The Planning Commission’s failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote
- The Violation of Open Meeting Laws
- Inadequate parking. VCH/SPY have only proposed 6 parking spaces for this facility, which means that parking (Residents, Employees and Volunteers) will overflow onto the surrounding streets. This will create additional hazards for children and families crossing the road to get to, and from St. Mark School, Coeur d’ Alene Elementary School and the neighboring preschools.
- 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). On May 28, the CPC heard the desperate pleas of too many parents and residents who will be directly impacted by this project, and shockingly, they ignored them.

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. VCH supporters - including a letter of support in the council file for this case, falsely claim that there will be on-site security. This is NOT TRUE. VCH/SPY say that having a 24 hour uniformed security guard goes against their best practices and they will not make that concession.

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. This was a terrifying experience for our school children, who had been practicing “active-shooter” drills all year. Parents received a text that the school was on lockdown, but we didn’t know why. An experience I hope I never have again. 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. My children have been subject to things that they are too young and innocent to comprehend: seeing grown men passed out in broad daylight, soaked in urine and/or vomit, grown men drinking alcohol on the sidewalk early in the morning, people defecating in the street, nudity, lewdness, they’ve been sworn at, harassed, verbally assaulted,

leered at, they've stepped over used condoms and human feces. They've seen men fighting with weapons, including a machete. They've seen filth and garbage lining the sidewalks around their school. They've seen drug paraphernalia. They've seen people experience psychotic episodes. They've seen too much.

The CPC's disinclination to consider these factors might be related to conflicts of interest held by two of the members, including President Samantha Millman and committee member Helen Leung. The specifics of these conflicts are laid out in the neighborhood appeal. But why did Vincent Bertoni totally disregard those conflicts in his rebuttals to the appeal? He didn't even address them. 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.

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.

VCH posted a faith-based letter led by Fr. Gregory Boyle sometime in May. The letter is signed by a number of religious leaders and urges support of this project, while falsely claiming that VCH did community outreach and worked with neighborhood councils. After the letter was posted, VCH and SPY supporters such as Linda Lucks were all over social media, touting Fr. Boyle as an example of “real Christian leadership.” Supporters consistently painted those in opposition as greedy, selfish, NIMBY’s, and On May 1, Mike Bonin’s husband, Sean Arian, gave Boyle’s Homeboy Industries a check for \$100,000. Arian sits on the board of directors for HI. He formed a tech non-profit in 2018 but there are no financial public records available. The timeline is troubling.

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,

Nikki Shallenberger

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 02:03 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. 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, Enid Baron Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: sean obrien

Date Submitted: 09/02/2020 09:53 AM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: please vote no, and help save Venice and show us that you are listening to residents and not service providers and consultants. 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: 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. The Planning Commission's failure to provide a fair hearing due to conflicts of interest held by commissioners participating in the vote. Inadequate parking. 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 is at four stories, looming 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 consultant, lawyers, bankers and 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 as proposed. Thank you, Sean Obrien Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: 30 Year Venice Resident

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

Council File No: 20-0858

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

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

Communication from Public

Name: Paul Graff

Date Submitted: 08/26/2020 04:55 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: My wife and I oppose the project. Venice Community Housing's other buildings and Safe Place for Youth have well documented safety issues, with a large number of police/fire responses. This is why the Venice Neighborhood Council voted unanimously to oppose this project and it is why we must speak up against this project!

Communication from Public

Name: Sheena AHDOOT

Date Submitted: 08/29/2020 11:36 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, Your Name Sheena Ahdoot Venice Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Andrew

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:32 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: I'm a local resident directly impacted the conflagration of unmanaged homeless in Venice. It's inappropriate to have an additional unmanaged homeless dumped on our community directly adjacent to a school and church community. Our community feels the negative effects of the unmanaged homeless daily via increased property crime statistics, inordinate calls to our police and fire departments associated with other homeless shelters, trash, harassment and general disorder. Please think of the larger constituency in the area and the impact these terribly negligent policies have had on or community.

Communication from Public

Name: David Myers

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 01:40 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: (I keep receiving a bounce-back notice when I submit this PUBLIC COMMENT FORM. Therefore, I am re-submitting.)
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: Mary Hruska

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 03:33 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: ?Re: Case File Number 20-0858 Case CPC-2019-6069-CU-DB-CDP-CDO-SPP-MEL-WDI Dear Council Members, As a resident of Mar Vista, the neighborhood immediately adjacent to 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, Mary Hruska

Communication from Public

Name: Juliet Chowdhury

Date Submitted: 08/31/2020 03:53 PM

Council File No: 20-0858

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, I am a mom and a resident of this city. I am strongly opposed to the Venice Lincoln Apartment project. It is dangerous to have this type of facility next door to two elementary schools. Recently, SWAT was called to my son's school, St. Mark, because a client of SPY was wielding a chain and destroying property. Since that experience, we live in constant fear of what might happen. I'm not opposed to this development, but it's location. It is unthinkable to have this next door to two elementary schools and is a recipe for disaster! Please do the right thing. Please help protect our children. Respectful, Juliet Chowdhury

Communication from Public

Name: Stephanie

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 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, Steph Griffith Venice Resident