

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTENTS OF THIS FILE

Submissions by the public in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures (ROPs), Rule 4.3, are distributed to the Commission and uploaded online. Please note that “compliance” means that the submission complies with deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) AND the number of copies. Please review the Commission ROPs to ensure that you meet the submission requirements. The ROPs can be accessed at <http://planning.lacity.org>, by selecting “Commissions & Hearings” and selecting the specific Commission.

All compliant submissions may be accessed as follows:

- **“Initial Submissions”**: Compliant submissions received no later than by end of day Monday of the week prior to the meeting, which are not integrated by reference or exhibit in the Staff Report, will be appended at the end of the Staff Report. The Staff Report is linked to the case number on the specific meeting agenda.
- **“Secondary Submissions”**: Submissions received after the Initial Submission deadline up to 48-hours prior to the Commission meeting are contained in this file and bookmarked by the case number.
- **“Day of Hearing Submissions”**: Submissions after the Secondary Submission deadline up to and including the day of the Commission meeting will be uploaded to this file within two business days after the Commission meeting.

Material which does not comply with the submission rules is not distributed to the Commission.

ENABLE BOOKMARS ONLINE:

**If you are using Explorer, you need will need to enable the Acrobat  toolbar to see the bookmarks on the left side of the screen.

If you are using Chrome, the bookmarks are on the upper right-side of the screen. If you do not want to use the bookmarks, simply scroll through the file.

If you have any questions, please contact the Commission Office at (213) 978-1300.

SECONDARY SUBMISSIONS

Mount Washington Homeowners Association

P.O. Box 65855
Los Angeles, CA 90065

March 25, 2019

East Los Angeles Planning Commission
200 N. Spring Street, RM 525
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: 300 Crane Blvd. [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

Dear Commissioners:

Appellant Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance ("MWAHA") submits the following in response to the City Planning Staff report for this case:

I. THE SPECIFIC PLAN DEFAULTS TO THE BUILDING CONTROLS OF THE LAMC UNLESS CERTAIN ITEMS IN THE SPECIFIC PLAN OVERRIDE THE LAMC, AND THEREFORE THIS COMMISSION MUST LOOK TO LAMC TO DETERMINE IF THE PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE IS VALID.

On page 8 of MWAHA's March 18, 2019 appeal letter and supporting evidence, we quoted Section 2 of the Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan ("Specific Plan") which directs that review of a proposed project starts with the usual hillside building controls in the Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC"). Only to the extent that the Specific Plan contains provisions that are less restrictive as to height, more restrictive as to Floor Area Ratios, more restrictive as to landscaping, and more restrictive for other development standards, does the Specific Plan prevail and supercede the usual LAMC hillside development regulations.

Therefore, in order to evaluate whether the Planning Director's Determination Letter for Project Permit Compliance under LAMC § 11.5.7 is legally compliant, this Commission must compare the LAMC requirements to the Specific Plan requirements, and follow the direction of Section 2 of the Specific Plan. Unfortunately, the Director did not follow Section 2 of the Specific Plan as to determining whether or not some LAMC provisions are more restrictive. For this reason alone, the appeal should be granted and the case returned to the Planning staff to fill in the missing portions of the required analysis.

To assist the Commission, we provide on the next page citations to LAMC/Specific Plan provisions that govern various development issues important in this case. We have bolded those provisions that govern the development issue because it appears that the particular provision is more restrictive than the standard set forth in the Specific Plan. Here is a useful chart for the Commission to use in its review of the issues in this appeal:

<i>Development Issue</i>	<i>LAMC Section</i>	<i>Specific Plan Section</i>
Floor Area Ratio	§12.03 (Floor Area, Residential Definition) §12.21.C.10(b)	§6.A.
Building Height	§12.21.C.10(d)(8)	§6.B. (up to 45 feet height)
Building Height measure	§12.03 (Height of Building or Structure Definition)	None
Frontyard Setback	§12.21.C.10(a)(1)	§6.C.
Sidyard Setback	§12.21.C.10(a)	None
Backyard Setback	§12.21.C.10(a)	None
Rooftop Deck Setback	§12.21.C.10(a)(7)	None
Maximum Grading	§ 12.21.C.10(f)	§ 6.E.
Landscaping	§12.40-43 & Guidelines	§6.F.
Native Tree Protection Prior to Specific Plan Application	§46.00-§46.06 (City Protected Tree Ord.)	None
Native and Significant Tree Protection Associated With Specific Plan Application		§3 Definitions, §6.F., §8.A & B.

A. The Specific Plan Requires That LAMC Floor Area Ratio Apply To The Project If It Is More Restrictive Than The Specific Plan; The Applicant And Director Failed To Analyze The LAMC Floor Area Ratio To Determine Which Is More Restrictive.

In order to obtain a Project Permit Compliance, an applicant must demonstrate compliance with the most restrictive Floor Area Ratio: LAMC or Specific Plan. The Specific Plan, on its enactment in 1993, provided a Floor Area Ratio that was more restrictive than the more permissive original Hillside Ordinance. But for steep hillside lots, that changed with the City's enactment of the Baseline Hillside Mansionization Ordinance (found at LAMC § 12.21.C.10.) Based upon new data showing the hillside communities are threatened by mansionization, the City enacted the Baseline Hillside regulations that as to Floor Area Ratio, Height, and Grading are more restrictive than our Specific Plan.

In order to establish facts showing the City has complied with Section 2 of the Specific Plan, an applicant must provide a comparison of Floor Area Ratio and house size calculations under both LAMC and the Specific Plan – and apply the more restrictive regulation. The Applicant does not appear to have submitted the required analysis under LAMC § 12.21.C.10(b) and the Director does not appear to have required it as Section 2 of the Specific Plan mandates.

The Applicant's materials show the Specific Plan formula yields an FAR of 0.474:1 for the 6,292.80 square foot lot, or an allowable Specific Plan house floor area of 2,982.79 square feet. However, just common sense shows that this R1 lot under Table 12.21.C.10-2a in LAMC § 12.21.C.10(b) would have a 0.45:1 FAR for portions of the lot sloped 0% to 29.99%, 0.40:1 FAR for portions sloped 30% to 44.99%, 0.35:1 FAR for portions sloped 45% to 59.99%, and 30:1 FAR for portions sloped 60% to 99.99%.

