

Communication from Public

Name: Web Farabow

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:13 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: Automatic road widening should be phased out. Wider streets have been shown to increase traffic speeds, making them more dangerous for everyone. Widening can also add costs to construction, making it even more challenging to build the housing LA desperately needs. Widening projects can also require tree removal, which makes our city less healthy and less beautiful! This is a great opportunity to phase out a misguided policy, and bring the City's practices in line with its own stated goals in Mobility Plan 2035.

Communication from Public

Name: Aaron Stein-Chester

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:16 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support this motion. Street widening and automatic street dedications make our roads more congested, less safe, and more costly to maintain.

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Jensen

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:17 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I am a regular voter and active member of my neighborhood council. Please support the motion to end automatic street widening dedications. These dedication requirements have been problematic in Venice, where the older street grid does not conform to the newer requirements. The feedback from the community has been that the narrower streets are part of the character of of the neighborhood, and a “one size fits all” rule does not work here. The result is haphazard street scapes with odd parking insets that reduce street parking and increase dangerous driving. Communities like Venice require narrowly tailored regulations because our lots sizes and streets widths are unlike the rest of Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: Barry Cassilly

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:29 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: Hi, Jeff. I strongly support the motion to end automatic requirements for street widening. In Venice in particular, these requirements are antithetical to the pedestrian friendly character of the community. The consensus of opinion in Venice overwhelmingly is supportive of narrower, more pedestrian friendly streets consistent with the original development patterns in the community. Street widening in older neighborhoods operates as a vestige of an antiquated urban renewal mentality that destroys the fabric of communities and imposes an alienating, lifeless alternative. Respectfully, Barry Cassilly

Communication from Public

Name: Robert

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:36 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: Please support the motion to end automatic requirements for street widening dedications. These “one size fits all” rules have been harmful to the Venice community, where smaller streets and walks are part of the character of the community. In addition, the haphazard application of street widening has created dangerous driving/parking conditions in the form of odd insets that are hard to navigate and actually reduce street parking.

Communication from Public

Name: John Farren

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:45 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support this motion. We need to end street widening and automatic street dedications. They ruin our city and make our roads more congested, polluted, and costly to maintain.

Communication from Public

Name: Adriane Hoff

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:46 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support the motion which will end the practice of street dedications. This is one more thing that drives up the cost of new housing and destroys mature trees. Widening streets creates dangerous conditions for drivers to speed. This is not what this city needs.

Communication from Public

Name: matthew j schwartz

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:48 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support this motion. We need to end street widening and automatic street dedications. They ruin our city and make our roads more congested, polluted, and costly to maintain. Having been to Europe and having experienced their medieval narrow streets, it seems we could take a lesson from history. Narrower streets are safer and healthier for everyone. We need to encourage alternative methods of transit in Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: George Francisco
Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:54 AM
Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the Council to support the motion to end automatic requirements for street widening dedications. These dedication requirements have been problematic in my community, Venice, where the older street grid does not conform to the newer requirements. The narrow streets and European layout of Venice are part of the character of the neighborhood, and a “one size fits all” rule just doesn't work here. We request thoughtful and well articulated guidelines that promote the betterment of Venice for its property owners, renters and businesses. Too often the effect of city policies, designed with more traditional urban areas in concept, prove to be extremely punitive in Venice. Few people in the community, save the trolls who want nothing to ever change, all houses to be single story 800sf shacks and rent to be free would approve. Passing a motion to automatically require street widening would result in haphazard streetscapes with odd parking insets that reduce street parking and increase dangerous driving. It would be very very bad for my community.

Communication from Public

Name: Tim Bonefeld

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 11:05 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: These dedication requirements have been problematic in Venice, where the older street grid does not conform to the newer requirements. The feedback from the community has been that the narrower streets are part of the character of the neighborhood, and a “one size fits all” rule does not work here. The result is haphazard streetscapes with odd parking insets that reduce street parking and increase dangerous driving. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name: Mark Millner
Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 11:32 AM
Council File No: 22-1476
Comments for Public Posting: We don't need to accommodate any more for cars in this city.
Thanks.

Communication from Public

Name: Karen Canady

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 11:33 AM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to support this motion. Street widening and automatic street dedications make our roads more congested, polluted, and costly to maintain. They also reduce our sidewalks and green spaces, remove trees, and harm the livability of our city. It also adds to the cost of housing construction, which we desperately need to make more affordable. Let's be intentional about designing and planning our city for livability.

