

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

South Coast Area Office  
200 Oceangate, Suite 1000  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4302  
(562) 590-5071

**W8j**

Filed: 10/13/2005  
49th Day: 12/1/2005  
180th Day: 4/11/2006  
Staff: CP-LB  
Staff Report: 12/22/2005  
Hearing Date: January 11, 2006  
Commission Action:

**STAFF REPORT: REGULAR CALENDAR**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 5-05-414

**APPLICANT:** James Shaw      **AGENT:** Geoffrey Collins, Architect

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 201 Bernard Avenue, Venice, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Demolition of a one-story, 1,400 square foot single-family residence, and construction of a 30-foot high (with a 33-foot high roof access structure), 3,900 square foot single-family residence with an attached two-car garage on a 4,220 square foot lot.

Lot Area	4,220 square feet
Building Coverage	2,277 square feet
Pavement Coverage	650 square feet
Landscape Coverage	1,293 square feet
Parking Spaces	3
Zoning	RD2-1
Plan Designation	Multi-Family Residential - Low Medium II
Ht above final grade	30 feet (plus 33-foot high roof access)

**LOCAL APPROVAL:** City of Los Angeles Specific Plan Director of Planning Sign-off, Case No. DIR-2005-6946 (VSO), 9/29/2005.

**SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed house, because of its large size, has generated much opposition in the North of Rose neighborhood, one of Venice's established inland residential neighborhoods (Exhibits #7&8). The opposition is urging the Commission to deny the proposed thirty-foot high single-family residence asserting that its height and mass would be detrimental to the character of the neighborhood and would set a bad precedent for future development. In fact, there is a significant contrast between the size of the proposed project and the existing homes in the residential neighborhood (the neighborhood is overwhelmingly single-story, with a few two-story homes). The opponents are petitioning the Commission to use its discretion to determine that the proposed project does not conform to the qualitative policy language set forth by the certified Venice LUP and the Coastal Act in regards to community character. The applicant has received an approval from the City of Los Angeles Planning Department, although the City did not require a public hearing for the project. The hearing before the Coastal Commission will be the public's only opportunity to participate in the review of the project.

Staff is recommending **APPROVAL** with conditions that would limit the size of the structure in order to make it more compatible with neighborhood character as required by Section 30251 of the Coastal Act. **See the bottom of Page Two for the motion.** The recommended conditions of approval would permit the structure to be built up to the thirty-foot height limit for single-family homes with varied rooflines (as set forth by the certified Venice LUP), but would limit the height of enclosed living area to the 25-foot elevation (above the fronting street). As conditioned, only a sloped roofline, one roof access structure (one hundred square feet maximum) and roof deck railings would be permitted to exceed the 25-foot elevation. The applicant does not agree with the staff recommendation.

**SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS:**

1. City of Los Angeles certified Land Use Plan (LUP) for Venice, 6/14/2001.
2. City of Los Angeles Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 175,693).
3. Coastal Development Permit 5-00-005 (Podleski – 839 Superba Ave.).
4. Coastal Development Permit 5-01-360 (Podleski – 2338 McKinley Ave.).
5. City of Los Angeles Local Coastal Development Permit No. ZA-2004-3779 (213 6<sup>th</sup> Ave.).
6. City of Los Angeles Local Coastal Development Permit No. ZA-2004-3778 (741 Broadway).
7. Coastal Development Permit Application 5-05-453 (Corzine – 221 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. Venice).
8. Coastal Development Permit Application 5-05-461 (Slaten – 233 Rennie Ave. Venice).
9. Coastal Development Permit Application 5-05-464 (Burstion – 703 Machado Ave. Venice).
10. Coastal Development Permit Required (Gordon – 218 Bernard Ave. Venice).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the following resolution to **APPROVE** the coastal development permit application with special conditions:

**MOTION:** *"I move that the Commission approve with special conditions Coastal Development Permit 5-05-414 per the staff recommendation."*

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

**I. Resolution: Approval with Conditions**

The Commission hereby **APPROVES** a coastal development permit for the proposed development and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction over the area to prepare a Local Coastal Program conforming to the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

**II. Standard Conditions**

1. **Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment.** The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the permittee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
2. **Expiration.** If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date this permit is reported to the Commission. Development shall be pursued in a

diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.

3. Interpretation. Any questions of intent or interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.
4. Assignment. The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.
5. Terms and Conditions Run with the Land. These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

### III. Special Conditions

#### 1. Permit Compliance

All development must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions. Any deviation from the approved plans must be submitted for review by the Executive Director to determine whether an amendment to this coastal development permit is required.