Table 12.21 C.10-2a Single-Family Zone Hillside Area Residential Floor Area Ratios (RFAR)								
Slope Bands (%)	R1	RS	RE9	RE11	RE15	RE20	RE40	RA
0 - 14.99	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.25
15 - 29.99	0.45	0.40	0.35	0.35	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.20
30 - 44.99	0.40	0.35	0.30	0.30	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.15
45 - 59.99	0.35	0.30	0.25	0.25	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.10
60 - 99.99	0.30	0.25	0.20	0.20	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.05
100 +	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

The Commission's visual inspection of lot pictures in the record demonstrates substantial portions of the lot at 300 Crane are very steeply sloped. Virtually all of the LAMC slope FAR ratios are LESS THAN the 0.474:1 FAR allowed under the Specific Plan, and the sum of those lesser FAR ratios, on a lot as steep as this one, will likely generate an allowable house floor area less than the 2,982.79 square feet allowed by the Specific Plan.¹

Thus, under even the most cursory comparison the Planning Director could have made, he would have observed that the applicable FAR calculation is the more restrictive one set forth in LAMC § 12.21.C.10(b). Because the Director erroneously allowed the Applicant to apply the less restrictive Specific Plan FAR, the Director has violated Section 2 of the Specific Plan and failed to proceed in accordance with law.

B. Even If The Specific Plan's 0.474:1 FAR Applied, Which It Does Not, The Project Violates The Specific Plan FAR Limit (And Therefore Must Also Violate The More Restrictive LAMC § 12.21.C.10(b) FAR Limit).

While the Specific Plan contains a definition that specifies what portions of buildings are included in the FAR calculation, including the covered parking of the garage, LAMC § 12.03 provides in relevant part the following definition of

¹ To create the Slope Analysis Map required to calculate the permissible house size requires physical access to the lot by Applicant's registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor. It was incumbent on the Applicant to include this analysis in the application to the City. MWHHA is not required to prepare a Slope Analysis Map because it has no ownership or right of access to the lot.

Residential Floor Area: ***“Any floor or portion of a floor with a ceiling height greater than 14 feet shall count twice the square footage of that area.”***

On page 10 of our March 18, 2019 letter we identified the 17-foot height garage as a likely subterfuge to later add habitable space in the top portion of the enormously tall garage. We also pointed out that contrary to Applicant’s plans stating the garage is only 367 square feet, the Original Plans² show the square garage structure as being 20’4” on one side. From that limited information, we calculated the garage at 413 square feet (20’4” x 20’4”) including exterior walls.

New Plan page A-06 (included in the Commissioner’s package) reveals wall measurements for the garage previously undisclosed. Multiplying these actual plan dimensions, we confirmed the Applicant’s 367 square feet calculation for the garage without the exterior walls. Based upon the exterior dimensions, the garage square footage including the walls is 417 square feet (20’4” x 20’6”).

However, whether the Commission used the Applicant’s 367 square foot calculation, or our 417 square feet calculation including the exterior walls, when the garage square footage is counted “twice the square footage of that area” as required by LAMC § 12.03, the Project goes over the total square footage allowed under the Specific Plan FAR (and therefore it must also go over the limit under the more restrictive LAMC FAR calculation). And this is true whether or not the Commission includes the exterior wall space deducted by the Applicant on his plans, the accessory unit, the covered portions of decks/patios, or the undisclosed basement storage rooms.

² The Staff Appeal Report at **Exhibit D** attaches a New Set of Project plans (dated 11-22-2017) compared to the Original Plans (dated 7-19-2017) that the Applicant submitted with its original application. MWHHA only found the Original Plans and copied them when it inspected the Planning File. (The Original plans included pages DIR-01, A-01, 02, 03, 03-1, 04, 05, 05.1, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, L1, Topo map.)

It appears the Applicant has been permitted to substitute into the Planning file the New Plans dated 11-22-2017. They are materially different from the Original Plans. While there are some new details regarding the garage (New pages A-06 and A-06.1) and basement rooms (New page A-09) not found at all in the Original Plans, the New Plans substantially omit important details of the Project including the cover sheet/project analysis (Org. Pg. A-01), the general notes page (Org. Pg. A-02), the entire retaining walls plan (Org. Pg. A-05.1), the roof plan (Org. Pg. A-08), the accessory unit and elevations showing how it is related to retaining walls (Org. A-09), the door and window schedule (Org. A-10), the XX, YY and ZZ cross section drawings showing how the original grade, foundations, and retaining walls of the main building, accessory unit, and garage are linked (Org. Pgs. A-14 & A-15). It is unclear why the Planning staff allowed these plan changes without informing the Commission in its Staff Appeal Report. Concerned members of the community will submit full copies of the Original Plans so the Commission can conduct its review.

Based upon more detailed information revealed by the Staff Appeal Report and previously undisclosed garage and basement room details, here is a revised version of the chart MWA provided the Commission in its March 18, 2019 letter at p. 9:

	Applicant Calculation without exterior walls	Specific Plan Calculation with exterior walls
First Floor (Org.Pg. A-06)	1,150	1,273
Second Floor (Org.Pg. A-07)	1,229	1,330
Garage (Org.Pg. A-05)	367	417
Garage 2nd Floor (Org.Pg. A-05)	367	417
Compare to 2,982.79 S.P. allows	3,113 s.f.	3,437 s.f.
Accessory Unit (Org.Pg. A-09)		275
Covered Patio (Org.Pg. A-07)		~ 179
Basement Rooms (New Pg. A-09)		312
Total including S.P. square feet		4,203 s.f.

Based upon LAMC § 12.03's definition of Residential Floor area requiring counting the floor area of the garage over 14 feet high twice, the Project indisputably exceeds the Specific Plan's maximum permitted floor area of 2,982.79 by at least 130 square feet, and must also exceed the more restrictive LAMC § 12.21.C.10(b) by even more had the City performed that calculation, which it did not. Also, to the extent the Director has also failed to count exterior walls, covered deck/patios, the accessory unit, and the previous undisclosed basement rooms, the amount by which the Specific Plan and LAMC floor area limits are exceeded are even greater. Because the Director has failed to properly apply the floor area ratio to the Project, there is no substantial evidence that the Project conforms to FAR requirements as applied by Section 2 of the Specific Plan.

C. While The Director Was Correct In Allowing The Project Building To Reach Up To 45 Feet Allowed In The Specific Plan, The Project Violates The LAMC's Method Of Measuring Building Height.

