

PLEASE POST AS A PUBLIC COMMENT WITH DATE AND RECIPIENTS VIEWABLE

Date: 5/01/2026

Subject: **Urgent Comments on CF 26-4118-S3 (220 Rose Ave, Venice) -**

Investigation Required/ & the City Council CANNOT proceed with a vote on CF 26-0170 (Venice Beach BID)

Hello Ms. Park,

On 3/27/2026, you wrote the motion for CF 26-4118-S3: Designation of Prohibited Locations / [220 Rose Avenue](#) / Council District 11 / Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 41.18. I would like to address a few issues of concern about this motion and this property.

The issue of egregious underpayment of commercial property taxes for decades is not an isolated issue at [220 Rose Avenue](#), it is endemic in Venice. For years,

Venice community advocates have documented a pattern and practice of many prominent commercial property owners in Venice, the essence of which is that if they find ways to operate with no permits, then they can avoid commercial property tax reassessment. Through these mechanisms, they hide many millions of dollars' worth of property improvements. We have extensive documentation available on request. This includes prominent commercial property owners within the Venice Beach Business Improvement District. This must be investigated immediately.

The City Council CANNOT proceed with a vote on CF 26-0170, currently scheduled for a City Council vote on May 5, 2026.

Please confirm receipt of this email. I would appreciate your immediate response.

Appreciatively,

Margaret Molloy

PLEASE POST AS A PUBLIC COMMENT WITH DATE AND RECIPIENTS VIEWABLE

Date: 5/01/2026

Subject: **Urgent Comments on CF 26-4118-S3 (220 Rose Ave, Venice) - Investigation Required/ & the City Council CANNOT proceed with a vote on CF 26-0170 (Venice Beach BID)**

Hello Ms. Park,

On 3/27/2026, you wrote the motion for CF 26-4118-S3: Designation of Prohibited Locations / 220 Rose Avenue / Council District 11 / Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 41.18. I would like to address a few issues of concern about this motion and this property.

CF 26-4118-S3 Motion and "Findings"

Your CF 26-4118-S3 Motion includes,

WHEREAS, the Office of Council District 11 has submitted / posted to the File relevant documentation, as further detailed in the Code, that the circumstances at this location pose a particular and ongoing threat to public health or safety;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to §41.18 (c) of the Los Angeles

Municipal Code that the Council hereby designates the following location for enforcement against sitting, lying, sleeping, or storing, using, maintaining, or placing personal property, or otherwise obstructing the public right-of-way, up to the maximum distance and effective for the maximum period of time prescribed, and as further detailed in the Code:

1. 220 Rose Avenue

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Department(s) with jurisdiction over the identified location is hereby directed and authorized to post appropriate notices of the above prohibitions at this location, and to begin enforcement upon the expiration of any required posting period.

On 4/13/2026, you submitted "Communication from Councilmember Park - Findings." it includes,

Description of the documentation:

Summary of Los Angeles Fire Department and Los Angeles Police Department statistics and data demonstrating the need to keep the aforementioned areas clear of encampments.

In "Communication from Councilmember Park - Findings" you also wrote:

The City of Los Angeles has made significant investments to increase the number of interim shelter beds for people experiencing homelessness (PEH) within Council District 11. There is an immediate need to provide safe spaces to unsheltered people living in the public rights-of-way in Council District 11.

1. Please provide the latest count for the number of unhoused people in Venice (92091), and in CD 11 overall.
2. Please provide the locations with address and number of the existing "interim shelter beds" in CD 11.
3. Please provide the date of closure, location, and number of "interim shelter beds" that have gone away within CD 11 since you took office on December 12, 2022.
4. Please provide the date of closure and number of "interim shelter beds" that went away at the Venice Bridge Home at 100 E Sunset Avenue, Venice - APN: 4286015900. <https://housinginnovation.co/deal/a-bridge-home-venice-beach/>, reports that that facility had with an approximate Cost Per Bed of \$60/bed/night for blended adults and youth. Currently, the Metro site is unused.
5. Please provide the date of closure and number of "interim shelter beds" that went away at the Ramada Inn at 3130 Washington Boulevard, Marina Del Rey, CA 90292. Please also provide the **expected return date of that site** for "interim shelter beds" within CD 11.
6. Ms. Park, as a lawyer by profession, though obviously not acting in that capacity as the City Council representative for District 11, your constituents expect a level of professionalism and transparency based on your professional experience. In "Communication from Councilmember Park - Findings" you wrote,

Description of the documentation: Summary of Los Angeles Fire Department and Los Angeles Police Department statistics and data demonstrating the need to keep the aforementioned areas clear of encampments.

