

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD, SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4830
VOICE (562) 590-5071
FAX (562) 590-5084



W14a

ADDENDUM

July 6, 2021

TO: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Parties

FROM: South Coast District Staff

SUBJECT: **ADDENDUM TO ITEM W14a, APPEAL NO. A-5-VEN-21-0036 (GOLDSTEIN) FOR THE COMMISSION MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 7, 2021.**

I. Changes to Staff Report

Commission staff recommends changes to the staff report dated June 25, 2021 to make the following minor modifications. Language to be added is shown in underlined text, and language to be deleted is identified by ~~strike-out~~.

1. On page 14 of the staff report, footnote 11 shall be modified as follows:

Examples include the following homes: 2325 McKinley Avenue (3,114 square feet), 2321 McKinley Avenue (3,219 square feet), and 2417 McKinley Avenue (2,981 square feet (www.zillow.com)/2,304 square feet (ZIMAS)).

2. On page 20 of the staff report, the following corrections shall be made to the first sentence:

~~*Two~~Four structures were not included because staff could not verify the details needed to include in this table. ~~These two~~ Two of the structures are 2341 Beach Avenue (DIR-2016-4362-CEX) and 2365 Beach Avenue (DIR-2005-4782). Based on the project descriptions of these local actions, staff found these to include minor additions and not full redevelopments. The third structure is 2325 McKinley Avenue. ZIMAS shows that the size of 2325 McKinley Avenue is 3,114 square feet and that the home was constructed in 2005. The fourth structure is 2337 McKinley Avenue. ZIMAS shows that the size of 2337 McKinley Avenue is 2,918 square feet and that the home was constructed in 2002. However, staff was unable to locate relevant permit history in ZIMAS for either new home.

3. One of the homes in the survey area was inadvertently included in Table 2 (Past City of Los Angeles local CDPs and exemptions issued for redevelopment of all structures* within the surveyed area since the Venice LUP certification in 2001.) and in Table 3 (All structures currently within the surveyed area that were constructed prior to certification of the Venice LUP in

2001.). On Page 21 of the staff report, 2332 Beach Ave. shall be deleted from Table 3 and the total number of residences and average square footage shall be updated as follows:

2325 Beach Ave	1949	2,700	1,080
2332 Beach Ave	1948	2,700	1,784
2321 McKinley Ave	1948	3,647	3,219

[...]

Total Number of Residences in Table:	<u>4544</u>
Average Square Footage:	<u>1,3901,381</u>

II. Response to Correspondence

On July 1, 2021 and July 2, 2021, the Commission received four letters in opposition to the proposed project. The correspondence is included under the “Correspondence” tab of this agenda item. As addressed in further detail in the staff report beginning on page 12, Commission staff conducted a survey of all single-family and multi-family residences along both sides of Beach Avenue between Mildred and Olive Avenue as well as along both sides of McKinley Avenue between Mildred Avenue and Holly Court (Exhibit 6), for a total of 54 single-family and multi-family residences. The area survey undertaken by the City, was limited to Beach Avenue and included a total of 23 residences. Commission staff broadened this survey scope to provide a somewhat broader analysis. The mass and scale of the City-approved residence in relation to the surrounding homes is also discussed in further detail beginning on page 11 of the staff report.

As described on page 14 of the staff report, the information provided in tables 1-3 for the survey area is based on available permit history on the City’s zoning and permit tracking website (ZIMAS) and Commission permit history. Additional sources such as LandVision and Zillow were used to corroborate data collected by staff. Discrepancies between the County Assessor data cited by the project opponents and the data presented in the staff report can be further evaluated in a future de novo hearing on this item. However, it is not feasible for staff to undertake this analysis prior to the substantial issue hearing.

The comment letter mischaracterizes the cumulative effects analysis in the staff report. Page 14 of the staff report assesses the potential cumulative effects of the development in connection with past, current, and probable future projects. In order to ensure that analysis of cumulative effects was not skewed by comparison of past projects, the survey of residences in the subject area was categorized into three tables representing past redevelopment projects (Tables 1 and 2) and current housing stock (Table 3); these tables were then analyzed as separate data sets, as found in Appendix B of the staff report. In summary, the analysis of cumulative impacts of redevelopment in Venice reflects the most current and comprehensive information available to Commission staff to date.