Communication from Public

Name: Hannah Gibson

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 01:26 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I am in support of this motion! We need to end automatic street widening in order to make LA a more pedestrian-friendly and alternate transportation modality-friendly city. As someone who enjoys cycling, I don't always feel safe riding because of how fast people often drive in this city. Adding street dedications will allow for more speeding. In addition, requiring street widening with new constructions adds more costs to developers, which makes housing more expensive - a crisis-level issue in LA right now. Trees also must be cut down to widen streets, and as climate change is having more and more noticeable effects on our lives here, we need to keep as many trees as we can. Thank you!
Hannah Gibson 90032

Communication from Public

Name: Matthew Robertson

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 01:34 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support this motion and I thank the sponsors for bringing this motion forward. We need to end street widening, we need to focus on making sure streets have sidewalks. Street widening adds congestion, pollution, costs, and simply gives cars more space to drive dangerously, recklessly, and promotes distracted driving. If anything, we need to make these streets more narrow. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Mike Royce

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 01:42 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: We need to be making our city more walkable, not less! Please support this proposal to end street widening and automatic street dedications that make our roads worse in every way.

Communication from Public

Name: Usman Sohail
Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 01:57 PM
Council File No: 22-1476
Comments for Public Posting: End automatic Street widening

Communication from Public

Name: Ryan W. Johnson
Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 03:00 PM
Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing/speaking in support of Council File 22-1476 to stop requiring developers to spot widen roads, leading to incoherent streetscapes that are at odds with a safe, livable City. Wider roads make the City more dangerous, polluted, congested, and costly to maintain. Requiring developers to spot widen roads also contributes to our housing crisis by adding up to hundreds of thousands of dollars to the cost of a housing development. It also often converts greenery to impermeable asphalt. Spot widening creates streets designed for drivers, not pedestrians, with crossing distances lengthened, causing streets to be more dangerous and confusing to walk along and across. Finally, spot widening leads to poorly designed, incoherent streets. The City's streetscape should be intentionally planned block by block and neighborhood by neighborhood, not parcel by parcel with no vision other than widening. Ending spot widening will lead to a better designed City that works better for all who use it. Thank you for your consideration. - Ryan

Communication from Public

Name: Ray Dang

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 03:29 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: We need to end automatic street widening. THis creates hazards for speed, destroys trees, reduces pedestrian space, and is costly for developers.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 04:20 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support the motion to end the requirement that developers to widen streets when they build. The current policy encourages speeding in residential neighborhoods, narrows sidewalks, cuts down trees, and unnecessarily increases the costs of building housing. Narrower streets are safer for cyclists, pedestrians, drivers, and passengers. Residential streets should not be designed for high capacity and high speed throughput of personal vehicles. These streets should instead be places to go to and not places to pass through. Again, I support the motion to end automatic street widening. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Allen

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 04:28 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support this motion. We need to end street widening and automatic street dedications. They ruin our city and make our roads more congested, polluted, and costly to maintain.

Communication from Public

Name: Frank Murphy

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 04:41 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I am a small developer who has worked in and around LA for more than 45 years. I have installed many of these street widening requirements. They are extremely disruptive to parking layouts, street scapes, pedestrian traffic amongst other considerations. Whether or not the street widening ever occurs, it's extremely disruptive in the meantime and that meantime can last decades as I have experienced. I don't see a problem deeding the land to facilitate the future widening nor even requiring a pro rata share of the funding to be kept a job side for the future development but to do it without doing the whole block is quite honestly absurd.
Respectfully, Frank Murphy

Communication from Public

Name: Eric Pierce

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 05:46 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in favor of Council File 22-1476 to stop developers for having to widen roads which leads to dangerous and incoherent street scapes. When roads are widened, cars go faster causing likely fatal encounters with pedestrians and cyclists. Developers are forced to pass this road widening expense on to tenants of the building exacerbating the housing crisis. We need to create a Los Angeles that puts people first not cars. Thank You.

Communication from Public

Name: Heather Witt

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 07:13 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I am in favor of the widening of the streets depending on the size of the building. For instance, I own a property on the 3100 block of Hutchinson and there is a builder that is proposing 73 units being built on our very thin street. I do not think it is possible to add that many cars without creating more access. We will have a lot of backup on our street making it impossible for us to get out of our driveways. Also if we widen the street at the end, it will encourage the new tenants to exit the way with easier access to the main road and not go down the residential street. I think this is important for smaller streets like mine built in the early 1900s that are not designed for traffic flow.

