

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
PHONE: (831) 427-4863
FAX: (831) 427-4877
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



W23e

A-5-VEN-17-0018 (HARBAUGH & COURT)

JUNE 5, 2017

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Sue Kaplan
2. Carollee Howes

Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal

From: Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 11:14 AM
To: Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal
Subject: FW: 938 AMOROSO 2017-06-07

From: Sue Kaplan [<mailto:sueakaplan@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 2:32 PM
To: Posner, Chuck@Coastal; Henry, Teresa@Coastal; Hudson, Steve@Coastal
Cc: Mary JACK; Shepard Stern; LILLIAN WHITE; Nancy WILDING; Robin Rudusill
Subject: 938 AMOROSO 2017-06-07

Chuck,

The Appellant group for 938 Amoroso Place has some clarifications that we would appreciate you including in an Addendum.

1. The Commissioner Summary on page 1 indicates that the structure is set back 8 feet from the rear property line. According to the plans drawn by you in Exhibit 4 (page 16), the ground floor garage is set back 5 feet from the property line for approximately 28 feet (70%) and 0 feet from the property line for approximately 12 feet (30%); and the upper floor is set back 7.5 feet from the property line. In addition, on page 6, section VI. A., 2nd paragraph, you say that the “rear portion of the remodeled structure is proposed to be setback 8 feet from the rear property line.”

Saying the structure is set back 8 feet from the rear property line is misleading. Can you please clarify on both page 1 and page 6 of your Staff Report that the ground floor garage portion of the rear end of the home is set back 5 feet from the property line for approximately 28 feet (70%) and the remainder of the rear end of the structure (office) is set back 0 feet from the property line for approximately 12 feet (30%) for the unenclosed rear access stairs; and the upper floor of the rear end of the home is set back 7.5 feet from the property line?

Our understanding is that this is considered an “attached garage,” and the building is in fact attached on the second floor. Is there some reason you are going out of your way to indicate that it is not an attached garage and/or the garage is not a part of the overall structure?

2. Regarding the demolition, is the 58 feet for the demolition of the existing detached garage included in the calculation to determine whether the project is a remodel? Please let us know the source/authority for this calculation.

Also, what is the significance of the project being a remodel, i.e. if the project were to be considered a demo/rebuild, what would be different besides the one additional parking space that would be required?

3. We find the plans in Exhibit 2 (pages 21-23) to be illegible and assume that the Commissioners will have the same problem. Frankly, the lack of legible plans has been the source of much difficulty and confusion on this

project, particularly in terms of the setbacks of the project, which are one of the main issues. Is it possible to put a legible copy in the Addendum? For example, the demolition plan currently on page 21 can be doubled or tripled in size (and should be darkened) and still fit on one page. The ground floor/site plan and the second floor plan currently on page 22 can be at least doubled and each one placed on one page, as well as darkened. Also, the elevations currently on page 23 can all be tripled or quadrupled in size and should be darkened. All measurements should be included and legible, as is required. Also, any major changes, such as what is indicated on Exhibit 4, page 12, with the note: "Canopy over green roof will NOT be built" should be shown on the plans so that the record has the most updated version.

4. On page 8 of your staff report, second paragraph, the first sentence is very important and it is clear. But then in the second sentence you state that "Given the specific conditions surrounding the subject site and the diverse development pattern of Venice, it is appropriate to use the certified LUP policies as guidance in determining whether or not the project is consistent with sections 30251 and 30253(e) of the Coastal Act." Could you please clarify what this sentence means and why it is necessary?

Perhaps it would be more clear to say something after that first sentence, such as:

"As indicated in the Introduction to the Certified Venice Land Use Plan Policy Group I. Locating and Planning New Development/Coastal Visual Resources and Special Communities, 'Venice is really a group of identifiable neighborhoods with unique planning and coastal issues;' and thus the Community Character of Venice is made up of the unique development patterns and the unique mass, scale and character of its individual, identifiable and distinct neighborhoods. Accordingly, the certified Venice Land Use Plan, Policies I. E. 1. and I. E. 2., require compatibility of the proposed project to the *existing* surrounding residential *neighborhood*, and the related analysis typically considers the mass, scale and character, as well as landscape, of the other homes on the surrounding block."

I am currently traveling, but I'm available to answer any questions you may have via email.

Thank you.....

Sincerely,

Sue Kaplan, on behalf of Appellants

Sue Kaplan

sueakaplan@gmail.com

Please check out my Community Facebook Page: <https://www.facebook.com/SueKaplanVenice/>

Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal

From: Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 12:52 PM
To: Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal
Subject: FW: W23e: 938 Amoroso Place (A-5-VEN-17-0018)

From: Sue Kaplan [sueakaplan@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 04, 2017 5:06 PM
To: Ainsworth, John@Coastal
Cc: Hudson, Steve@Coastal; Robin Rudusill; Mary JACK; Shepard Stern; LILLIAN WHITE; Nancy WILDING
Subject: Fwd: W23e: 938 Amoroso Place (A-5-VEN-17-0018)

Hi Jack,

On Thursday, I submitted an Addendum to the case for 938 Amoroso Place, It asked some very pertinent and important questions re. the Staff Report, and I asked that the potential errors and/or areas of confusion be corrected or clarified. It has not been posted nor have I received an acknowledgement that it was received.

I ask that if an Addendum with corrections or clarifications is not sent to every Commissioner personally and posted prominently with the Staff Report first thing Monday morning, then we respectfully request that the item be continued, that a new staff person be assigned and a new staff report prepared that is responsive to our concerns re. the corrections and clarifications.

Please acknowledge that you received this email request and what your action will be.

Thank you.

Sue Kaplan, on behalf of Appellants for A-5-VEN-17-0018
sueakaplan@gmail.com

Please check out my Community Facebook Page: <https://www.facebook.com/SueKaplanVenice/>

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sue Kaplan <sueakaplan@gmail.com>
Subject: 938 AMOROSO 2017-06-07
Date: June 1, 2017 at 2:32:24 PM PDT
To: "Chuck@Coastal Posner" <Chuck.Posner@coastal.ca.gov>, "Henry, Teresa@Coastal" <Teresa.Henry@coastal.ca.gov>, "Hudson, Steve@Coastal" <Steve.Hudson@coastal.ca.gov>
Cc: Mary JACK <maryjackis@yahoo.com>, Shepard Stern <shep@sternworld.net>, LILLIAN WHITE <LWHITE1@verizon.net>, Nancy WILDING <nancy@bobcentral.com>, Robin Rudusill <wildrudi@me.com>

Chuck,

The Appellant group for 938 Amoroso Place has some clarifications that we would appreciate you including in an Addendum.

1. The Commissioner Summary on page 1 indicates that the structure is set back 8 feet from the rear property line. According to the plans drawn by you in Exhibit 4 (page 16), the ground floor garage is set back 5 feet from the property line for approximately 28 feet (70%) and 0 feet from the property line for approximately 12 feet (30%); and the upper floor is set back 7.5 feet from the property line. In addition, on page 6, section VI. A., 2nd paragraph, you say that the “rear portion of the remodeled structure is proposed to be setback 8 feet from the rear property line.”

Saying the structure is set back 8 feet from the rear property line is misleading. Can you please clarify on both page 1 and page 6 of your Staff Report that the ground floor garage portion of the rear end of the home is set back 5 feet from the property line for approximately 28 feet (70%) and the remainder of the rear end of the structure (office) is set back 0 feet from the property line for approximately 12 feet (30%) for the unenclosed rear access stairs; and the upper floor of the rear end of the home is set back 7.5 feet from the property line?

Our understanding is that this is considered an “attached garage,” and the building is in fact attached on the second floor. Is there some reason you are going out of your way to indicate that it is not an attached garage and/or the garage is not a part of the overall structure?

2. Regarding the demolition, is the 58 feet for the demolition of the existing detached garage included in the calculation to determine whether the project is a remodel? Please let us know the source/authority for this calculation.

