

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD, SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4325
VOICE (562) 590-5071
FAX (562) 590-5084



F19a

ADDENDUM

DATE: May 9, 2022
TO: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Parties
FROM: South Coast District Staff
SUBJECT: **ADDENDUM TO ITEM F19a, Appeal No. A-5-VEN-21-0069 FOR THE COMMISSION MEETING ON FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2022.**

This addendum modifies the staff report to summarize and respond to public comments received since publication of the staff report, correct a typographical error, and clarify a footnote.

I. REVISIONS TO THE STAFF REPORT

The following modifications and corrections are made to the staff report dated April 21, 2022. Language to be added is shown in underlined text, and language to be deleted is identified by ~~strikethrough~~.

- a) Add a "Response to Comments" section to the staff report (Page 30) and renumber the subsequent section.

F. Response to Comments

In response to publication of the subject staff report, the applicant's representative submitted a letter in opposition to staff's Substantial Issue recommendation (May 5, 2022). On Friday May 6, 2022, the Commission received three letters in support of staff's recommendations of Substantial Issue and Denial of the De Novo CDP from Councilmember Mike Bonin and the two appellants.

Councilmember Bonin states that the subject development would "contribute to the cumulative erosion of community character" in Oakwood and replace four affordable units with two expensive single-family homes, which exemplifies how development has contributed to the wealth gap and residential segregation in Los Angeles. The letter from Citizens Preserving Venice claims that the "project would be harmful to the social diversity of Oakwood and therefore Venice."

reiterates some of the appeal contentions, highlights that the social diversity of Venice is concentrated in Oakwood and must be protected, and requests that the Commission direct the City to comply with Section 30625(c) of the Coastal Act, which states: "Decisions of the Commission, where applicable, shall guide local governments or port governing bodies in their future actions under this division," and enumerates the ways in which the City has not followed the Commission's decisions. The appellant also asserts that it is in support of ADUs as a tool to increase the allowable density on a site, not maintain it, and lists potential project alternatives that would lessen or avoid coastal resource impacts. POWER's support letter also reiterates some of the contentions raised in the combined appeal, states that the project would undermine the community's and City's goals to preserve and increase affordable housing in the coastal zone, and provides a narrative that suggests that the residents of the existing four affordable houses were long-term, low-income community members and that the applicant was unwilling to work with the community to find a solution that would prevent their permanent displacement.

The applicant's letter states that the staff recommendation runs contrary to the substance and spirit of the California Housing Crisis Act of 2019 and California State Senate Bill 9 because of the Commission's position that an ADU is not a full residential unit for density purposes and acknowledges that they are not the standard of review. In any case, these laws are intended to encourage the addition of new housing units, not for ADUs to function as replacements for residential units. The applicant's representative also lists and responds to five specific contentions made by the appellants in their appeal. Finally, the comments provided by the applicant's representative acknowledges that the City's existing LUP for Venice does not yet include an environmental justice policy, that the project has already been heard and discussed at three public hearings and the applicant has prevailed each time, and that the project conforms with the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan (uncertified), the certified LUP, the Venice Community Plan (uncertified), and the Mello Act.

Regarding the five statements in the appeal rebutted by the applicant (that the project does not conform with the community character and visual resources policies of Chapter 3; cumulative effects were not considered; the project would result in the loss of density; the subdivision is inconsistent with the neighborhood character; and the impact of the loss of the low-income units was not considered), the applicant's position is that the Commission should respect the City's interpretation and cites City findings that conclude that the project is consistent with the standard of review. Some of the City's findings, however, are associated with staff recommendations on the appeal of the subject local CDP, not the findings of the City's final action on the project. In addition, the City's findings regarding visual resources, cumulative impacts, density, and affordability are discussed at length in the Substantial Issue and De Novo findings of this staff report.

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

- b) Correct a misspelling of one of the appellants' names (Pages 2 and 6).

...POWER, (represented by Bill Przylucki)...

c) Clarify Footnote 7 (Page 15).

⁷ The Commission found that without provisions for harmonizing the requirements of the density bonus statute and the Coastal Act, the density bonus provisions of the LUP ~~did~~ not conform with policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. The legal basis supporting these suggested modifications is set forth in the memorandum to Coastal Commissioners from Ralph Faust, Chief Counsel, Dorothy Dickey and Amy Roach, dated October 10, 1995.