8787 Community Outreach 11/20/2022 Notes

First I would like to acknowledge how thankful I am that we have such an open builder willing to work with our community for what's best. We really appreciated him taking the time to explain all of the different aspects that they were considering when designing this building. It is especially good to keep in mind that they are asking for concessions from the city to go above and beyond the height limitations laid out in the general plan.

This is NOT a done deal. The more we stay on him, the more we can request as a benefit to our community. Maybe by pushing harder, we can at least make small wins. At the end of the day, it will happen, but maybe he will make some compromises.

Possible neighborhood concessions: (Please tell me your own! Just offering suggestions here. These are not My must haves, just ideas.)

- a coffee shop or some outdoor space for the residents to not have to just hang out of the streets. (I imagine a bunch of tech guys needing space to work outside of 600sf of space.)
- getting rid of the dog wash (thereby not encouraging as many people to get dogs in the building) - having it encourages ownership.
- a few units for 2 and 3 bedroom people to grow and live in the building longer with more varied types of residents staying longer
- free parking for 50 of the units when requested. Or something to limit the 73 or more new cars in the area.
- Dedicated guest parking for 10 cars
- Getting the city to deny residential permits to his building.
- Fixing neighborhood sidewalks when they are pouring concrete.
- Adding security cameras and/ or staff for the building
- Upgrading the sewer and water lines in the street when building.
- Widening the street at the entrance to Helms.

I just don't have the time to lay out all items today, but I wanted to make a couple of notes.

There are a few wording choices that the building team seemed to repeat many times that I think might be keys to some of the bonuses that they are asking for.

Island Not park space: They keep mentioning that the island between Venice in "clearly not a park space." It is as if they can prevent that from being used as such, they are allowed to do something more on their land. That might be worth exploring.

1 building- They are pushing really hard that this is not 2 buildings. Clearly it is. There might be some reason they are divorcing them in the wording.

Traffic Study - Sounded like it was completed during covid, and they used the stats before the lockdown. And/or some new way of doing the report. We should demand a new one as so much has changed with the bike lanes on Washington and Venice since covid.

Parking permits - The biggest take away, was that they had told SORO building council that the residential building was not going to be eligible for parking permits. We now know that this is not true and he can't make any promises.

Paid Parking - The 73 units will have to pay extra for parking and possibly even for bike parking. No parking is offered with the units. So we go into this knowing that the 11 low income units will most likely not be able to afford parking as the rent is on a strict percentage of household income.

I just want to point out the differences between the max height limits in the area vs. what is being asked as a bonus. The front building should stop around the top of the electric polls at 55' (Now 82' high) and the back

building should go to 45' (now 70'6"). By adding 11 low income units he can go 2 stories higher with his building.

When you look at the building, a good way to get perspective is to look at the light pole, and imagine it up by half of another light pole. And there will be 8' between the light pole and the front of the building. I am guessing that is where the fence starts.

It looks like he is burying the electric poles within the building, but not on the outside.

There is no dog run for the dogs, he expects them to be walked in the neighborhoods as they are now. (Only with maybe 73 units, maybe 1/4 have dogs = 19 new dogs). It looks like the spot he was pointing for the dogs to go will be a bunch of trees. Maybe they should scrap the trees and make a dog run.

SORO is going to have a dedicated meeting for this in January. So they did not leave it with a blanket approval.

They need to make use of incentives, bonus density and waivers to finish this project that will most likely take a year to approve.

Try to send me contacts and emails and I will work to keep everyone informed.

With gratitude for all my caring neighbors.