The language of both Specific Plan § 6.B and LAMC § 12.21.C.10(d)(8) make clear that any specific plan height that is greater than that permitted by LAMC will be governed by the less restrictive specific plan height provision. The Specific Plan in this case does allow a building height up to 45 feet. So the Director applying the 45-foot limit was correct. However, because the method for measuring building height is set forth in LAMC § 12.03, and the Specific Plan is silent, the LAMC method of how to measure height applies. LAMC § 12.03 specifies: "Retaining walls shall not be used for the purpose of raising the Effective Elevation of the finished grade for purposes of measuring the height of a building or structure." This requirement is found in multiple definitions in § 12.03 (GRADE, HILLSIDE AREA, HEIGHT OF BUILDING OR STRUCTURE)

There are two reasons the building height finding cannot be made by the Director. First, contrary to Applicant's labeling the garage as "detached," the New plans establish that the North side of the house, stairwell, and garage all share a common heavy concrete structural retaining wall to hold up the slope next to those structures. Applicant's plans fail to show this shared wall in one drawing, but the Commission can lay New Plan pages A-06 and A-09 next to each other and plainly see that main house, stairwell and garage all share the northern 20 foot high concrete retaining wall.

Additionally, the south side of the garage is connected to two 10-foot high retaining walls that hold up the southern portion of the house and the patio that connects between the house and the garage south walls. These walls are not shown on any plan the Planning Staff gave the Commission, but on the Original Plans at page A-05.1, the tops of those walls are plainly shown connecting between the house and the garage. As a result, the garage shares a common wall with the main house on the north, and is connected to a 10 foot-high and 20-foot high retaining wall on the south. The garage is therefore attached to the house and part of the same building under the LAMC. Therefore, height is required to be measured from 5-foot in front of the garage, not where shown on the Applicant's plans. When measured from the proper location, the house is 4 to 5 feet above the already extremely generous Specific Plan height limit of 45 feet. On this ground alone, the City has no substantial evidence supporting its height finding.

Second, the Applicant has manipulated the plans to purport to measure the height of the house from the Finished Floor Elevation of the Stairwell, but this is improper because building height must be measured from final grade. The soil retained within the three 20 foot high retaining walls to the north, east, and south, and by the western concrete foundation of the garage will be at least 4 inches lower based upon the typical thickness of a concrete floor. If measured from there, the house will be several inches overheight, but even that is not the proper location to measure from. The final grade, before placement of the soil in the stairwell is at least another 18 inches down. When measured from the final grade BEFORE PLACEMENT OF SOIL AND FLOOR IN THE STAIRWELL, the house will exceed the Specific Plan height limit by 2 or more feet. Thus, whether the height is measured in the stairwell area or in front of the garage (because it is part of the main building), the City lacks substantial evidence the Project is within the 45-foot height limit.

D. The LAMC Baseline Hillside Grading Requirements Are More Restrictive Than The Specific Plan; The Director Failed To Accurately Determine The Amount Of Export, Require Environmental Review When The Actual Amount Exceeded 1,000 Cubic Yards, Or Require A Zoning Administrator Review For Any Amount Above 750 Cubic Yards.

For grading, LAMC § 12.21.C.10(f) imposes strict limits on the amount of grading and soil export by right. Section 2 of the Specific Plan mandates that the City follow the LAMC grading requirements because they are more restrictive than

the Specific Plan's general reference of landform grading in § 6.E. The City and hillside communities across the city spent years to achieve consensus on the new hillside development regulations of the Baseline Hillside Mansionization Ordinance. The Planning Director should have followed it, but did not.

The Applicant's building permit found in **Exhibit 1** of our March 18, 2017 letter is substantial evidence of the actual amount of grading – not the unsupported claim on the Planning application of 650 cubic yards. The amount of grading per the Applicant's permit is 1800 cubic yards (1,700 cut and 100 fill), with 1,600 cubic yards of export.

Under LAMC § 12.21.C.10(f)(2)(ii), a lot like 300 Crane Boulevard on a Substandard Hillside Limited Street only has a "by-right" of 750 cubic yards of grading (75% of the R-1 by-right grading in an R-1 zone). The Director's Determination made the following faulty finding at page 6: "As stated in the Specific Plan the Department of Building and Safety is required to review all grading in excess of 1,000 cubic yards for compliance with the 'Planning Guidelines for Landform Grading Manual.' The project proposes to cut 650 cubic yards of soil and will export 650 cubic yards of soil, the amount of grading is below the 1,000 cubic yard threshold." This finding violates Section 2 of the Specific Plan which requires the City to apply and show compliance with the now more restrictive LAMC § 12.21.C.10(f). Thus, the grading findings are not supported by the facts, and the Director has failed to proceed in accordance with law.

Additionally, the Applicant has misled the City into processing only the Specific Plan Permit Process when in fact, a discretionary Zoning Administrator grading decision under LAMC § 12.21.C.10(f)(4) is required for all of the amounts of grading the Applicant proposes in excess of the by-right amount.³ The failure to properly disclose the actual amount of grading to the Planning Department has resulted in skirting of the multiple approvals ordinance, LAMC § 12.36. In a case requiring both a Director's Determination and a Zoning Administrator action, LAMC section 12.36.C.3 requires that the Zoning Administrator be the initial decision maker, not the Planning Director. Thus, although the Applicant checkmarked on the Planning application that this Project involved multiple-item approvals (**Exhibit 5** of our March 18, 2019 letter), the City has been misled by the Applicant failing to simultaneously apply for the Zoning Administrator's approval of excessive project grading required by this design. Therefore, on this independent ground, this Commission must set aside the entirely improper Director's Determination, because a Zoning Administrator was required to initially hear this Determination and grading variance together.

³ The LADBS appears to agree that a Zoning Administrator decision is required before a grading permit can be issued as the building permit in **Exhibit 1** of our March 18, 2019 letter lists "ZA Case" as something to be cleared before the grading permit can be issued to Applicant. Applicant has piecemealed the cases.

E. The City's Approved Plans Attached To The Staff Report Violate Other Requirements of Law.

1. The Landscape Plans Are For A Building Design Different From The Now Approved Design.

The Landscape Plans are not consistent with the approved design of the buildings. If the Commission compares New Plan Pages L1 and L2 provided by the Planning Department in **Exhibit D** of the Staff Appeal Report, to New Plan pages A-05, A-12, A-13 and Original pages A-05.1 and A-12, it will notice that the patios and retaining walls between the main house and accessory unit are materially different.