Under "CF 26-4118-S3: Restrictions Pursuant to LAMC 41.18" you highlighted "Passage Routes" in yellow. At the bottom of the paragraph that followed, you wrote in red, "***Note: The data provided by LAFD and LAPD is from 03/16/25 - 03/16/26.**"

You did not include the "data provided by LAFD and LAPD" from "03/16/25 - 03/16/26" in your "Findings" document or in the CF 26-4118-S3 file. Today, please provide the actual data provided by LAFD and LAPD for the 220 Rose Avenue, Venice, site from 03/16/25 - 03/16/26" directly to all recipients listed here, and in the CF 26-4118-S3 file. That is an important public record.

7. Please provide the cost of all service responses provided by LAFD and LAPD from "03/16/25 - 03/16/26" for 220 Rose Avenue, Venice, cited in your "Findings" document.

8. Please explain why you did not tell you City Council colleagues in your motion or "Communication from Councilmember Park - Findings" that the site of the former Rose Cafe at 220 Rose Avenue, Venice, has been vacant since December 15, 2024.

9. Please provide a CD 11 summary of the potential liability of any property owner who creates an "attractive nuisance" if they fail to provide private security, lighting, and other activation of a vacant commercial property in Venice from December 15, 2024, until 3/27/2026.

In this summary, please provide the actual cost of all of our public responders to this specific site including but not limited to LAPD, LAFD, Care+ or any other city or county outreach teams; LA Sanitation; and the number of dispatch calls to the Venice Beach Business Improvement District for this specific site.

Taxpayers should not be paying for public services that were required because a property owner created an "attractive nuisance" by failing to provide private security, lighting, and other activation of a vacant commercial property in Venice from December 15, 2024, until 3/27/2026.

10. As you know, 220 Rose Avenue is the site is the former **ROSE CAFE** (www.therosevenice.la). It is one block east of Ocean Front Walk at Venice Beach. The Richlar Partnership has owned 220 Rose Avenue, and 212 Rose Avenue (aka 300 S. Main Street) immediately to the west, since 1977.

Los Angeles County Assessor records show the Last Owner Change for 220 Rose Avenue on 03/18/1977. APN 4286004002 encompasses 3-lots with a 7,789.9 sq. ft. area. The property has a Use Code: 2100 - Commercial - Restaurant, Cocktail Lounge - Restaurant, Cocktail Lounge, Tavern - One Story. **LACA 2026 [Tax] Roll Preparation for AIN: 4286-004-002 shows: “Land: \$308,640”; “Improvements: \$42,833”; Total: \$351,473.**

2025 Current Roll	RC	Year	1978 Base Value		
Land	\$ 308,640	\$ 302,589	A	1978	\$ 130,980
Improvements	\$ 42,833	\$ 41,994	L	1979	\$ 32,560
Total	\$ 351,473	\$ 344,583			\$ 163,540

That is not a viable commercial property tax valuation for this site as shown below.

212 Rose Avenue (aka 300 S. Main Street) to the west has APN: 4286004004. LACA shows a “**Use Type:** Vacant Land” and “Legal Description (*for assessment purposes*): *TR=OCEAN TR*(EX OF STS) LOT 4 BLK T.” ZIMAS shows a 6,966.1 sq. ft. Lot. **LACA 2026 [Tax] Roll Preparation for AIN: 4286-004-004 shows: “Land: \$176,715”; “Improvements: \$0”; Total: \$176,715.**

Land	\$ 176,715	\$ 173,250	T	1978	\$ 75,000
Improvements	\$ 0	\$ 0	G	1978	\$ 0
Total	\$ 176,715				

That is not a viable commercial property tax valuation for this site as shown below.

Analysis

The Richlar Partnership has owned 220 Rose Avenue since 03/18/1977, and 212 Rose Avenue since 05/06/1977. 220 Rose Avenue was originally owned by the Southern California Gas Company with 40'x96 office building on the site. The Rose Cafe opened at this location in 1979. On October 2, 1980, the Los Angeles Department of Building

and Safety issued a Certificate of Occupancy to "Owner: Richlar Partnership (below) with the description: "Convert existing one story, Type IIIA, 40'x96 office to market and restaurant, maximum occupants in dining area: 47; 7 parking spaces required, 45 parking spaces provided, G-2 occupancy."

220 Rose - 10/02/1980 Certificate of Occupancy – Owner: Richlar Partnership

Address of
Building

220 Rose Ave.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY



NOTE: Any change of use or occupancy must be approved by the Department of Building and Safety.

This certifies that, so far as ascertained by or made known to the undersigned, the building at the above address complies with the applicable requirements of the Municipal Code, as follows: Ch 1, as to permitted uses, Ch 9, Arts. 1, 3, 4, and 5, and with applicable requirements of State Housing Law—for following occupancies:

Issued 10-2-80 Permit No. and Year W24218/24994/79

Convert existing one story, Type IIIA,
40'x96" office to market and restaurant,
maximum occupants in dining area 47,
7 parking spaces required, 45 parking spaces
provided, G-2 occupancy.

0 1 5 0 1 2 0 0 1 5 1

Owner

Richlar Partnership

Owner's
Address

433 N. Camden Dr.

Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Form B-95b

BY D.P.PATTEE:ws

Subsequently, the Department of City Planning approved ZA-2008-1537-CEX; DIR-2011-2962-SPP; ZA-2011-1278-CUB; and DIR-2015-96-VSO for 220 Rose Avenue. Rose Cafe went through an extensive remodel and expansion in 2009; and the Rose Cafe closed for nine months in 2015 for a major remodel and expansion. On November 9, 2015, Amy Scattergood wrote in the Los Angeles Times (below), "the original Rose Cafe closed about eight months ago," and the new version is "jigsawed into a space that is about 5,000 square feet inside and 3,000 outside, which doesn't include the 50 parking spaces." (emphasis added)

On December 3, 2024, Stephanie Breijo wrote in the LAT (below) just days before the Rose Cafe closed, "The Venice icon had humble beginnings. In 1979 owner-founders Kamal Kapur and Manhar Patel flipped an empty gas-company office to a neighborhood cafe," but when it reopened in November 2015 the "8,000-square-foot Rose boasted 400 seats."

Also on December 3, 2024, Matthew Kang wrote in LA Eater (below), “Neroni stated that the Rose served upwards of 10,000 people a week, making it one of the busiest restaurants in Southern California.” And “Sprout has not announced plans for the space for 2025 and beyond, which means one of Venice’s largest restaurants will be left without a future for now.”

The Rose Cafe opened in 1979 as a 4,140 sq. ft. cafe at 220 Rose Avenue; expanded in 2011; and re-opened in 2015 at “about 5,000 square feet inside and 3,000 outside, which doesn’t include the 50 parking spaces” (LAT, November 9, 2015). **The 2026 Los Angeles County Assessor’s commercial property tax assessments for 220 Rose Avenue: “Land: \$308,640”; “Improvements: \$42,833”; Total: \$351,473.** This does not show the required reassessments for a change of use from office to restaurant, and substantial remodels and expansion of that restaurant. **The Richlar Partnership appears to have unjustly benefited for decades from this undervaluation.**

Assessment History																
☒ Hide Inactive Rolls Show All																
Showing 2 to 11 of 43 entries																
Roll Detail					Real Property Value											
Bill Num...	Bill Type	Bill St...	Date Created	Date To Auditor	Recording Date	Se #	Doc #	Doc...	Doc Re...	O...	Q...	%	Total Value	Land Value	Re...	Base Year
> 2250000	R	A	07/02/2025	06/27/2025	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 173,250	\$ 173,250	T	1978
> 2240000	R	A	07/10/2024	07/10/2024	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 169,853	\$ 169,853	T	1978
> 2230000	R	A	07/12/2023	07/12/2023	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 166,523	\$ 166,523	T	1978
> 2220000	R	A	07/26/2022	07/26/2022	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 163,258	\$ 163,258	T	1978
> 2210000	R	A	07/06/2021	07/06/2021	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 160,057	\$ 160,057	T	1978
> 2200000	R	A	07/06/2020	07/06/2020	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 158,416	\$ 158,416	T	1978
> 2190000	R	A	07/01/2019	07/01/2019	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 155,310	\$ 155,310	T	1978
> 2180000	R	A	07/19/2018	07/19/2018	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 152,265	\$ 152,265	T	1978
> 2170000	R	A	06/26/2017	06/26/2017	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 149,280	\$ 149,280	T	1978
> 2160000	R	A	07/06/2016	07/06/2016	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 146,353	\$ 146,353	T	1978
Rows per page 10 < 1 2 3 4 5 > 																
> 2150000	R	A	06/23/2015	06/23/2015	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 144,155	\$ 144,155	T	1978
> 2140000	R	A	06/24/2014	06/24/2014	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 141,332	\$ 141,332	T	1978
> 2130000	R	A	06/25/2013	06/25/2013	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 140,694	\$ 140,694	T	1978
> 2120000	R	A	06/27/2012	06/27/2012	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 137,936	\$ 137,936	T	1978
> 2110000	R	A	07/08/2011	07/08/2011	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 135,232	\$ 135,232	T	1978
> 2100000	R	A	07/22/2010	07/22/2010	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 134,222	\$ 134,222	T	1978
> 2090000	R	A	06/11/2009	06/11/2009	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 134,541	\$ 134,541	T	1978
> 2080000	R	A	06/12/2008	06/12/2008	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 131,903	\$ 131,903	T	1978
> 2070000	R	A	06/14/2007	06/14/2007	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 129,317	\$ 129,317	T	1978
> 2060000	R	A	06/22/2006	06/22/2006	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 126,782	\$ 126,782	T	1978
Rows per page 10 < 1 2 3 4 5 > 																
> 2050000	R	A	06/24/2005	06/24/2005	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 124,297	\$ 124,297	T	1978
> 2040000	R	A	06/26/2004	06/26/2004	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 121,860	\$ 121,860	T	1978
> 2030000	R	A	06/27/2003	06/27/2003	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 119,627	\$ 119,627	T	1978
> 2020000	R	A	07/05/2002	07/05/2002	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 117,282	\$ 117,282	T	1978
> 2010000	R	A	06/30/2001	06/30/2001	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 114,983	\$ 114,983	T	1978
> 2000000	R	A	07/13/2000	07/13/2000	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 112,729	\$ 112,729	T	1978
> 1990000	R	A	07/16/1999	07/16/1999	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 110,519	\$ 110,519	T	1978
> 1980000	R	A	07/14/1998	07/14/1998	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 108,509	\$ 108,509	T	1978
> 1970000	R	A	07/19/1997	07/19/1997	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 106,382	\$ 106,382	T	1978
> 1960000	R	A	08/03/1996	08/03/1996	05/06/1977	50	A					00%	\$ 104,297	\$ 104,297	T	1978
Rows per page 10 < 1 2 3 4 5 > 																

>	1950000	R	A	07/29/1965	07/29/1995	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 103,153	\$ 103,153	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1940000	R	A	07/31/1964	07/31/1994	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 101,940	\$ 101,940	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1930000	R	A	07/31/1963	07/31/1993	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 99,942	\$ 99,942	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1920000	R	A	07/29/1962	07/29/1992	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 97,983	\$ 97,983	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1910000	R	A	07/26/1961	07/26/1991	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 96,062	\$ 96,062	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1900000	R	A	08/15/1960	08/15/1990	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 94,179	\$ 94,179	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1890000	R	A	08/04/1959	08/04/1989	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 92,333	\$ 92,333	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1880000	R	A	08/23/1968	08/23/1988	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 90,523	\$ 90,523	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1870000	R	A	11111111	06/30/1987	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 88,749	\$ 88,749	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1860000	R	A	11111111	06/30/1986	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 87,009	\$ 87,009	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
Rows per page 10< < 1 2 3 4 5 > >>															
>	1850000	R	A	11111111	06/30/1985	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 85,303	\$ 85,303	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1840000	R	A	11111111	06/30/1984	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 83,631	\$ 83,631	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
>	1830000	R	A	11111111	06/30/1983	05/06/1977	50	A	00%- \$ 81,992	\$ 81,992	T	1978	\$ 0	G	1978
Rows per page 10< < 1 2 3 4 5 > >>															

The Rose Cafe operated 212 Rose Avenue as a commercial beach parking lot with about “50 parking spaces.” (LAT, November 9, 2015) **The 2026 Los Angeles County Assessor’s Tax Preparation Roll for 212 Rose Avenue with “Use Code: 100V - Vacant Land” is “Land: \$176,715; “Improvements: \$0”; Total: \$176,715** (1 = Commercial; 0 = Commercial; 0 = Unused or Unknown Code (No Meaning); V = Vacant Land). This does not reflect the required reassessments for decades of commercial beach parking use. **The Richlar Partnership appears to have unjustly benefited for decades from this undervaluation.**

Conclusion

Ms. Park, as the elected City Council representative for CD 11, I am asking you to provide the requested information above. I am also asking you to request an immediate Los Angeles County Assessor investigation of the property taxes at 212 and 220 Rose Avenue, Venice, and all other Richlar Partnership properties in Venice.

Additionally, the City Council CANNOT proceed with a vote on CF 26-0170

The Richlar Partnership and their other legal entities is the largest private property owner in the proposed Venice Beach Business Improvement District. Jeremy Weinstein, Richlar Partnership/ NSB Associates, is a founding executive officer of the Venice Beach Property Owners Association, the 501(c)(3) that has previously contracted with the city to operate the VBBID. **As shown above, the commercial property taxes of all properties owned by The Richlar Partnership and their other legal entities in Venice, and within the VBBID need to be investigated.**

Zone	APN 2	1st Owner Name	Owner 2 First	2nd Owner Assee Name
Zone 2	4286-005-010	Richlar Partnership		
Zone 2	4286-004-006	Richlar Partnership		
Zone 2	4286-005-011	Richlar Partnership		
Zone 2	4286-004-002	Richlar Partnership		
Zone 2	4286-004-004	Richlar Partnership		
Zone 2	4286-006-015	Richlar Partnership		
Zone 2	4286-006-018	Richlar Partnership		
Zone 2	4286-006-016	Richlar Partnership		

Additionally, the issue of egregious underpayment of commercial property taxes is endemic in Venice, not isolated.

For years, Venice community advocates have documented a pattern and practice of many prominent commercial property owners in Venice, the essence of which is that if they find ways to operate with no permits, then they can avoid commercial property tax reassessment. Through these mechanisms, they hide many millions of dollars' worth of property improvements. We have extensive documentation available on request.

Ms. Park, you are familiar with many of these properties and property owners.

Ms. Park, you know that Steven Heumann, Sidewalk Enterprises, is currently a member of the VBPOA/ VBBID Board of Directors (www.venicebeachbid.com/people/). Mr. Heumann filed the Articles of Incorporation for the Venice Beach Property Owners Association; was a founding executive officer of the VBPOA/ VBBID; is a former VBPOA/ VBBID president; and signed the 2021 VBPOA/ VBBID contract with the City Clerk as VBBID president.

There is no Secretary of State filing or Los Angeles County Fictitious Name Registration for "Sidewalk Enterprises" but that family and their representatives use that identity along with Piazza Partnership; Ocean Walk Properties Ltd; RMJD Partnership LP; Goodfader, Mary Tr., and other legal entities They are one of the largest private property owners in the VBBID. The "Sidewalk Enterprises" family has owned the entire two blocks on Ocean Front Walk at Windward Avenue since 1986, from Market Street to 17th. Avenue (4226-008-001: 1501 Ocean Front Walk; 4226-008-002: 1505 Ocean Front Walk; 4226-008-012: 1509 Ocean Front Walk; 4226-008-013: 1515-1521 Ocean Front Walk; 4226-009-001: 1603-1615 Ocean Front Walk). Since 1986, they have paid commercial property taxes for "Use Code: 2700" (2 = Commercial; 7 = Parking Lot (Commercial Use Property); 0 = Lots - Patron or Employee; 0 = One Story) for the entire two blocks on Ocean Front Walk at Windward Avenue.

The 2026 Los Angeles County Assessor's Tax Preparation Roll for 1501-1615 Ocean Front Walk with a "Use Code: 2700" and "Improvement: \$0" has a total valuation of \$3,943,981.

Meanwhile, for decades these two blocks house small businesses and takeout restaurants on Ocean Front Walk, with "commercial parking" on the rear of the lots at Speedway. **"Sidewalk Enterprises" appears to have unjustly benefited for decades from this undervaluation.**

Ms. Park, as the elected City Council representative for CD 11, I am asking you to request an immediate Los Angeles County Assessor investigation of the property taxes at 1501-1615 Ocean Front Walk, Venice, and all other properties in Venice owned by "Sidewalk Enterprises," Piazza Partnership; Ocean Walk Properties Ltd; RMJD Partnership LP; Goodfader, Mary Tr., and other legal entities.

For these reasons, the City Council CANNOT proceed with a vote on CF 26-0170

Again, we have extensive documentation of egregious underpayment of commercial property taxes in Venice, including within the VBBID, available on request.

Please confirm receipt of this email. I would appreciate your immediate response

Appreciatively,

Margaret Molloy

Media Coverage: Rose Cafe – 212 and 220 Rose Avenue, Venice

The Rose Cafe opens, or reopens, in Venice on Tuesday

<https://www.latimes.com/food/dailydish/la-dd-rose-cafe-open-20151104-story.htm>

By Amy Scattergood
Nov. 9, 2015

As you may remember, particularly if you live near the Rose Avenue location of the restaurant and feel strongly about the issue, **the original Rose Cafe closed about eight months ago.**

. . .

That team is running a compound that will seat some 240 people throughout a main dining room; a beer garden patio; a bar that includes counter, standing room and communal seating; and another large outdoor patio.

...

All of the above is jigsawed into a **space that is about 5,000 square feet inside and 3,000 outside, which doesn't include the 50 parking spaces.**

(emphasis added)

Venice stalwart the Rose to close after 45 years. 'I thought that place would be there forever'

<https://www.latimes.com/food/story/2024-12-03/the-rose-venice-closes-after-45-years>

By Stephanie Breijo
Dec. 3, 2024

The Venice icon had humble beginnings. **In 1979** owner-founders Kamal Kapur and Manhar Patel **flipped an empty gas-company office to a neighborhood cafe**, which quickly became a hangout for surfers and Venice's bohemian set.

...

But when it reopened in November, the "impressive" and "kind of stunning" new iteration retained roughly two dozen of its old staff and placed many others elsewhere in Sprout properties.

The **8,000-square-foot Rose boasted 400 seats**; a custom-designed kitchen with a wood-burning oven; an extensive wine program with around 2,500 bottles; expansive deli and pastry cases that would later incorporate a raw bar; new art from C.R. Stecyk III, a childhood fan of the original Rose Café; a 40-foot cocktail bar; and a hyper-local California-cuisine menu by Neroni.

(emphasis added)

The Rose, One of Venice's Most Popular Restaurants, Is Closing Forever This Month Relunched in 2015 by Jason Neroni and Sprout restaurant group, the Rose Venice will close on December 15

<https://la.eater.com/2024/12/3/24312097/rose-venice-closing-45-years-los-angeles-jason-neroni>

by Matthew Kang

Dec 3, 2024

The Rose, one of Venice's most iconic and enduring restaurants that relaunched in 2015 under Sprout restaurant group and chef Jason Neroni, will close permanently after brunch service on December 15, 2024.

Neroni stated that the Rose served upwards of 10,000 people a week, making it one of the busiest restaurants in Southern California.

Sprout has not announced plans for the space for 2025 and beyond, which means one of Venice's largest restaurants will be left without a future for now.