#### 2. Revised Plans

A. **PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT**, the applicant shall submit revised plans to the Executive Director for review and approval. The project plans shall be revised to incorporate the following revisions to the project:

- (i) **Building Height.** All heights shall be measured from the elevation of the fronting right of way; Bernard Avenue. The height of the enclosed living area, as measured from the fronting right-of-way to the top of the ceiling/plate line of the upper level or story, shall not exceed 25 feet. Sloped rooflines, parapet walls, roof deck railings and decorative features may extend to a maximum of 30 feet above the fronting right of way. One enclosed roof access structure (to provide access to a roof deck) with a footprint not exceeding one hundred square feet may extend to a maximum height of 33 feet above the fronting right of way. Chimneys, exhaust ducts, ventilation shafts and other similar devices essential for building function may exceed the specified height limit by five feet.
- (ii) **Parking/Curb Cuts.** Three parking spaces shall be provided and maintained on the project site. One space may be provided on the driveway apron. Vehicular access shall be taken only from the alley. No new curb cuts are permitted. Existing curb cuts shall be removed and the curb restored in order to maximize on-street parking.

B. The permittee shall undertake development in accordance with the final plans approved by the Executive Director. Any proposed changes to the approved final plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the approved final

plans shall occur without a Commission amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is required.

### 3. Construction Responsibilities and Debris Removal

By acceptance of this permit, the applicant agrees that the permitted development shall be conducted in a manner that protects water quality pursuant to the implementation of the following BMPs.

- (a) No construction materials, equipment, debris, or waste will be placed or stored where it may be subject to wind or rain erosion and dispersion.
- (b) Any and all demolition/construction material shall be removed from the site within ten days of completion of demolition/construction and disposed of at an appropriate location. If the disposal site is located within the coastal zone, a coastal development permit or an amendment to this permit shall be required before disposal can take place.
- (c) Erosion control/sedimentation Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be used to control sedimentation impacts to coastal waters during construction. BMPs shall include, but are not limited to: placement of sand bags around drainage inlets to prevent runoff/sediment transport into the sea.

## IV. Findings and Declarations

The Commission hereby finds and declares:

### A. Project Description

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing one-story, 1,400 square foot single-family residence on the site, and construct a three-level (two-story plus mezzanine), 3,900 square foot single-family residence with an attached two-car garage (See Exhibits). The 4,220 square foot lot is situated about one-half mile inland of the beach in part of the Oakwood area of Venice that is referred to as "North of Rose" (because of its location north of Rose Avenue). The project site is a corner lot that abuts a city park and the border between the cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica (Exhibit #2).

The height of the proposed residence is thirty feet above the elevation of Bernard Avenue, with a roof access structure that extends up to 33 feet in elevation (Exhibit #6). A roof deck is proposed at the 25-foot elevation (Exhibit #5). Three on-site parking spaces are proposed, with curb cuts proposed on both Bernard Avenue and Dewey Street (Exhibit #4).

### B. Project Background

The applicant has received an approval from the City of Los Angeles Planning Department, although the City did not hold a public hearing for the project. The applicant is now requesting Commission approval of the coastal development permit that is necessary to undertake the

proposed development. The hearing before the Coastal Commission will be the public's only opportunity to participate in the review of the project.

The Commission has recognized in both prior permit and appeal decisions that the Oakwood area of Venice, where the proposed project is located, is a unique coastal community. In 1980, the Commission adopted the Regional Interpretive Guidelines for Los Angeles County which included specific building standards for the various Venice neighborhoods, including the Oakwood neighborhood. These building standards, which apply primarily to density, building height and parking, reflect conditions imposed in a series of permits heard prior to 1980. The Commission has consistently applied these density, height and parking standards to development in the Venice coastal zone in order to protect public access to the beach and to preserve the special character of the community and its historic walk streets.

On June 14, 2001, the Commission certified the City of Los Angeles Land Use Plan (LUP) for Venice. The certified Venice LUP maintains the City's and Coastal Commission's previous density limits and parking standards for the Oakwood area of Venice. Prior to 2001, the height limit for single-family residences in the Oakwood area was 25 feet. The certified LUP set forth a new, higher thirty-foot height limit for single-family residences in the Oakwood area and a few other Venice neighborhoods (Exhibit #2). The additional five feet in height (from 25 to thirty feet) is only permitted for projects with varied or stepped-back rooflines, in order to allow and encourage more variation in rooflines. Flat-roofed structures are still limited to a maximum of 25 feet.