In addition, Original pages A-05.1 and A-12 depict on the ground and 10-foot high planters (under the uncovered patio above) with foliage, however, the Landscape Plan at pages L1 and L2 does not show any irrigation or planting plans for these additional planting areas on the Project site.

Section 8.A of the Specific Plan states "Conditions may be imposed if the Director finds the conditions necessary to make the findings required in this Section." On page 2 of the Director's Determination, he imposed a condition that the Project show compliance with the City's xeriscape requirements. Because the Landscape Plans do not show full compliance with xeriscape requirements, the Director lacks substantial evidence showing all required findings.

2. The Setback Of The Occupied Rooftop Deck Of The Garage Does Not Comply With The More Restrictive LAMC § 12.21.C.10(a)(7).

Section 2 of the Specific Plan provides that LAMC requirements apply for all development unless the Specific Plan has more restrictive requirements. LAMC § 12.21.C.10(a)(7) provides an additional setback requirement from the side yard in any R1 zone. Given the side yard of the Project is 7 feet, 3.5 inches, the Plans fail to show the additional required 3 foot set back on the north side of the lot.

This more restrictive development standard applies from the LAMC, because Section 2 of the Specific Plan requires such LAMC requirements to apply to a project unless the Specific Plan requirement is more restrictive. The Specific Plan does not have a more restrictive side yard set back, thus this LAMC provision is required to be applied to the Project. Because the plans do not show conformity with LAMC § 12.21.C.10(a)(7), the Director's Determination fails to comply with the requirements of Section 2 of the Specific Plan.

F. There Is Substantial Evidence That The Applicants Violated The Protected Tree Ordinance In Removing At Least Five Southern California Black Walnut Trees Without A Permit.

The Commission's attention is directed to the two tree reports prepared for 300 Crane found in **Exhibit 9** of our March 18, 2019 letter. The first tree report dated April 10, 2015 (likely actually 2016 because the report states the inspection was on March 29, 2016) and prepared by Leonard Markowitz, provides a discussion of the requirements of the Protected Tree Ordinance, but evidences no awareness of how Significant Trees are also protected in the Specific Plan area. Additionally, we note that portions of the Markowicz Report appear to be redacted on pages 5 & 6. We also note that Markowicz listed tree No.1 on his Summary of Field Inspection – Protected Trees, as “multi” trunk diameter, but failed to identify tree No. 1 or propose that it be removed in connection with the Project. The picture in his report only shows pictures of Trees 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6, but there is no picture of protected Tree No. 1.

Because this report and inspection occurred in 2015/2016 prior to the March 2017 tree removals, Mr. Markowicz must have seen the substantial stand of other trees on the property but only mentioned the presence of the Southern California Black Walnut trees as protected trees. He identified 5 trees on or near the property line, and concluded all would be adversely affected by trenching and retaining walls proposed on the property line. It is unknown what his recommendation was for Protected Tree No. 1.

As documented by the community, during the weeks around March 26, 2017, workers cut down every tree and shrub on the lot.

The second tree report dated August 11, 2017 was prepared by Shelley Sparks. Sparks inspected the Project site on August 10, 2017. Just like Markowicz, Sparks described the requirements of the Protected Tree Ordinance but did not evidence an understanding of the additional protection afforded all significant trees under the Specific Plan.

Significantly, Sparks only identified a “broken and fallen” Fremont Cottonwood tree. At the time of Sparks' inspection, she did not identify any of the five (5) protected Southern California Black Walnut trees on the site's property line. How could Spark's have missed the five trees pictured at page 9 of Markowicz's report and identified as Black Walnut trees ranging in height from 12 to 15 feet in height with a spread of branches 15 to 22 feet? The most likely explanation was that all five of the Black Walnut trees Markowicz identified as needing mitigation were removed during the denuding of the property in March 2017 – just a few months before Sparks conducted her inspection.

This conclusion is supported by the bark patterns on tree trunks and limbs pictured in the Applicant's blue Republic rollaway trash bin that Christopher

Howard photographed on March 26, 2017. These branches are consistent with those of Southern California Black Walnut. The Commission cannot accept Planning Staff's proposal to bury its head and ignore the serious of evidence unpermitted destruction of protected trees. The Commission must refer this matter back to Planning Staff with direction to Urban Forestry Division to investigate tree stumps visible in pictures of the denuded property.

G. The Director's Findings Related To Native And Significant Trees Are Deficient.

First, Section 8.B.2 of the Specific Plan requires the Director to make findings that "neither the proposed grading nor other construction activity will occur in the driplines of a Native or Significant Tree. If digging of trenches within the dripline is absolutely necessary for the installation of utilities, hand tools or small hand-held power equipment shall be used to avoid cutting roots." While the Markowicz report stated 5 protected Black Walnuts were on the property line and would be affected, neither he nor Sparks stated whether other protected native or significant trees are adjacent to the property lines and could be adversely affected within their driplines. Neither of the tree reports specifically address the dripline question, except to the extent Markowicz said all five of the Black Walnut trees would be have their roots disrupted and had to be removed and mitigated. The Director's Determination issued by the City lacks a specific finding about driplines of adjacent trees. On this ground alone, the Director has failed to follow Section 8 requirements and proceed in accordance with law.

Second, nowhere in Sparks' report does she mention the Specific Plan's requirements for protection of native trees, native plants, and significant trees. The Specific Plan's requirements are more restrictive than the LAMC. Sparks did not identify the Fremont Cottonwood as "protected" under LAMC or the Specific Plan. She marked the tree as "No" under the protected column of her Summary of Trees. The Planning staff has proposed characterizing Sparks' recommendation to replace the unprotected Cottonwood tree as a Significant Tree under the Specific Plan, but Sparks never explained or addressed the Specific Plan's tree and plant provisions. Therefore, the Director's finding that only one Significant Tree was impacted, in light of the substantial number of tree stumps of other Significant Trees existing on the lot on or about the time of application, is not supported with substantial evidence. The Commission should order the case back to the Planning Department to investigate the full impacts of the Applicant's tree removals.

II. CONCLUSION.

Based upon the all materials in the record before the Commission, the Director failed to proceed in accordance with law on numerous grounds, the Determination lacks required findings, and the Appeal must be granted.

