

(DRAFT)

Grass Roots Venice Neighborhood Council

Special Board of Officers Meeting Minutes

October 25, 2005

1. Meeting was called to order by DeDe Audet at 8:10 pm
2. Prior to calling the role Jan Sproull, District 2 rep, raised a point of order as to the authority of the Board to hold this meeting. Ivan Spiegel, Parliamentarian, noted that Deanna Stevenson of DONE at a previous meeting reviewed the Brown Act requirements for calling a special meeting. Those requirements had been met by the Communications Officer. After further review of The GRVNC Bylaws, DeDe Audet reminded Jan Sproull that the ultimate governing authority lies with The Stakeholders and that her interpretation was that The Stakeholders thru their elected representatives had sanctioned the meeting. Jan Sproull indicated that she had no reason to not want the meeting to continue other than her desire for us to abide by our bylaws. Ivan Spiegel's interpretation was that there was no prohibition on additional meetings.

3. Announcements

David Ewing reported that residents of Lincoln Place presented their case to The LA City PLUM Committee today. The reason they were there was that the conditions agreed to earlier are not being enforced and that any conditions recommended by The GRVNC might also be ignored by The City.

David Moring announced that The Emergency Preparedness committee will have their 1st organizational meeting this Thursday, October 27th and urged all interested parties to attend.

4. **Role Call** by Phil Raider, 18 present including DeDe Audet, Colette Bailey, CJ Cole, Sylviane Dungan, Peter Force, Michael King, Linda Lucks, Challis Macpherson, Ingrid Mueller, Stan Muhammad, Richard Myers, Naomi Nightingale, Dianna Pollard, Phil Raider, Jan Sproull, Rebecca Tafoya, Mindy Taylor-Ross, Kelley S Willis.
Absent: LJ Carusone, Yolanda Gonzalez, Brett Miller

5. Additional Announcements

Deanna Stevenson wants to remind everyone to get their Budget Surveys completed, must be in by 12/15/05. The form is available on line.

There is space available at The Vera Davis Center to store our equipment.

The GRVNC 05-06 budget has been officially accepted by the city.

The next Regular Board Meeting will be 11/15/05 at Westminster School.

6. Public Comment

An unknown speaker wanted to know how outreach for this meeting was conducted. Richard Myers explained how The GRVNC posting and email outreach was conducted. He asked everyone to fill out a contact information card.

DeDe Audet, Kelley S Willis and Phil Raider explained that our meeting was hastily arranged in order for it to take place before of The LA City Planning Department's meeting on the RAD/MTA project.

Jan Sproull again raised the issue of the legitimacy of The Board to meet. Her request for an appeal from the decision of the chair to her unstated motion failed for lack of a second.

Bill Christopher of Urban Concepts, representing RAD Development, announced that the planning meeting has been postponed and will probably take place downtown. He explained that the conditions approved by The LUPC will impact the project and asked that we continue discussing the final plan and how the project relates to The VSP.

Jan Sproull questioned Mr. Christopher about his relationship with DONE, the developer and The GRVNC. He explained that he would need to recuse himself from any GRVNC issues that came before DONE where he is a commissioner. Ms. Sproull remarked that there were 25 people attending the meeting. The Secretary counted over 50.

Naomi Nightingale requested that Michael King explain some of the zoning issues about the project.

Carmel Beaumont opposes height, density, reports that the traffic study ignores the alleys, is concerned about parking and road rage in these alleys.

Rick Gunderson opposes project. He was on The VSP project 30 years ago and wants the developer to follow The VSP.

Carol V Beck opposes the project. She cites lack of public input and wants the project stopped.

Stuart Oscars opposes the size of the project. He noted that he had to comply with the VSP when he remodeled his home and wants RAD to do the same. He wants a liaison between The GRVNC and LA City Planning Dept.

Laura Silagi, Venice CC, has concerns about attaching conditions to any approval. She urges that the board clarify that conditions don't constitute approval.

Emily Winters, Venice Arts Council, is concerned about the lack of time for outreach and urged the Board not to be taken in by developer negotiating tactics. She doesn't want a gated community and is concerned about toxics at the site.

David Ewing believes that all are operating in good faith and needs to stick to the rules in order to avoid the pitfalls of the past. He believes the process is backwards and that the developers are holding a gun to the head of The

MTA, which is pressuring The City to approve the project. He wants the Board to emphasize the VSP in this and future developments.

Ira Koslow opposes height and density. He has written letters, and attended many meeting to speak out against this project. He was told by Yaroslavsky not to attend MTA meetings. The have a \$30,000,000 deal with and want this done. He wants the developer to follow The VSP.

Inge Mueller would like The Board to disapprove the project. She wishes it had just been disapproved at The LUPC meeting. Venice doesn't need it and doesn't want it. She questions what type of use is really in the best interest of the Venice community.

Lisa Ezell has questions about the whole process. She notes that the land is public property and that the public should decide what is best for the site. She would like it all to be affordable housing. She wants to know what the units will cost. Doesn't want chain stores in the retail and doesn't like the architecture.

