

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

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



**F17a**

**A-5-VEN-16-0083 (742-748 BROOKS AVENUE, VENICE)**

**MAY 12, 2017**

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**From:** [Rehm, Zach@Coastal](mailto:Rehm_Zach@Coastal)  
**To:** [Rehm, Zach@Coastal](mailto:Rehm_Zach@Coastal)  
**Subject:** RE:  
**Date:** Thursday, May 11, 2017 4:55:10 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Ellen [<mailto:ellenthesignlady@netzero.net>]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 2:45 PM  
To: Hudson, Steve@Coastal  
Subject:

Hello,

I live next door to this project. The information that is stated in the Coastal Commission Report indicated that 2 houses were torn down. This is NOT correct. It was one small house. In addition, it is stated that 4 houses are to be built with detached garages. These detached garages have apartments on top of them, making this an 8 unit complex on a double lot. The owners have said that they are mother-in-law houses, trying to suggest that only mothers-in-law will be staying in them. In any case, no matter who lives in them, there are EIGHT UNITS.

The buildings are 3 stories high with deck roofs. There are two configurations. Two building 2-3 inches apart and then a space and two more.

Why did you approve this project? Venice is being raped by money hungry investors who could care less that Venice one was a thriving semi hippie community. It is slowly becoming a googlized nightmare. Why don't I sell, you ask? Because I want to do my part to try and save what is left of the city that I love.

Ellen Korak  
ellen the sign lady  
310-980-8674 cell

**From:** [Beth Tate](#)  
**To:** [Ainsworth, John@Coastal](mailto:Ainsworth.John@Coastal); [Rehm, Zach@Coastal](mailto:Rehm.Zach@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 742-748 Brooks Ave Venice  
**Date:** Monday, May 08, 2017 5:50:24 PM

---

May 8, 2017

Via email to Steve Hudson

Honorable Commissioners  
Jack Ainsworth, Executive Director  
California Coastal Commission  
45 Fremont Street, #2000  
S.F., CA 94105

OPPOSITION to Revised Findings A-5-VEN-  
16-0083  
742-744-746-748 Brooks Ave, Venice

Dear Commissioners and Mr. Jack Ainsworth,

I am writing to express my concern that the Coastal Commission is not performing their duties to protect our neighborhood from over development.

The recent debacle at 742-748 Brooks Ave has put light on what appears to be a cozy relationship between the Developers and the

City and Commission.

When the neighborhood began to experience redevelopment I was happy to see the influx of modern homes, most displaying creativity and retained the sense of "the individual."

But in the last couple of years it has become a free for all, mega cookie cutter corporate structures are grossly impacting our street and community.

Not sure you can do anything.

Beth Tate

845 Brooks Ave

Venice CA 90291

**From:** [Erik Arnesen](#)  
**To:** [Hudson, Steve@Coastal](mailto:Hudson.Steve@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [Ainsworth, John@Coastal](mailto:Ainsworth,John@Coastal); [Rehm, Zach@Coastal](mailto:Rehm,Zach@Coastal)  
**Subject:** 742-748 Brooks project  
**Date:** Monday, May 08, 2017 1:48:23 PM

---

Dear Commissioners -

The saga of 742-748 Brooks has become a sad refrain on residents ability to exercise any control over the size, scale, and impact of development in our neighborhood - and I see this throughout Venice. This has now landed in your lap and although your staff found reasons to not approve this project the approval went forward anyway and now I have seen that the staff findings have been reshaped to fit your conclusion.

This project has been out of scale from the onset - it is needlessly overbuilt and has the potential to become four residential units and four rentals. I live in a coastal zone, I am a native of Southern California and have always considered my outdoor living space as part of my lifestyle. I am dismayed at the trend to build out and build up with no consideration for the characteristics that enhance our Southern California lifestyle. I have always thought of the Coastal Commission as being on my side - protection and preservation of our coastal resource and in this case the watchdog on over built out of scale projects in a beach community.

I hope you can see that your original staff report that found this project incompatible still hold and that you can follow that report and look to mitigating the size and mass of this project.

Sincerely,

Erik Arnesen  
708 Brooks Ave  
Venice 90291

24 year resident of Venice

**From:** [MB. Boissonnault](mailto:MB.Boissonnault)  
**To:** [Hudson. Steve@Coastal](mailto:Hudson.Steve@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [Rehm. Zach@Coastal](mailto:Rehm.Zach@Coastal)  
**Subject:** 742-748 Brooks Ave. 90291  
**Date:** Monday, May 08, 2017 12:14:11 PM

---

Dear Coastal Commission Member,

I am a neighbor of this and other horrendous properties you have deigned to pass thru

( 663 Brooks Ave. has destroyed our property @ 667 Brooks by being allowed to go almost 40 ft. high, over 7,000 sq. ft. and made by one of the worst developers presently allowed to operate in Venice, Lew Futterman.)

You have failed us miserably on our street in particular and have allowed these unscrupulous greed-mongers to manipulate the process that is supposed to protect our neighborhoods. These builders are being greenlit to go way over what is acceptable to the REST of the community & their big money must be making it easier to get their way with your board. There is no way you have our interests at heart if you are letting the 742 Brooks Ave. go forward in the proposed dimensions. Where do WE get heard? Where do WE get to say how the integrity of our home gets upheld? Do you have ANY of our interests in your minds? Please consider how you are having a complicit hand in the ruination of Oakwood in particular right now and please know that we find the ability of money & influence to sway your board to help in this destruction to be entirely unacceptable. We are asking you to deny any further permits to this developer.

Thank you for your time,

MB. Boissonnault  
667 Brooks Ave. #1  
Venice CA 90291  
310-721-0153

From: [Nick Mele](#)  
To: [Hudson, Steve@Coastal](#)  
Cc: [Ainsworth, John@Coastal](#); [Rehm, Zach@Coastal](#)  
Subject: 742-748 Brooks Venice 90291  
Date: Monday, May 08, 2017 11:21:25 AM

---

Costal Commi ssi on:

Dear Si rs,

My family and neighbors are dumbfounded and angry to realize what this developer has done with his project. And the behavior and decisions revising the recommendations from staff by the commission are reprehensible. To go forward with this project demonstrates that developers have way too much influence on the commission. Do not forget the reason why the commission was established.

Di sgusted,

Ni chol as Me l e

Ni chol as Me l e  
701 Indiana ave  
Venice, CA 90291

**From:** [Laura Stoland](#)  
**To:** [Hudson.Steve@Coastal](mailto:Hudson.Steve@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [Ainsworth.John@Coastal](mailto:Ainsworth.John@Coastal); [Rehm.Zach@Coastal](mailto:Rehm.Zach@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Re: 742-748 Brooks  
**Date:** Monday, May 08, 2017 11:20:14 AM

---

To: Honorable Commissioners  
Jack Ainsworth, Executive Director California Coastal Commission

Re: Opposition to revised findings A-5-VEN-16-0083 742-44-46-48 Brooks Avenue Venice

When we moved to Venice I was excited to take part in an active community dedicated to forming its future. I joined with other residents to try to help shape the growth of our neighborhood in a way that honored its past and made room for growth. I volunteered countless hours to participate on the Venice Neighborhood Council's Mass, Scale and Character Committee and felt proud to be part of a group of intelligent and engaged neighbors shaping the future of our community.

The actions of the governing bodies have caused me to all but give up my involvement. From what I have observed in this case and others, it seems the elected and appointed officials have chosen to listen to and respond to the needs of developers, who stand only to profit; rather than the residents of the neighborhood.

Residents give of our time and energy for the good of the neighborhood while developers are motivated by short-term financial gain. We rely on elected and appointed officials to protect us, we cannot afford to spend our days defending our neighborhood in a fight. We have jobs to go to, families to raise, lives to live. Unlike the developers, we do not stand to gain millions from the outcome.

I would have hoped the Commissioners would have listened to the neighborhood's concerns and desires for the direction of the place where we live. We are the STAKEHOLDERS. We shouldn't have to have legal battles to have our voices heard or our preferences for our own streets respected.

Please do the right thing and represent the community's wishes. Do not allow Lighthouse Properties to continue their projects and do not pass the other similar projects currently seeking approval. There is room for healthy growth without exploitation.

Sincerely,  
Laura Stoland  
721 Brooks Avenue  
Venice, CA 90291  
(347) 526-7508

May 4, 2017

**F17a**

Via email:

Steve.Hudson@coastal.ca.gov

Honorable Commissioners  
Jack Ainsworth, Executive Director  
California Coastal Commission  
45 Fremont Street, #2000  
S.F., CA 94105

OPPOSITION to Revised Findings  
A-5-VEN-16-0083  
742-744-746-748 Brooks Ave, Venice

Dear Commissioners and Jack,

We are shocked to have received a copy of the “revised” findings presented to you by staff for the 742-748 Brooks Ave development (“Project”). As an agency that exists in order to protect the Coastal Zone, including visual resources and the character of Coastal neighborhoods, you have been put into a disgraceful position by this project applicant and his representatives.

Simply put, these newly “revised” findings make a mockery of the Coastal Commission’s review process. How can this Commission be comfortable that just a few months ago staff prepared a 301-page report outlining in precise detail the aspects of this Project that are not compatible and do not conform with the Coastal Act, and yet today is presenting you with an exact opposite conclusion simply with the addition of a couple of very minor changes/non-specific sentences? The proposed changes to the findings are not minor details, but rather they fundamentally flip staff’s report on its head. Suddenly, the exact same aspects of the Project that were blatantly determined to be incompatible with the character of the surrounding area, have now become compatible?

No real changes have been made to the Project plans. This action is nothing more than an artificial attempt to support your December decision, but it is based on absolutely no facts. None of the additions to the findings presented before you were discussed at the original Coastal Commission hearing. Staff never presented any of them. Their additions now, after

the fact, signal nothing more than the fact that staff is willing to make up whatever “facts” and “statements” need to be made up in order to take whatever action is at their whim or your pleasure.

What would acceptance of the newly revised findings mean for this Commission? Is the Coastal Commission telling its Coastal communities that evidence makes absolutely no difference to them; proving here that they can “spin” whatever project is put in front of them into something they will approve? With this decision, these are questions the Commission must answer.

It has never been the role of the Coastal Commission to blindly accept whatever staff report is put in front of them. Frankly, this is exactly the type of bureaucratic action that has drawn scandal to the Coastal Commission in the past couple of years. We ask that the Commission, in consideration of Coastal Act Section 30320, reject these “revised” sham findings.

Yours truly,

Robin Rudisill  
Jenni Hawk  
Smith Cho  
Erik Arnesen