Daniel Wright, MWHHA Representative



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

300 Crane Blvd. [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

3 messages

Jon von Leden <grindragon1@hotmail.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 1:58 PM

To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org>, "james.k.williams@lacity.org" <james.k.williams@lacity.org>, "gerald.gubatan@lacity.org" <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>, Dan Wright <fiberflash@aol.com>

RE: [300 Crane Blvd.](#) [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

Dear Commissioners:

I write to ask that this Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am a long time resident and voter in this community. I am shocked and dismayed to learn that experienced real estate developers –persons who market their skill at guiding projects through our Specific Plan process –are alleged to have sent workers on to their lot at [300 Crane Blvd.](#) to cut down every mature tree and shrub including some protected Southern California Black Walnut trees which are an endangered plant community.

While I am not opposed to owners of property proposing a reasonable development, at a minimum, compliance with the laws we imposed on ourselves ought to be the bare minimum. For the Planning Director and his staff to refuse to inspect the tree stumps on this site, look at aerial photos readily available on the City Planning website and Google, or to refer this matter to the Urban Forestry Division of the City for investigation and enforcement of the Protected Tree Ordinance is outrageous to me.

While housing remains an important need, it is certainly not at the cost of our laws, ethics and basic decency.

This Commission's job is to impartially enforce our Specific Plan. That means requiring scrupulous enforcement of the rules, and setting aside environmental "exemption" claims when the facts show a developer has gamed and misled the City to evade environmental review, and inflicted completely unnecessary harm on our community's sensitive biological resources.

For these reasons, I request that the Commission take ample time at Wednesday's hearing to get to the bottom of these disturbing actions, and send this Project back to the Planning staff for a proper investigation and revision of this Project to comply with all laws, and that includes, a referral to the Urban Forestry Division to impose a punishment for these unlawful tree removals to send a message to other developers considering such unacceptable actions.

Sincerely,

Jon von Leden
[941 Mayo Street](#)
[Los Angeles, CA 90042](#)

goldleroux <goldleroux@aol.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 3:05 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.co

I have lived in Mount Washington nearly my entire life and have sold real estate on the hill for 40 years. I have sold numerous homes on Crane. I've lived on Cross Ave(off Crane Blvd) since 2010 and walk Crane regularly. While i have no photos, i can attest to the fact that that lot was heavily wooded at one time and the removal of our protected trees was and is evident. I found it shocking and disturbing to think the City would approve such an act

For these reasons, I request that the Commission take ample time at Wednesday's hearing to get to the bottom of these disturbing actions, and send this Project back to the Planning staff for a proper investigation and revision of this Project to comply with all laws, and that includes, a referral to the Urban Forestry Division to impose a punishment for these unlawful tree removals to send a message to other developers.

Sincerely
Kathleen Goldstein

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S9, an AT&T 5G Evolution smartphone

Mark Kenyon <mark.b.kenyon@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 4:26 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, Gerald Gubatan <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>, Dan Wright <fiberflash@aol.com>

Please find attached a letter for the above references case.

Sincerely,

Mark Kenyon



Office Scanner_20190325_142033.pdf
1678K



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

ELAAPC appeal hearing: Testimony for 300 Crane [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

1 message

Daniel Marlos <dmarlos@roadrunner.com>

Sun, Mar 24, 2019 at 11:01 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org

Cc: james.k.williams@lacity.org, Gerald Gubatan <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>, fiberflash@aol.com

Daniel Marlos
1702 Burnell Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065
323-342-0902
dmarlos@roadrunner.com

March 25, 2019

East Los Angeles Planning Commission
200 N. Spring Street, RM 525
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: [300 Crane Blvd.](#) [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

Dear Area Planning Commissioners:

I am a longtime resident and voter on Mount Washington. I have looked at the City's Planning Department's Appeal Report in the above-referenced case. It appears that there are important materials in the official Planning File held by the City Planning Department that have not been shared with members of this Commission. It is my understanding that in considering the pending appeal, the Commission only looks at the materials the Planning staff saw fit to attach to the appeal report.

I draw to your attention that the official file of the Planning Department has two tree reports prepared for this project, not just the one report attached to the Staff Appeal Report. I recommend that the members of the Commission compare Exhibit F of the Staff Appeal Report to Exhibit 9 of the March 18, 2019 Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance Letter. There are two reports and neither of the them demonstrate that the arborists understood that Significant Trees are also protected under our Specific Plan. In other words, neither report acknowledges the protection afforded to Significant Trees, and Ms. Sparks, who prepared her report after the March 2017 denuding of the property of all trees, failed to comment on obvious recent destruction of a large number of Significant trees based upon the circumference of their stumps.

I find it particularly alarming that the official file contains the Applicant's own color photos, apparently taken as workmen completed the tree destruction (some photos show multiple workers on the site). The

Applicant's own color photos in the file show significant tree trunk stumps. I have attached these color photos because the Planner failed to share this critical evidence with the Commission. I am calling on the Commission to send this case back for proper investigation of the tree removals. In any event, the City has no evidence in the record that supports a factual finding that there were no Significant Trees on the lot – and therefore you cannot sustain the Director's Determination Letter.

Sincerely,

Daniel Marlos

Please enter my email into the official record for the March 27 hearing with the attached file of images.



300_crane_tree_clearance.pdf
5950K



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

1 message

Karen Pedersen <karen.leafygreen@gmail.com>

Sun, Mar 24, 2019 at 12:49 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.com

via email

East Los Angeles Planning Commission

200 N Spring St Rm 525

Los Angeles CA 90012

RE: [300 Crane Blvd](#) DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to ask that the Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mt. Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am a longtime Mt. Washington homeowner, resident of Los Angeles, and very concerned citizen regarding this matter. Basically it sounds like an outrageous violation of not only the laws of Los Angeles - native tree protection - but a violation of the trust we citizens place in you to actually enforce the laws designed to protect people, property, and environment. Why have laws if these developers are permitted to just ignore them and then lie about it and still get approved without meaningful review?

There is clear evidence that the native trees on the 300 Crane property existed for many years (google earth photographs) and then the property developers, in March 2017, cut them ALL cut down and hauled away. Now these developers falsely claimed in August 2017 there was "only one tree" that was removed. There are photos proving otherwise. Yet the inspector sent out by the developer - hardly a neutral party - had to walk through numerous tree stumps to write a "report" that there were no trees removed.

Why do we even have these laws if there is an easy way for developers to circumvent them? It is beyond discouraging and disappointing. It is an outrage and appears to show some sort of insider deal between developers and the city's planning and inspection offices. It is not right.

Our neighborhood deserves far better. At the very least, let this appeal go forward. It is the right thing to do.