Jeanne Giovannoni wants to know why Zev Yaroslavsky isn't defending Venice against developers like he is his constituents in Brentwood.

7. Board Action on LUPC Report

Challis Macpherson read the report of the LUPC into record. Copy attached.

Motion to separate the LUPC findings into two sections.

Moved by Jan Sproull, Phil Raider 2nd.

After some clarifying discussion it is confirmed that the first section will consist of the first sentence only and that the second section will be the balance of the motion forwarded from The LUPC.

Richard Myers supports splitting the report and supports the motion. Linda Lucks supports the motion and urges The Board not to approve the project.

Motion carries 17-0-0.

Move to adopt the first finding in The LUPC report, that we do not approve the project as proposed.

Motion by Phil Raider, Unknown 2nd

Motion carries 17-0-1

Move that The GRVNC Board state that the Venice community will only consider any project on this site, 100 Sunset, subject to the following conditions as previously read.

Motion by Challis Macpherson, 2nd by Michael King

Challis Macpherson wanted to amend her motion to include but was interrupted by a RONR reading by Jan Sproull which was determined by the Parliamentarian to be mute at this time.

Friendly amendment to the motion to add additional condition that any toxic bloom at the site be cleaned up according to EPA standards.

Motion by Challis Macpherson, 2nd by unknown

Phil Raider noted that EPA will require that the site be fully remediated and that RAD will not accept a toxic site as discussed in The LUPC meeting.

Linda Lucks would like to include the language, but not limited to, into the conditions so that we do not shut ourselves off to adding additional conditions.

Sylviane Dungan wants to add similar language. She feels that there should be more than 20% low income housing. She questioned whether the "included but not limited to" language would be of value.

Challis Macpherson and Michael King withdrew their friendly amendment.

Phil Raider didn't want to duplicate the efforts of the LUPC but wants a decision based on the work of The LUPC. He urged The Board to reject the list of conditions and stick with the motion already passed.

Kelley S Willis agrees that the first part is the most important part. He supports the "included but not limited to" language and suggested that the conditions could lead to better projects throughout Venice.

Michael King noted that the Planning Dept. findings on the project found that it complies with the general and community plans. Any change of zoning to the CM-1 without further restrictions or conditions would allow a building that falls far out of the bounds of the VSP. He noted that the conditions are the only way to protect the site and to insure that the spirit and size restrictions of The VSP is maintained. He urged inclusion of The LUPC conditions.

CJ Cole was reluctant to include a lot of conditions and urged that we include adherence to The VSP.

Naomi Nightingale has concerns that the laundry list might leave us open to having left something out and that the list could be challenged. She also is concerned that because we're not architects we could be making mistakes. She would like any project to be subject to approval by the community. She favors the "included but not limited to" language.

Ingrid Mueller would like to multiple public workshops used to determine what other uses could be on the site. She reminded us that so many time conditions are ignored.

Jan Sproull wants the Q conditions re-instated and that the parcel should be re-zoned RD1.5 if the busses leave. This was the intent of the community when The VSP was written. The CM zoning has no height restrictions and

that the impositions of conditions could be useless. She doesn't want CM zoning to be her legacy.

Phil Raider appreciates the arguments against the CM zoning and asks Michael King for guidance as to how best to protect the site.

Michael King responded that the best protection for the site is in the conditions.

Sylviane Dungan wants to request zoning for commercial and residential but wants the protections of The VSP.

Michael King stated that the property is already zoned CM-1 and again reiterates that the best protection is in the conditions.

Richard Myers wants clarification of the height and was informed that The VSP doesn't address height in a mixed use project.

CJ Cole agrees with Jan Sproull and just disapprove the project. She doesn't want to negotiate with developers.

Kelley S Willis questioned Phil Raider as to where he was with the motion.

Phil Raider responded that after hearing the arguments and discussion and being made aware that there's a big hole in The VSP in terms of mixed use development the he would support the conditions.

The motion currently before the board is to approve the 2nd part of the bifurcated findings in The LUPC report

Ivan Spiegel suggested that if we wanted to include the additional "including but not limited to" language that we vote down the current motion and propose a new one.

A role call vote was called for and The Board voted as follows;

Ayes: 8, Colette Bailey, Sylviane Dungan, Peter Force, Michael King, Challis Macpherson, Stan Muhammad, Dianna Pollard, Phil Raider

Nays: 8, CJ Cole, Linda Lucks, Ingrid Mueller, Richard Myers, Jan Sproull, Rebecca Tafoya, Mindy Taylor-Ross, Kelley S Willis.

Abstain: 1, Naomi Nightingale

Jan Sproull read from RONR that an abstention is a non-vote and asked for further clarification if a 2/3 vote or simple majority was required. Ivan Spiegel explained that all that was need was a simple majority.

Naomi Nightingale maintained hear abstention. DeDe Audet cast the tie breaking vote with a nay.

Motion defeated 8-9-1

Richard Myers wanted someone to make a motion similar to the findings in Jon Forman's report.

Jan Sproull called a point of order to point out that we were off agenda. Ivan Spiegel ruled that we could continue to take action on the LUPC RAD/MTA agenda item.