### **Certified Venice LUP Policies**

The Commission adopted the following policy as part of the certified Venice LUP in order to regulate residential development on lots in the Oakwood area of Venice that have been designated with the *Multi-Family Residential - Low Medium II* land use designation. The following policy language applies to the project site, although the North of Rose neighborhood does not reflect the land use designation of the certified LUP, as it is comprised almost entirely one-story single-family residences.

Venice Land Use Plan Policy I.A.6.d states:

- **Policy I. A. 7. Multi-Family Residential - Low Medium II Density.** *Accommodate the development of multi-family dwelling units in the areas designated as "Multiple Family Residential" and "Low Medium II Density" on the Venice Coastal Land Use Plan (Exhibits 9 through 12). Such development shall comply with the density and development standards set forth in this LUP.*

#### **d. Oakwood, Milwood, Southeast and North Venice**

*Use: Duplexes and multi-family structures*

*Density: One unit per 1,500-2,000 square feet of lot area. Lots smaller than 4,000 square feet are limited to a maximum density of two units per lot.*

*Replacement Units/Bonus Density: Lots greater than 4,000 square feet can add extra density at the rate of one unit for each 1,500 square feet in excess of 4,000 square*

*feet on parcels zoned RD1.5, or one unit for each 2,000 square feet of lot area in excess of 4,000 square feet on parcels zoned RD2, if the unit is a replacement affordable unit reserved for low and very low income persons. (See LUP Policies I.A.9 through I.A.16).*

*Yards: Yards shall be required in order to accommodate the need for fire safety, open space, permeable land area for on-site percolation of stormwater, and on-site recreation consistent with the existing scale and character of the neighborhood.*

*Height: Oakwood, Milwood and Southeast Venice: Not to exceed 25 feet for buildings with flat roofs; or 30 feet for buildings utilizing a stepped back or varied roofline. The portion that exceeds 25 feet in height shall be set back from the required front yard one foot for every foot in height above 25 feet. Structures located along walk streets are limited to a maximum height of 28 feet. (See LUP Policy I.A.1 and LUP Height Exhibits 13-16).*

The standard of review for the proposed development is the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The certified Venice LUP provides specific guidance for the Commission's interpretation of the relevant Chapter 3 policies.

The Commission has not approved any new development in the North of Rose neighborhood since 2001 when it certified the Venice LUP with the new thirty-foot height limit for single-family residences. More recently, however, in 2005 the City of Los Angeles Zoning Administration, and the Planning Commission on appeal, ruled on a proposed two-unit residential project in the North of Rose neighborhood (Local Coastal Development Permit No. ZA-2004-3779: 213 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue). In that case, the City found that the mass and height of the proposed thirty-foot high project would be incompatible with the existing character of the neighborhood. The City limited the building height to a maximum of twenty feet. In this case, the applicant avoided the City Zoning Administration's jurisdiction by applying to the Coastal Commission for the necessary coastal development permit.<sup>1</sup>

The recent ruling by the Zoning Administration limiting a project to twenty feet is a precedent-setting action. This application may also set a precedent for future rulings by the Commission, as several applications for new homes are awaiting Commission review:

- Coastal Development Permit Application 5-05-453 (Corzine – 221 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. Venice).
- Coastal Development Permit Application 5-05-461 (Slaten – 233 Rennie Ave. Venice).
- Coastal Development Permit Application 5-05-464 (Burston – 703 Machado Ave. Venice).
- Coastal Development Permit Required (Gordon – 218 Bernard Ave. Venice).

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 30600(b) of the Coastal Act provides that prior to certification of its Local Coastal Program (LCP), a local jurisdiction may, with respect to development within its area of jurisdiction in the coastal zone and consistent with the provisions of Sections 30604, 30620 and 30620.5, establish procedures for the filing, processing, review, modification, approval or denial of a coastal development permit. Pursuant to this provision, the City of Los Angeles developed a permit program in 1978 to exercise its option to issue local coastal development permits. The Commission, however, still accepts applications for single-family residences and other development that typically qualifies for administrative approval.

### **C. Community Character**

Several persons (more than 100) have written and voiced their opposition to the proposed project (See Exhibits #7&8). The opponents of the proposed project assert that the mass and scale of the proposed single-family residence is out of scale with the existing structures in the neighborhood, and that it is not compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. As stated above, the standard of review for the proposed development is the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act, rather than the policies of the certified LUP. The Coastal Act requires that the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected, development be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and that special neighborhoods be protected.