Sincerely,

Karen Pedersen and Hugh King

[954 Elyria Drive](#)

[Los Angeles CA 90065](#)



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. {DIR-2017-3280; ENV- 2017 –CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU1 message

Liz Larner <liz@larnerstudio.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 3:31 PM

To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org>, "james.k.williams@lacity.org" <james.k.williams@lacity.org>, "gerald.gubatan@lacity.org" <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>, "fiberflash@aol.com" <fiberflash@aol.com>

Liz Larner and Tom Chasteen

[975 W. Avenue 37](#)[LA CA 90065](#)VIA EMAIL to apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org,
gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.com

East Los Angeles Planning Commission

[200 N. Spring Street, Rm. 525](#)[Los Angeles, CA 90012](#)RE: Testimony for [300 Crane Blvd.](#) {DIR-2017-3280; ENV- 2017 –CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU

March 25, 2019

Dear Commissioners:

We are writing to ask that this Commission grant the above numbered appeal of the Mount Washington

Homeowners Alliance.

I have lived and voted in Mt. Washington since 2003 and my husband has lived in Mt. Washington since the late 1990s. We are so very concerned and upset to have discovered that an experienced real estate developer-- by this we mean people who profess and market their skills as guiding projects through our Specific Plan process-- are alleged to have sent workers on to their lot at [300 Crane Blvd.](#) to raze every mature tree and shrub including some protected Southern California Black Walnut trees which are an endangered and indigenous plant community.

We are not opposed to owners of property proposing a reasonable development that is at a minimum in compliance with the laws we imposed on ourselves and feel ought to be the upheld. In our view it is simply not fair that some residents abide by these laws and others neglect to acknowledge that they exist or ignore them. For the Planning Director and his staff to refuse to inspect the tree stumps on this site, look at aerial photos readily available on the City Planning website and Google, or to refer this matter to the Urban Forestry Division of the City for investigation and enforcement of the Protected Tree Ordinance is, we feel, neglectful and dismissive of the law. While housing remains an important need, it should certainly not be at the cost of our laws, ethics and basic decency.

This Commission's job is to impartially enforce our Specific Plan. That means requiring rigorous enforcement of the rules, and setting aside environmental "exemption" claims when the facts show a developer has played and misled the City to evade environmental review, and caused **completely unnecessary harm** on our community's sensitive biological resources.

It is for these reasons, we request that the Commission take ample time at Wednesday's hearing to delve into these disturbing actions, and send this Project back to the Planning staff for a proper investigation and revision of the Project to comply with all laws, and that includes, a referral to the Urban Forestry Division to impose a punishment for these unlawful tree removals and to send a message to other developers considering such unlawful and insupportable actions.

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter,

Liz Larner and Tom Chasteen



VIA EMAIL to apceastla.docx

14K



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE1 message

David Matsu <davidmatsu@earthlink.net>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 3:45 PM

To: gerald.gubatan@lacity.org

Cc: apceastla@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.com, james.k.williams@lacity.org

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to request that this Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am a long time resident and voter in this community. While I am not opposed in any way to property owners building on their land, I am deeply disturbed that developers are allowed to routinely violate ordinances and rules specific to our community when building on their properties. When the city overlooks violations or only places token penalties on actors who flagrantly violate the laws and rules it encourages others to also violate the rules that our city and community have put in place. I would point out that you can be both helpful and fair to those who seek to build on property within Los Angeles and simultaneously enforce the rules that we have all put in place to control and guide that development. I would humbly ask that you judiciously fulfill the role of your department and apply the rules consistently and in accordance with law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Matsu

Mt. Washington, Los Angeles



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE1 message

Matt tanner <tanner7202@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 2:31 PM

To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org>, "james.k.williams@lacity.org" <james.k.williams@lacity.org>, "gerald.gubatan@lacity.org" <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>, "fiberflash@aol.com" <fiberflash@aol.com>

Dear Commisioners,

I write to ask that this Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am a resident and voter in this community. I am shocked and dismayed to learn that experienced real estate developers – persons who market their skill at guiding projects through our Specific Plan process – are alleged to have sent workers on to their lot at [300 Crane Blvd.](#) to cut down every mature tree and shrub including some protected Southern California Black Walnut trees which are an endangered plant community.

While I am not opposed to owners of property proposing a reasonable development, at a minimum, compliance with the laws we imposed on ourselves ought to be the bare minimum. For the Planning Director and his staff to refuse to inspect the tree stumps on this site, look at aerial photos readily available on the City Planning website and Google, or to refer this matter to the Urban Forestry Division of the City for investigation and enforcement of the Protected Tree Ordinance is outrageous to me. While housing remains an important need, it is certainly not at the cost of our laws, ethics and basic decency.

This Commission's job is to impartially enforce our Specific Plan. That means requiring scrupulous enforcement of the rules, and setting aside environmental "exemption" claims when the facts show a developer has gamed and misled the City to evade environmental review, and inflicted completely unnecessary harm on our community's sensitive biological resources.

For these reasons, I request that the Commission take ample time at Wednesday's hearing to get to the bottom of these disturbing actions, and send this Project back to the Planning staff for a proper investigation and revision of this Project to comply with all laws, and that includes, a referral to the Urban Forestry Division to impose a punishment for these unlawful tree removals to send a message to other developers considering such unacceptable actions.

Sincerely,

Matt Tanner – Homeowner

[349 Crane Blvd](#)

[Los Angeles, CA 90065](#)



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE1 message

Matt tanner <tanner7202@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 2:31 PM

To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org>, "james.k.williams@lacity.org" <james.k.williams@lacity.org>, "gerald.gubatan@lacity.org" <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>, "fiberflash@aol.com" <fiberflash@aol.com>

Dear Commisioners,

I write to ask that this Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am a resident and voter in this community. I am shocked and dismayed to learn that experienced real estate developers – persons who market their skill at guiding projects through our Specific Plan process – are alleged to have sent workers on to their lot at [300 Crane Blvd.](#) to cut down every mature tree and shrub including some protected Southern California Black Walnut trees which are an endangered plant community.

While I am not opposed to owners of property proposing a reasonable development, at a minimum, compliance with the laws we imposed on ourselves ought to be the bare minimum. For the Planning Director and his staff to refuse to inspect the tree stumps on this site, look at aerial photos readily available on the City Planning website and Google, or to refer this matter to the Urban Forestry Division of the City for investigation and enforcement of the Protected Tree Ordinance is outrageous to me. While housing remains an important need, it is certainly not at the cost of our laws, ethics and basic decency.