Linda Lucks wants an opportunity to read The Planning Commission report. Ivan Spiegel informed her that the Planning Commissions report is not on our agenda.

Jan Sproull interrupted with a point of order parliamentary question as to whether or not we could even make this motion. Ivan Spiegel explained that a new motion could be made

Moved that the community to only consider any project on this site subject to but not limited to the following conditions;

1. That an arts component be included at the site. Arts Project to be reviewed by the GRVNC Arts Committee and approved by the GRVNC Board.
2. That traffic be fully mitigated including a stop light at Main and Thornton along with the proposed smart cross walks currently included in the developers
3. That all Mello/Roos Act compliance low income housing be on site.
4. That a (20% participation) at risk employment component be instituted during construction.
5. That the maximum height of the project be 35 feet.
6. That the pedestrian walk street align with the existing walk street coming up from the beach.
7. All required parking be provided on site
8. That the developer widen an area of the roadway on Main Street to provide for a loading zone and transit bus turn out.
9. That 20% of the units be very low income units in perpetuity.
10. That 10% of the units be moderate income units in perpetuity.
11. That the roof access be limited to the minimum amount of square footage necessary to gain access and less that the 100 square feet currently allowed.
12. That the floor area (ratio) be limited to 1.5.
13. That the project contain both indoor and outside public access areas, I.e. public park area and community meeting room.
14. That the project provide bicycle parking on the site.

15. That the commercial portion of the project be configured to promote small square footage uses on the order of ten 2000 square foot spaces and not one large 20,000 square foot tenant.

Motion by Phil Raider, 2nd by Challis Macpherson.

Richard Myers reminded us of the time.

CJ Cole is against the motion with conditions, we should just deny it.

Michael King likes the motion especially with the inclusion of the "but not limited to" language. He feels that this really defends the VSP.

Question was called, seconded and the call passed by acclamation.

A role call vote was called for and The Board voted as follows;

Ayes: 12, Colette Bailey, Sylviane Dungan, Peter Force, Michael King, Linda Lucks, Challis Macpherson, Stan Muhammad, Richard Myers, Naomi Nightingale, Dianna Pollard, Phil Raider, Kelley S Willis.

Nays: 5, CJ Cole, Ingrid Mueller, Jan Sproull, Rebecca Tafoya, Mindy Taylor-Ross

Motion carries 12-5-0

Motion to adjourn carried by acclamation at 9:50pm

**GRASS ROOT VENICE NEIGHBORHOOD
COUNCIL
Land Use Planning Committee**

TO: Grass Roots Venice Neighborhood Council Board of Officers, known as GRVNC

FROM: Land Use Planning Committee, known as LUPC

SUBJECT: Special Meeting Wednesday, October 19, 2005 from 7:05pm to 9:45pm,
at Westminster Elementary School, 1010 Abbot Kinney Boulevard, Venice, California, to
consider MTA/RAD Currently Proposed Project at 100 Sunset Avenue, Venice, Case No.
CPC 20051002-SPE-ZC-CDP-MEL-ZAA-SPP-SPR only

Dear GRVNC Board of Officers:

Be it known that the LUPC did, on Wednesday, October 19, 2005, consider and pass the following motion made by Michael King, seconded by Phil Raider, friendly amendments by Phil Raider which were accepted by Michael King. Entire session recorded electronically. Five tapes available for perusal

Motions not to approve project as presently proposed. The community to only consider any project on this site subject to the following conditions:

1. That an arts component be included at the site. Arts Project to be reviewed by the GRVNC Arts Committee and approved by the GRVNC Board.
2. That traffic be fully mitigated including a stop light at Main and Thornton along with the proposed smart cross walks currently included in the developers
3. That all Mello/Roos Act compliance low income housing be on site.
4. That a (20% participation) at risk employment component be instituted during construction.
5. That the maximum height of the project be 35 feet.

6. That the Main Street access to the pedestrian walk street be widened beyond the current 10'.
 7. That the pedestrian walk street align with the existing walk street coming up from the beach.
 8. All required parking be provided on site
 9. That the developer widen an area of the roadway on Main Street to provide for a loading zone and transit bus turn out.
 10. That 20% of the units be very low income units in perpetuity.
 11. That 10% of the units be moderate income units in perpetuity.
 12. That the roof access be limited to the minimum amount of square footage necessary to gain access and less than the 100 square feet currently allowed.
 13. That the floor area (ratio) be limited to 1.5.
 14. That the project contain both indoor and outside public access areas, I.e. public park area and community meeting room.
 15. That the project provide bicycle parking on the site.
 16. That the commercial portion of the project be configured to promote small square footage uses on the order of ten 2000 square foot spaces and not one large 20,000 square foot tenant.
-

Motion made voted as follows:

Michael King, yes
Ingrid Mueller, no
Inge Mueller, yes
Challis Macpherson, yes
Stan Mohammad, yes
Phil Raider, yes
Ann Giagni, no

LUPC members absent: Brett Miller, Sylviane Dungan

Motion carried five to two.