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states:

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

Section 30253(5) of the Coastal Act states, in part:

New development shall: (5) Where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods which, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.

Building height and bulk can adversely affect the scenic and visual qualities of the Venice coastal area and the unique character of its individual neighborhoods. Architectural design and the provision, or lack thereof, of adequate open space and landscaping can also strongly influence community character and visual resources. The certified Venice LUP contains specific building limits and design standards that have been designed and adopted in order to preserve the unique character of the Venice walk streets and neighborhoods and to carry out the requirements of Sections 30251 and 30253 of the Coastal Act. [*See Page Five for certified LUP Policy I.A.7.*]

#### **Character of the North of Rose Area of Venice**

The North of Rose neighborhood, except for the properties along the Rose Avenue commercial corridor, is comprised almost entirely one-story single-family residences built in the 1940s and 1950s (a few are older). The few two-story residences in the neighborhood are modest in scale with a height of about 25 feet. There are two two-story houses on Bernard Avenue, and all the rest are one-story. Out of 169 properties in the neighborhood, the opponents counted 148 one-story homes, 21 two-story homes, and no three-story homes. Commission staff has visited the neighborhood and found it to be comprised almost entirely of one-story homes. The City Zoning Administration's findings for Local Coastal Development Permit No. ZA-2004-3779

(213 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue) defined the neighborhood character as one and two-story with a prevailing building height of twenty feet or less.

The Oakwood area is a neighborhood in on the cusp of a major transition. As is already common in the other Venice neighborhoods, many older homes are being sold to persons planning to replace them with larger modern homes. New two-story homes are not incompatible with the established existing Venice neighborhoods, as two-story homes have been allowed and built since Venice was first developed in the early 1900s. A large two-story home can be built within the 25-foot height limit that was applicable to single-family homes in the Oakwood area until 2001. The increase in the height limit to thirty feet is just enough for three-level homes. Three-level homes, however, are so massive in relation to the existing scale of development in the North of Rose neighborhood that they would redefine neighborhood scale. The opponents are working with their City Council representative in an effort to lower the height limit back to 25 feet, and to impose other building standards that would protect the existing low-scale character of the neighborhood while still allowing the homeowners to build up to two stories. The opponents do not want a new project to be built that changes the neighborhood character while they are trying to address the issue through a local ordinance.

### **Compliance with the Coastal Act and Venice LUP**

The primary issue with the proposed project is whether it is compatible with the character of the surrounding (Oakwood) neighborhood as required by Section 30251 of the Coastal Act. The opponents argue that the mass and scale of the proposed single-family residence is out of scale with the existing structures in the neighborhood, and that it is not compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. In this case, the applicant is proposing a two-story home with a habitable mezzanine level that reaches thirty feet in elevation. The project site abuts a city park and the border between the cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica (Exhibit #2).

The maximum height for single-family homes in the Oakwood area, as set forth by the certified Venice LUP, is 25 feet with an additional five feet for a “a varied or stepped back roofline” instead of a flat roof. The purpose of allowing the additional five feet (from 25 to thirty feet) is to allow buildings to be designed without flat roofs so as to avoid blocky buildings. The additional five feet in height for varied rooflines is discretionary: additional height over 25 feet does not have to be approved if the project would result in a significant contrast in the mass and scale of a new building in relation to the character of the established neighborhood (Coastal Act Sections 30251 and 30253).

The opposition is urging the Commission to deny the proposed thirty-foot high single-family residence asserting that its height and mass would be detrimental to the character of the neighborhood and would set a bad precedent for future development. In fact, there is a significant contrast between the size of the proposed project and the existing homes in the residential neighborhood (the neighborhood is overwhelmingly single-story, with a few two-story homes). The opponents are petitioning the Commission to use its discretion to determine that the proposed project does not conform to the qualitative policy language set forth by the certified Venice LUP and the Coastal Act in regards to community character.



Staff is recommending a conditional approval that would limit the size of the structure in order to make it more compatible with neighborhood character as required by Section 30251 of the Coastal Act, while still allowing the applicant to build a large two-story home. The recommended conditions of approval would permit the structure to be built up to the thirty-foot height limit for single-family homes with varied rooflines (as set forth by the certified Venice LUP), but would limit the height of enclosed living area to the 25-foot elevation (above the fronting street). As conditioned, only a sloped roofline, one roof access structure (one hundred square feet maximum) and roof deck railings would be permitted to exceed the 25-foot elevation. The mezzanine would be eliminated, or moved entirely below the 25-foot elevation, so that no enclosed living area would be above the 25-foot level. The recommended conditions of approval would reduce the contrast between the proposed project and the existing development, thus making it more visually compatible with the character of surrounding area. The recommendation would also protect the special neighborhood from a bad precedent which would certainly be followed by similarly-sized development proposals.

Therefore, the Commission finds that, only as conditioned will the proposed project conform with the requirements of Sections 30251 and 30253 of the Coastal Act to be compatible with the character of the surrounding (Oakwood North of Rose) neighborhood and it will not adversely affect neighborhood character.

#### **D. Parking**

The Commission has consistently found that a direct relationship exists between residential density, the provision of adequate parking, and the availability of public access to the coast. Section 30252 requires that new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by providing adequate parking facilities.

Section 30252 of the Coastal Act states, in part:

The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by... (4) providing adequate parking facilities....

Many of the older developments in Venice do not provide adequate on-site parking. As a result, there is a parking shortage in the area and public access has been negatively impacted. The walk streets and alleys provide no public parking, and residents of the area and their guests often occupy the small amount of parking area that may be available for the general public on the surrounding streets. To mitigate this problem, the Commission has consistently conditioned new single-family residences in the Oakwood area of Venice to provide three on-site parking spaces.

The proposed project includes three on-site parking spaces, but also proposes two curb cuts on public streets that provide public parking (Exhibit #4). The curb cuts would reduce the amount of on-street parking and are unnecessary as the project site has direct access from the fifteen-foot wide rear alley (Exhibit #3). The on-street parking in the neighborhood is seldom, if ever, used by beach goers because of the distance to the shoreline (about a half-mile). There is, however, a city park within twenty feet of the project site. Park visitors and guests of residents depend on the on-street parking when they visit this neighborhood. Therefore, the permit is conditioned to eliminate the proposed curb cuts and to take vehicular access from the alley. The Commission finds that, only as conditioned to ensure the continued provision of

adequate on-site parking, is the proposed project consistent with the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

#### **E. Control of Polluted Runoff**

Section 30230 of the Coastal Act states:

Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.

Section 30231 of the Coastal Act states:

The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

The proposed project poses a potential source of pollution due to contaminated runoff. Runoff from the site enters the City's stormdrain system and is ultimately discharged into the marine environment. Untreated wastewater from the site must be prevented from negatively affecting the marine resources in the adjacent waters of the Pacific Ocean. To mitigate potential impacts to marine resources caused by polluted runoff leaving the site, a special condition requires the applicant to incorporate best management practices (BMPs) into the project and site management procedures to reduce or prevent contaminants from running off the site. As conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with past Commission action with regards to water quality requirements and will minimize water quality impacts. The Commission, therefore, finds that, as conditioned, the development will be consistent with Sections 30230 and 30231 of the Coastal Act.

#### **F. Local Coastal Program**

Section 30604(a) of the Coastal Act provides that the Commission shall issue a coastal development permit only if the project will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction to prepare a Local Coastal Program which conforms with Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act:

- (a) Prior to certification of the Local Coastal Program, a coastal development permit shall be issued if the issuing agency, or the commission on appeal, finds that the proposed development is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200) of this division and that the permitted development will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a Local

Coastal Program that is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200). A denial of a Coastal Development Permit on grounds it would prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a Local Coastal Program that is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200) shall be accompanied by a specific finding which sets forth the basis for such conclusion.

The City of Los Angeles does not have a certified Local Coastal Program for the Venice area. The City of Los Angeles Land Use Plan (LUP) for Venice was effectively certified on June 14, 2001. As conditioned, the proposed development is consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and with the certified Land Use Plan for the area. Approval of the project, as conditioned, will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare an LCP that is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.

**G. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

Section 13096 Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations requires Commission approval of a coastal development permit application to be supported by a finding showing the application, as conditioned by any conditions of approval, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) of CEQA prohibits a proposed development from being approved if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect which the activity may have on the environment.

The proposed project, as conditioned, has been found consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. As conditioned, there are no feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect which the activity may have on the environment. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project, as conditioned to mitigate the identified impacts, is the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative and can be found consistent with the requirements of the Coastal Act to conform to CEQA.