This Commission's job is to impartially enforce our Specific Plan. That means requiring scrupulous enforcement of the rules, and setting aside environmental "exemption" claims when the facts show a developer has gamed and misled the City to evade environmental review, and inflicted completely unnecessary harm on our community's sensitive biological resources.

For these reasons, I request that the Commission take ample time at Wednesday's hearing to get to the bottom of these disturbing actions, and send this Project back to the Planning staff for a proper investigation and revision of this Project to comply with all laws, and that includes, a referral to the Urban Forestry Division to impose a punishment for these unlawful tree removals to send a message to other developers considering such unacceptable actions.

Sincerely,

Matt Tanner – Homeowner

[349 Crane Blvd](#)

[Los Angeles, CA 90065](#)



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE1 message

David Matsu <davidmatsu@earthlink.net>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 3:45 PM

To: gerald.gubatan@lacity.org

Cc: apceastla@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.com, james.k.williams@lacity.org

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to request that this Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am a long time resident and voter in this community. While I am not opposed in any way to property owners building on their land, I am deeply disturbed that developers are allowed to routinely violate ordinances and rules specific to our community when building on their properties. When the city overlooks violations or only places token penalties on actors who flagrantly violate the laws and rules it encourages others to also violate the rules that our city and community have put in place. I would point out that you can be both helpful and fair to those who seek to build on property within Los Angeles and simultaneously enforce the rules that we have all put in place to control and guide that development. I would humbly ask that you judiciously fulfill the role of your department and apply the rules consistently and in accordance with law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Matsu

Mt. Washington, Los Angeles



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

1 message

Clare Marter Kenyon <claremarterkenyon@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 12:56 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.com

March 25, 2019

East Los Angeles Planning Commission

[200 N. Spring Street, RM 525](#)[Los Angeles, CA 90012](#)RE: [300 Crane Blvd.](#) [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

Dear Area Planning Commissioners:

It appears that the City Planning staff only provided this Commission with the Tree Report of Shelly Sparks dated August 17, 2019. (See Staff Appeal Report **Exhibit F**). In sole reliance on this report, the Planning Staff completely ignored and failed to investigate the appeal's contention that the Applicant entered the lot at 300 Crane Boulevard and removed a large number of significant trees and shrubs before applying for the Project, and that the Applicants stated under penalty of perjury that no trees had been removed.

It is so disheartening to see that the Staff Appeal Report fails to indicate that the Planning Staff undertook even the most basic investigation. How much effort would it have taken for the Staff to look at the City's own planning website?

I have attached aerial photos of 300 Crane that can be easily accessed on the City's Zoning Information and Map Access System at www.zimas.lacity.org. If Commissioners just enter "300 Crane" and choose from the various aerial photo background layers, it is plain to see that prior to the 2017 aerial photos the lot had a vibrant green canopy of leaves, however since late 2017 forward, the site has been stripped of those trees and shrubs.

Accessing ZIMAS is a basic task of City Planning officials in verifying information in Project applications or to investigate that illegal tree removals have occurred. It is ironic that readily available photos on the City's own website are substantial evidence establishing that significant tree removals occurred on the site just before the application was made in August 2017.

I therefore ask the Commission to conscientiously enforce our Specific Plan, and order the City Planning Department to send tree experts from the Urban Forestry Division to examine the tree stumps and determine the extent of Significant Trees loss under our Specific Plan, and removal of Southern California Black Walnuts without the requirement permit under the Protected Tree Ordinance. Without proper investigation, the Commission would be implicitly endorsing real estate developer destruction of our fragile

environmental resources with impunity. The developer must be made to pay for all mitigation of the harm they inflicted on our community, including enforcement of the Protected Tree Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Clare Marter Kenyon

Resident Mount Washington since 1978
Appointee to LA City's Community Forest Advisory Committee
Board Member North East Trees
Immediate Past President Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance



Zimas1.pdf
1073K



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

1 message

Nicole Thomas <nicoletomasstaley@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 8:26 AM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, Dan Wright <fiberflash@aol.com>

Nicole Thomas

[4041 Tropico Way](#)[Los Angeles, CA 90065](#)

March 25, 2019

East Los Angeles Planning Commission

200 N. Spring Street, RM 525

Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: [300 Crane Blvd.](#) [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

Dear Area Planning Commissioners:

It has come to my attention that the Staff Appeal Report at **Exhibit D** includes a set of Project plans dated November 22, 2017, yet the Staff has not informed the Area Planning Commissioners that these plans were NOT the set of plans submitted by the Applicant in support of the original application. These "new" plans that the Planning Staff relies upon includes some new pages with details about the garage structure and the heretofore undisclosed basement storage/furnace room. But there are significant differences between the new plans dated November 22, 2017 and the original plans dated July 19, 2017.

I note that the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance letter dated March 18, 2019, provided the Commissioners with some but not all of the pages of the Project as originally submitted in the application. Because I think the Commissioners should have been provided a full copy of the original plans submitted by the Applicant, I have attached 9 pages from the original plans dated July 19, 2017.

I have been made aware of the Commission's new 10-page submission limit. Myself and a friend will submit copies of the plans in separate letters – because we are forced to submit these plans under separate names due to the Commission onerous submission rules. These rules appear to be a violation of the due process of rights of persons to submit information in response to the staff report. We object to these overly restrictive rules, and therefore, what should have been submitted by one person, is being submitted by two persons in order to comply with the Commission's arbitrary submission rule.

I recommend that the Commission also instruct the Applicant to bring a full set of the most current version of the project plans to the Commission's hearings because all copies before the Commission are difficult to read.

Sincerely,

3/26/2019

City of Los Angeles Mail - Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

Nicole Thomas



Plans1-9.pdf
12339K



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

1 message

Christine Irwin <littlechrissy@me.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 7:33 AM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org

Cc: Dan Wright <fiberflash@gmail.com>

Christine Irwin

[4329 Marmion Way](#)[Los Angeles, CA 90065](#)

March 25, 2019

East Los Angeles Planning Commission

[200 N. Spring Street, RM 525](#)[Los Angeles, CA 90012](#)RE: [300 Crane Blvd.](#) [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

Dear Area Planning Commissioners:

It has come to my attention that the Staff Appeal Report at **Exhibit D** includes a set of Project plans dated November 22, 2017, yet the Staff has not informed the Area Planning Commissioners that these plans were NOT the set of plans submitted by the Applicant in support of the original application. These "new" plans that the Planning Staff relies upon includes some new pages with details about the garage structure and the heretofore undisclosed basement storage/furnace room. But there are significant differences between the new plans dated November 22, 2017 and the original plans dated July 19, 2017.