Also, what is the significance of the project being a remodel, i.e. if the project were to be considered a demo/rebuild, what would be different besides the one additional parking space that would be required?

3. We find the plans in Exhibit 2 (pages 21-23) to be illegible and assume that the Commissioners will have the same problem. Frankly, the lack of legible plans has been the source of much difficulty and confusion on this project, particularly in terms of the setbacks of the project, which are one of the main issues. Is it possible to put a legible copy in the Addendum? For example, the demolition plan currently on page 21 can be doubled or tripled in size (and should be darkened) and still fit on one page. The ground floor/site plan and the second floor plan currently on page 22 can be at least doubled and each one placed on one page, as well as darkened. Also, the elevations currently on page 23 can all be tripled or quadrupled in size and should be darkened. All measurements should be included and legible, as is required. Also, any major changes, such as what is indicated on Exhibit 4, page 12, with the note: “Canopy over green roof will NOT be built” should be shown on the plans so that the record has the most updated version.

4. On page 8 of your staff report, second paragraph, the first sentence is very important and it is clear. But then in the second sentence you state that “Given the specific conditions surrounding the subject site and the diverse development pattern of Venice, it is appropriate to use the

certified LUP policies as guidance in determining whether or not the project is consistent with sections 30251 and 30253(e) of the Coastal Act.” Could you please clarify what this sentence means and why it is necessary?

Perhaps it would be more clear to say something after that first sentence, such as:

“As indicated in the Introduction to the Certified Venice Land Use Plan Policy Group I. Locating and Planning New Development/Coastal Visual Resources and Special Communities, 'Venice is really a group of identifiable neighborhoods with unique planning and coastal issues;' and thus the Community Character of Venice is made up of the unique development patterns and the unique mass, scale and character of its individual, identifiable and distinct neighborhoods. Accordingly, the certified Venice Land Use Plan, Policies I. E. 1. and I. E. 2., require compatibility of the proposed project to the *existing* surrounding residential *neighborhood*, and the related analysis typically considers the mass, scale and character, as well as landscape, of the other homes on the surrounding block.”

I am currently traveling, but I'm available to answer any questions you may have via email.

Thank you.....

Sincerely,
Sue Kaplan, on behalf of Appellants
Sue Kaplan
suekaplan@gmail.com

Please check out my Community Facebook Page: <https://www.facebook.com/SueKaplanVenice/>

Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal

From: Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 11:13 AM
To: Vaughn, Shannon@Coastal
Subject: FW: 938 AMOROSO 2017-06-07

From: Carollee Howes [<mailto:howes@gseis.ucla.edu>]
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 4:17 PM
To: Posner, Chuck@Coastal; Henry, Teresa@Coastal; Hudson, Steve@Coastal
Cc: Sue Kaplan; Robin Rudisill
Subject: 938 AMOROSO 2017-06-07

To: Chuck Posner, Teresa Henry, Steve Hudson

From: Carollee Howes

815 Amoroso Place

Venice CA 90291

Re: 938 AMOROSO 2017-06-07

After 35 years of living on the Millwood Walk Streets in Venice California I have learned a lot about Walk Street Alley life and manners. In particular there are life and manner problems when houses have no rear yard setbacks. With no rear yard setback on your own property getting the car into the garage is not easy. With a very short turning radius too many of us have scrapes and dents as well as much frustration waiting while a neighbor takes several tries to make it into the garage. For those of us in the middle of the block we have no easy street access to our homes. So when carrying children, groceries, etc. negotiating the alley is a daily hassle. When buildings are built to the property line meeting a car coming towards you in the alley means someone has to back up and there is no where to go. Backing up on the 900 block of Amoroso would include backing into a busy major street, Lincoln. With a rear yard setback there is room to pass.

Most importantly, buildings that stretch to the alley and fill our tiny lots almost to the side edges reduce the light and airflow for all of us. The proposed building will simply add to the congestion and with the lack of a rear yard setback set a bad precedent for future development.