Heather

Kyle Winston <kyle.winston@lacity.org>

Kyle Winston

City Planner

Los Angeles City Planning

200 N. Spring St., Room 721

Los Angeles, CA 90012

T: (213) 978-1348 | Planning4LA.org

Note: Regular Day Off Alternating

Mondays

Metro/Downtown DSC

Phone: 213-482-7077

Email: planning.figcounter@lacity.org

Bonnie Kim City Planner

Los Angeles City Planning

200 N. Spring St., Room 701

Los Angeles, CA 90012

T: (213) 978-1330 | Planning4LA.org

Hydee Feldstein Soto

HYDEE FELDSTEIN SOTO FOR CITY ATTORNEY 2022(ID:1435767)

15760 Ventura Blvd., Suite 700

Encino, CA 91436

Telephone: (213) 489-4792

Email: hydeefeldsteinsoto@gmail.com

Website: hydeeforcityattorney.com

Samantha Millman: cpc@lacity.org

ENTITLEMENTS AND PERMITTING

CITY PLANNING APPLICATION

CASE NUMBER: CPC-2022-8382-DB-VHCA
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NUMBER: ENV-2022-8383-SCPE
DATE SUBMITTED: 11/16/2022

DENSITY BONUS WITH INCENTIVES AND WAIVERS

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PROJECT EXEMPTION (SC

ENTITLEMENTS AND PERMITTING 20

DENSITY BONUS WITH INCENTIVES AND WAIVERS

PURSUANT TO LOS ANGELES MUNICIPAL CODE ("LAMC") SECTION 12.22.A.25 AND GOVERNMENT ("GOV") CODE SECTION 65915, THE APPLICANT REQUESTS APPROVAL OF DENSITY BONUS AFFORDABLE HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM COMPLIANCE REVIEW FOR A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT WITH 73 DWELLING UNITS, OF WHICH **15% WOULD BE RESTRICTED AFFORDABLE UNITS AT THE VERY LOW INCOME LEVEL**, WHICH QUALIFIES THE PROJECT FOR THE FOLLOWING INCENTIVES AND WAIVERS:

PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.22.A.25(F)(8), AN ON-MENU **INCENTIVE TO AVERAGE THE DENSITY, FLOOR AREA, OPEN SPACE, PARKING AND VEHICLE ACCESS ACROSS THE PROJECT SITE.**

PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.22.A.25(F)(4), AN ON-MENU **INCENTIVE TO PERMIT A FLOOR AREA RATIO ("FAR") OF 3.53 TO 1**, IN LIEU OF THE OTHERWISE PERMITTED 3 TO 1, AVERAGED ACROSS THE PROJECT SITE.

PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.22.A.25(G)(3), AN OFF-MENU **INCENTIVE TO PERMIT AN OVERALL HEIGHT INCREASE UP TO 23.5 ADDITIONAL FEET**, APPLICABLE OVER THE ENTIRE PROJECT SITE (NOT INCLUSIVE OF LIMITED PERMITTED EXCEPTIONS FOR PARAPET WALLS, ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT, STRUCTURES, AND IMPROVEMENTS PURSUANT TO WEST ADAMS-BALDWIN HILLS-LEIMERT CPIO SECTIONS VI-2.A.1.F AND VI-2.A.1.G AND LAMC SECTION 12.21.1.B.3).

PURSUANT TO LAMC SECTION 12.22.A.25(G)(3), **WAIVERS TO ALLOW DEVIATIONS FROM THE TRANSITIONAL HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS** TO ALLOW A MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT OF 78.5 FEET, IN LIEU OF THE OTHERWISE PERMITTED 25 FEET BETWEEN 0 AND 49 FEET FROM THE OPEN SPACE ZONE IN THE VENICE BOULEVARD MEDIAN, 33 FEET BETWEEN 50 AND 99 FEET **FROM THE OS ZONE IN THE VENICE BOULEVARD MEDIAN**, AND 61 FEET BETWEEN 99 AND 199 FEET FROM THE OS ZONE IN THE VENICE BOULEVARD MEDIAN.

WAIVERS TO ALLOW INTERIOR RECREATION ROOMS TO QUALIFY FOR UP TO 36% OF TOTAL REQUIRED USABLE OPEN SPACE, IN LIEU OF THE OTHERWISE PERMITTED MAXIMUM OF 25% OF TOTAL REQUIRED USABLE OPEN SPACE.

Communication from Public

Name: Kent

Date Submitted: 03/02/2023 10:20 PM

Council File No: 22-1476

Comments for Public Posting: I support Council File 22-1476 to end the practice of requiring developers to spot widen roads. This has proven to be an ineffective and now-obsolete effort to widen city streets, many in residential areas. The results have been counter-productive, creating irregular and confusing sidewalks and curb space while burdening developers with unnecessary expenses at a time when we need to make housing development more affordable. Thank you