I note that the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance letter dated March 18, 2019, provided the Commissioners with some but not all of the pages of the Project as originally submitted in the application. Because I think the Commissioners should have been provided a full copy of the original plans submitted by the Applicant, I have attached more pages from the original plans dated July 19, 2017.

I have been made aware of the Commission's new 10-page submission limit. Myself and a friend will submit copies of the plans in separate letters – because we are forced to submit these plans under separate names due to the Commission's onerous submission rules. These rules appear to be a violation of the due process of rights of persons to submit information in response to the staff report. We object to these overly restrictive rules, and therefore, what should have been submitted by one person, is being submitted by two persons in order to comply with the Commission's arbitrary submission rule.

I recommend that the Commission also instruct the Applicant to bring a full set of the most current version of the project plans to the Commission's hearings because all copies before the Commission are difficult to read.

3/26/2019

City of Los Angeles Mail - Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

Sincerely,

Christine Irwin

Sent from my iPhone



attachment 1.pdf

7832K



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

1 message

Brad Weyers <brad.weyers@gmail.com>

Sun, Mar 24, 2019 at 10:55 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.com

From:

Brad Weyers

[4053 San Rafael Ave](#)[Los Angeles, CA 90065](#)VIA EMAIL to apceastla@lacity.org

East Los Angeles Planning Commission

[200 N. Spring Street, Rm. 525](#)[Los Angeles, CA 90012](#)

I write to ask that this Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am disappointed in the Planning Commissions resolve to enforce our Specific Plan. As a relatively new member of the community, but one who has taken considerable effort to abide by the Specific Plan I am angered to learn that someone clear-cut the lot at [300 Crane Blvd.](#) eliminating several endangered & protected Southern California Black Walnut trees in an attempt to dup the city. Even more upsetting is that this tactic seems to have worked.

Why has the Planning Director and his staff to refused to inspect the tree stumps on this site, to look at aerial photos readily available on the City Planning website and Google, or to refer this matter to the Urban Forestry Division of the City for investigation and enforcement of the Protected Tree Ordinance?

This Commission's job is to impartially enforce our Specific Plan. To enforce the rules, and setting aside environmental "exemption" claims when the facts show a developer has gamed and misled the City to evade environmental review, and inflicted completely unnecessary harm on our community's sensitive biological resources.

Show us the Planning Commission is not a rubber stamp. Send this project back to the planning staff for a proper investigation and revision. Please stand up for the law abiding citizens and make an example of these developers that this unscrupulous conduct will not be tolerated.

Regards,

Brad Weyers



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

1 message

anthony <ahumanengineer@yahoo.com>

Sun, Mar 24, 2019 at 10:16 PM

Reply-To: anthony <ahumanengineer@yahoo.com>

To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org>, "james.k.williams@lacity.org" <james.k.williams@lacity.org>, "gerald.gubatan@lacity.org" <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>, "fiberflash@aol.com" <fiberflash@aol.com>

From: Dr. Anthony Cahill
1527 Randall Ct.
Los Angeles, CA 90065

To: East Los Angeles Planning Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Rm. 525
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 300 Crane Blvd. [DIR-2017-3280; ENV-2017-3281-CE; ADM-2018-4831-ADU]

Dear Commissioners:

I write to ask that this Commission grant the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

I am a voter and long time home owner in this community. Year after year we have watched our property tax bills increase, along with the degradation of our community via variances and poor judgement being used by the people we put into office to make reasonable decisions for our quality of life. This is taxation without representation. We did not organize to have a specific plan or Protected Tree Ordinances to be disregarded by people outside of our community that have no interest in either living here, or following the rules we all play by to keep this community special. I am not anti-development. But this sort of thing, skirting environmental impact, continuously seems to be going on here. We deserve better.

I respectfully request the commission to enforce our specific plan. When developers side step protections we fought to have put in place, they need to be held accountable, and play by the established rules. Please review and reconsider granting the appeal of the Mt Washington Homeowners Alliance in regards to 300 Crane Blvd.

Dr. Anthony Cahill



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd. DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE1 message

nancy buchanan <nbuchanan@igc.org>

Sun, Mar 24, 2019 at 1:30 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, fiberflash@aol.com

Dear Commissioners:

I have lived in this area for many years, and I am shocked by the illegal removal of protected trees for the purpose of speculative development. I am writing in support of the above-numbered appeal of the Mount Washington Homeowners Alliance.

Our remaining Southern California Black Walnut trees are valuable and must be retained in those areas where they are growing.

It appears that the Planning Director and his staff never inspected the tree stumps on this site, or looked at aerial photos readily available on the City Planning website as well as Google. I wonder if financial gain was involved in the disposition of this matter.

For these reasons, I request that the Commission take ample time at Wednesday's hearing to investigate this matter, and send this Project back to the Planning staff for a proper investigation and revision of this Project to comply with all laws.

Sincerely,
Nancy Buchanan
622 Dimmick Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065



James Williams <james.k.williams@lacity.org>

Testimony for 300 Crane Blvd DIR-2017-3280-SPP; ENV-2017-3281-CE

1 message

Carol Teutsch <cbteutsch@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 2:19 PM

To: apceastla@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, fiberflash <fiberflash@aol.com>

Dear East Los Angeles Planning Committee,

As a resident of Mount Washington, I am very concerned that the city may not be upholding critical ordinances for development and building in Mount Washington.

I have great concern that the land associated with above development was cleared of trees and vegetation inappropriately by the builder leaving a bald hill where there are clearly stumps visible from cut trees. Please investigate this thoroughly at your Wednesday meeting and appropriately fine or prohibit the builder from building there if there is flagrant violation of our specific ordinances.

Please also note the high risk for erosion as things now are with the heavy rains we have been having. Please also examine how disruptive any building at that critical corner and base of Crane Boulevard will be for access to all the homes above and for emergency vehicles. Having more vehicles entering at this already challenging site from dwellings here on substandard roads will create a safety and vehicle disaster.

Concerned,
Carol Teutsch, M.D.
[Moon Ave](#)
[Los Angeles, CA 90065](#)

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS