

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

September 25, 2023

Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Van Nuys City Hall
Council Chamber, 2nd Floor
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, California 91401
E-Mail: cpc@lacity.org

Re: DIR-2020-2067-TOC-1A (the “Project”)
1447 South Hi Point Street

Dear Honorable Commissioners of the Los Angeles City Planning Commission:

My office represents Hi Point M, LLC (“Real Party”), the owner of the real property commonly known as 1447 South Hi Point Street (the “Property”) within the City of Los Angeles (the “City”). This letter clarifies a bus schedule contained in the Appeal Recommendation Report for Item 6 (DIR-2020-2067-TOC-1A) (the “Staff Report”) and responds to Hi Point Neighbors Association’s (“Petitioner”) arguments contained in its September 18, 2023 letter (the “Sept. 18th Letter”)

Real Party agrees with the Staff Report’s analysis and supports the recommended actions, which include denying Petitioner’s appeal and adopting the Planning Director’s Conditions of Approval and Findings. However, Real Party wishes to clarify the bus schedule for Metro Line 217 contained in the Staff Report. In this regard, the Staff Report attached a bus schedule for Metro Line 217 dated December 16, 2018, whereas Real Party, in its letter to the CPC dated September 12, 2023 (“Sept. 12th Letter”), attached a schedule dated June 23, 2019. Although these schedules have different dates, each show the same service interval frequencies. Accordingly, each constitute the bus schedule for Metro Line 217 in place on March 17, 2020 (and, for that matter, in place on February 27, 2020).

Second, we address Petitioner’s Sept. 18th Letter. Noteworthy, in arguing that the Project does not qualify for Tier 3 incentives, Petitioner fails to address the Staff Report’s analysis that the Project’s Tier 3 designation is based on a two-step process: (1) concluding that the intersection of Pico Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue is a Major Transit Stop because the intersection of the Metro Line 217 and Santa Monica Big Blue Bus 7 each have service intervals of 15 minutes or less during peak periods; and then (2) determining that the Project qualifies for Tier 3 incentives

because this Major Transit Stop contains the intersection of two rapid buses.¹ Rather, Petitioner's letter solely contends that the CPC cannot aggregate bus lines to reach the 15-minute service intervals (which argument Real Party addressed in its Sept. 12th Letter). Accordingly, the CPC should conclude that the Project qualifies for Tier 3 incentives based on the Staff Report's analysis of the City's two-step process.

Next, Petitioner argues that the Project violates the "Q" Conditions' Open Space standards. This argument, which is not before the Commission, again fails. As noted in the Staff Report, the only item before the CPC is whether the Project qualifies for Tier 3 incentives – not whether the Project's plans violate the "Q" Conditions Open Space standards. See Staff Report, Page A-6 ("The remaining appellant point is whether the City erroneously concluded that the project qualifies as a Tier 3 TOC project based on its proximity to a Major Transit Stop."). On this basis alone, the CPC should dismiss Petitioner's claims. Moreover, in its Ruling on Submitted Matter attached as Exhibit A to the Revised Peremptory Writ of Mandamus, the Court analyzed and rejected each of Petitioner's claims that the Project violated the "Q" Conditions' Open Space standards. Petitioner failed to appeal such decision to the Court of Appeal, which again precludes Petitioner from raising these issues. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event the CPC desires to reconsider the "Q" Conditions' Open Space standards, the CPC should rely on the Court's analysis and again reject Petitioner's claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Real Party respectfully requests that the CPC dismiss Petitioner's arguments, adopt the Staff Report's recommendations, deny the appeal, and confirm that the Project qualifies for Tier 3 incentives.

¹ This is the same analysis the City used in determining that the following projects qualified for Tier 3 status: DIR-2018-3378-TOC (<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/document/MjM4MzA10/46e6f77e-051c-4e11-ad6d-6ce8558211cd/pdd>) (see **Exhibit A**); DIR-2020-4062-TOC-HCA (<https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/document/MjM2NjYy0/46e6f77e-051c-4e11-ad6d-6ce8558211cd/pdd>) (see **Exhibit B**).

Los Angeles City Planning Commission
September 25, 2023
Page 3

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized, elongated cursive mark that starts with a small loop and ends with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke.

ERNEST J. GUADIANA
Elkins Kalt Weintraub Reuben Gartside LLP

EJG:ejg

cc: Esther Ahn
Donna Wong, Esq.

Exhibit A

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND
VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ

CAROLINE CHOE

HELEN LEUNG

KAREN MACK

DANA M. PERLMAN

YVETTE LOPEZ-LEDESMA

AJAY RELAN

CITY OF LOS ANGELES CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

VACANT
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

DIRECTOR'S DETERMINATION TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITIES AFFORDABLE HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM

December 29, 2020

Applicant

1550 South Fairfax LLC (A) (O)
12650 Riverside Drive Unit # 100
Studio City, CA 91607

Representative

Heather Lee (R)
The Ketter Group
12650 Riverside Drive Unit # 100
Studio City, CA 91607

Case No. DIR-2020-4192-TOC-HCA

CEQA: ENV-2020-4193-CE

Location: 1550-1556 South Fairfax
Avenue

Council District: 10 – Herb J. Wesson Jr.

Neighborhood Council: P.I.C.O.

Community Plan Area: Wilshire

Land Use Designation: Medium Residential

Zone: [Q]R3-1-O

Legal Description: Lots 91-92; Tract TR4713

Last Day to File an Appeal: January 13, 2021

DETERMINATION – Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentive Program

Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.22-A,31, I have reviewed the proposed project and as the designee of the Director of City Planning, I hereby:

1. **Determine** that, based on the whole of the administrative record, the project is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15332 (Class 32), and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies;
2. **Approve with Conditions** a 70 percent increase in density, consistent with the provisions of the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program along with the following three (3) incentives for a qualifying Tier 3 project totaling 30 dwelling units, including three (3) units reserved for Extremely Low Income (ELI) Household occupancy, for a period of 55 years;
 - a. **Yard/Setback.** Utilization of the 30 percent reduction of two side-yard setbacks from 9 feet to 6 feet and 4 inches; and

EXHIBIT A

- e. If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.

"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the applicant otherwise created by this condition.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The project site consists of two existing lots encompassing approximately 13,772.2 square feet of lot area with two dwelling units. The properties are single-story units, one having three bedrooms (1550 South Fairfax Avenue), one having two bedrooms (1556 South Fairfax Avenue). The subject site is located within the Wilshire Community Plan Area and is zoned [Q]R3-1-O with a corresponding land use designation of Medium Residential. The "Q" Qualified Permanent Condition, established pursuant to Ordinance Number 179,884, limits the allowable uses otherwise permitted in the R3 Zone. The subject property is also located within a Transit Priority Area in the City of Los Angeles (ZI-2452) and an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone. The property is not otherwise within the boundaries of any specific plan, community design overlay, or interim control ordinance.

The project site is located within a Tier 3 Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentive Area, qualified by its proximity to the intersection of a Major Transit Stop. The project site is located within 1,500 feet of the Metro Rapid Line 780, local Metro Line 217, Santa Monica Line 7, and Santa Monica line R7 at the intersection of Fairfax Avenue and Pico. As such, the project meets the eligibility requirements for a TOC Housing Development to be located within 1,500 feet of a Major Transit Stop.

Exhibit B

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND
VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ
CAROLINE CHOE
HELEN LEUNG
KAREN MACK
MARC MITCHELL
VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS
DANA M. PERLMAN

CITY OF LOS ANGELES CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES 200

N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525 LOS
ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

VACANT
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

DIRECTOR'S DETERMINATION TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITIES AFFORDABLE HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM

November 13, 2020

Applicant

1551 South Orange Grove LLC (A)
12650 Riverside Drive Unit # 100
Studio City, CA 91607

Case No. DIR-2020-4062-TOC-HCA

CEQA: ENV-2020-4063-CE

Location: 1551(1557-1559) Orange
Grove Avenue

Council District: 10 – Herb J. Wesson Jr.

Neighborhood Council: P.I.C.O.

Community Plan Area: Wilshire

Land Use Designation: Medium Residential

Zone: [Q]R3-1-O

Legal Description: Lots 85-86; Tract TR4713

Owner

1551 South Orange Grove LLC (O)
12650 Riverside Drive Unit # 100
Studio City, CA 91607

Representative

Heather Lee (R)
The Ketter Group
12650 Riverside Drive Unit # 100
Studio City, CA 91607

Last Day to File an Appeal: November 30, 2020

DETERMINATION – Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentive Program

Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.22-A,31, I have reviewed the proposed project and as the designee of the Director of City Planning, I hereby:

1. **Determine** that, based on the whole of the administrative record, the project is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15332 (Class 32), and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies;
2. **Approve with Conditions** a 70 percent increase in density, consistent with the provisions of the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program along with the following three (3) incentives for a qualifying Tier 3 project totaling 30 dwelling units, including three (3) units reserved for Extremely Low Income (ELI) Household occupancy, for a period of 55 years;

Exhibit B

relieve the applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).

- e. If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.

"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the applicant otherwise created by this condition.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The project site consists of two existing lots encompassing approximately 13,772.2 square feet of lot area with three dwelling units. The properties are single-story units, one having three bedrooms (1551 South Orange Grove), one having two bedrooms (1557 South Orange Drive) and a single room occupancy unit (1559 South Orange Avenue). The subject site is located within the Wilshire Community Plan Area and is zoned [Q]R3-1-O with a corresponding land use designation of Medium Residential. The "Q" Qualified Permanent Condition, established pursuant to Ordinance Number 179,884, limits the allowable uses otherwise permitted in the R3 Zone. The subject property is also located within a Transit Priority Area in the City of Los Angeles (ZI-2452) and an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone. The property is not otherwise within the boundaries of any specific plan, community design overlay, or interim control ordinance.

The project site is located within a Tier 3 Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentive Area, qualified by its proximity to the intersection of a Major Transit Stop. The project site is located within 1,500 feet of the Metro Rapid Line 780, local Metro Line 217, Santa Monica Line 7, and Santa Monica line R7 at the intersection of Fairfax Avenue and Pico. As such, the

project meets the eligibility requirements for a TOC Housing Development to be located within 1,500 feet of a Major Transit Stop.

The project proposes the demolition of three (3) existing residential structures, on two lots and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new six-story (6), approximately 61'8" high residential building with 30 dwelling units, parking at-grade and one (1) level of subterranean parking. The proposed building will encompass approximately 36,838 square feet in total building area, resulting in a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of approximately 4.2:1. Of the 30 units proposed, 2 will be one bedroom, 14 will be two bedrooms, and 14 will be three bedrooms. The project proposes to provide 52 residential automobile parking spaces which includes and one (1) electric vehicle charging station. Additionally, the project proposes 30 long-term bicycle parking and three (3) short-term bicycle parking spaces. A total of 3,465 square feet of open space will be provided by way of yards, balconies, and roof patio. The project will maintain a 20 -foot front yard, as required by the underlying Qualified Permanent Condition of Ordinance No. 179884, and a 6 foot-4 inch setback for the northeast and southwest side yards—a 30 percent reduction from the required 9 feet— as a TOC incentive.

The project meets all eligibility requirements for the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program. As such, the project is eligible for Base Incentives and up to three (3) additional incentives. As base incentives, the project is eligible to (1) increase the maximum allowable number of dwelling units permitted by 70 percent, (2) increase the maximum allowable FAR from 3:1 up to a maximum of 4.5:1 in a [Q]R3-1-O Zone (3) provide automobile parking at a ratio of 0.5 spaces per residential unit. As Additional Incentives, the project is requesting (1) a 16 foot and 8 inch increase in building height, from 45 feet to 61 feet and 8 inches, (2) a 30% reduction of the 9-foot side yard setback requirements of the R3 Zone to 6 feet and 4 inches and (3) a 20% reduction of open space 4,300 square feet to 3,465 square feet. The project meets the TOC Guideline requirements of providing at least 11 percent of the base units for Extremely Low-Income Households in exchange for the additional incentives. The project is setting aside three (3) units for Extremely Low-Income Households, which equates to ten (10) percent of the 30 proposed units permitted through the Transit Oriented Guidelines for Tier 3.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

Surrounding properties are developed with single-family, and multi-family residential uses. Properties abutting the subject site to the east and west are zoned [Q]R3-1-O, improved with single-story residential developments. Properties abutting the site to the north are zoned [Q]R3-1-O characterized by multi-family and single-family residences. Properties abutting the site to the south are zoned [Q]R3-1-O and improved with multi-story and single-story residential buildings.

STREETS

Orange Grove Avenue, abutting the property to the east, is designated Local Street – Standard, dedicated to a right-of-way width of 60 feet, a roadway width of 36 feet and is improved with asphalt, concrete curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

HOUSING REPLACEMENT

Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22-A,31(b)(1), a Housing Development located within a Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Area shall be eligible for TOC Incentives if it meets any applicable replacement requirements of California Government Code Section 65915(c)(3) (California State Density Bonus Law).



September 28, 2023

City Planning Commission
Van Nuys City Hall, Council Chamber, 2nd Floor
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, California 91401

RE: Item No. 7 - Pro-Housing Neighbors Support Housing at 5240 N. Lankershim Blvd.

Commission President Millman and Members of the City Planning Commission,

We, the pro-housing neighbors of Abundant Housing LA's Southeast San Fernando Valley Chapter, support the project proposed at 5240 North Lankershim Boulevard (DIR-2022-6485-TOC-SPR-VHCA-1A) in Council District 2. We recognize the urgent need to build housing and support more housing in their backyards at all levels of affordability.

The project involves the demolition of a two-story commercial building for the construction, use, and maintenance of a new seven-story mixed-use building with 128 dwelling units, of which 13 dwelling units will be restricted affordable at the Extremely Low Income level, and up to 5,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. We want to acknowledge and applaud the NoHo Neighborhood Council for working with the applicant to create a better development in our neighborhood.

This item is on the Commission's agenda due to an appeal on the City's determination that the project met the criteria under Class 32 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This project is urban infill development, the type of housing that is perfect for transit-oriented communities like the NoHo Arts District. We urge the City Planning Commission to deny the appeal and sustain the Director of Planning's determination. Simply put, housing delayed is housing denied.

Given these reasons, we respectfully ask to deny the appeal.

Sincerely,

Southeast San Fernando Valley For All
A chapter of Abundant Housing LA

cc: Councilmember Paul Krekorian, District 2



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

We oppose this.

Anthony Jackson <ajackson@crdent.com>
To: "cpc@lacity.org" <cpc@lacity.org>

Fri, Sep 22, 2023 at 12:28 PM

Please let's not destroy our beautiful Tujunga with heavy traffic and havoc. We oppose this monstrosity. Please highly consider that this should not happen.



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

Support for Ref: 7577 Foothill Blvd CPC-201-9909-DB-SP-SPP-HCA and ENV-2021-9910-CE

Eve Ahlroth <eve.ahlroth@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 2:55 PM

To: cpc@lacity.org

To whom it may concern;

I'm writing as a longtime resident of Tujunga about the proposed apartment buildings at [7577 Foothill Blvd](#). I would like to voice my support for this project. We need more housing, and that lot has been empty for far too long. I know there are people in Sunland-Tujunga that would like to keep the town as small as possible to try to preserve a bygone era. However, I would like to see more options for housing and a more competitive housing market. That's only going to happen if we have the supply. So please note my voice in support of the apartments on 7577 Foothill Blvd.

Thank you,
Eve Ahlroth
[10445 Kailua Lane #7](#)
[Tujunga, CA 91042](#)
818-438-7041

--

Carthago delenda est



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

Ref: 7577 Foothill Blvd CPC-201-9909-DB-SP-SPP-HCA and ENV-2021-9910-CE

Marcel Valcarce <marcel@valcarce.us>

Sat, Sep 23, 2023 at 8:22 AM

Reply-To: marcel@valcarce.us

To: cpc@lacity.org

To whom it may concern,

I would like to object to the variances being requested for this construction.

Thanks for your time.

--

Best,
Marcel Valcarce
7548 Thousand Oaks Drive
Tujunga, CA 91042



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

CPC-2021-9909-DB-SP-HCA and ENV-2021-9910-CE 7577 Foothill Blvd

patip91040@ca.rr.com <patip91040@ca.rr.com>

Tue, Sep 26, 2023 at 9:04 AM

To: cpc@lacity.org

Asking the City **NOT** to support the project for the following reason.

Majority of this property is zoned commercial and it should stay that way, Why not develop a mix-use?

-

The height they are requesting is over the FBCSF 33 ft limit which should not be allowed!!

This community thrives on the mountain views, that height will take that away.

It should not be allowed any higher than the townhomes to the north of this property.

There are already too many apartments just built or in the process of being build where an extra height has been allowed.

This cannot continue, particularly on the main boulevard.

A full traffic study needs to be done on the corner to show the rush hour traffic. Beside the increase traffic at that corner the traffic lights there on Foothill, Plainview and Day are not good. There have been a few times on Day Street, and I had to wait 2 complete cycles before I got a Green light on Day.

With the parking, or lack of parking, should not be allowed. In the evening there is no street parking left nor is there enough parking on-site for the renters. I suppose they are not allowed to have visitor since they would have nowhere to park.

So many things wrong with an apartment being on this corner

Thank you!

Pati Potter

Resident of Sunland



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

7577 Foothill Blvd CPC-201-9909-DB-SP-SPP-HCA and ENV-2021-9910-CE

Regina Clark <hrh.regina@earthlink.net>
To: cpc@lacity.org

Fri, Sep 22, 2023 at 11:40 AM

City Planning Commission:

I OPPOSE this project in its entirety. We do not have the infrastructure to support this additional dense housing project. We do not need more apartments in our community.

Further, I strongly OPPOSE giving this developer any VARIANCES for height, set-backs or separations for this proposed project. At the very least, follow the criteria set forth in our Foothill Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan.

It's bad enough this building may get built, obstructing our views of the mountains, creating even more awful traffic along the boulevard and putting extra strain on our overburdened infrastructure. But to give this developer special considerations for overbuilding on the site, is beyond logical.

I oppose the project and I oppose any variances.

Regina Clark

Tujunga Resident

More Affordable Housing In District NoHo

TO: CPC@lacity.org, Jason.McCrea@lacity.org

SUBJECT: 9/28 District NoHo; CPC-2019-7239-GPAJ-ZCJ-HD-SP-SN-BL; CPC-2019-7240-DA

My name is Andrea Dominguez and I am a constituent of District 2

I am strongly opposed to the project as currently presented. Los Angeles is in a homeless crisis that has been made worse by a history of discriminatory and racist policies. The city needs to create over 400,000 new residential units, and over 50% must be low- and moderate- income housing, according to the LA Housing Element. The current plans call for 75-80% of the housing units to be market-rate apartments on public land in one of the largest joint development projects in the city. These plans are contrary to the directions, goals, objectives, and policies of the Los Angeles Housing Element. We can and must do better. Please do not approve this project as currently configured.

A. Dominguez 91601



September 21, 2023

Jason McCrea
City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning
221 N. Figueroa Street Suite 1350
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear City Planning Commission,

We are writing to express our support for the proposed 1481-unit mixed-use District NOHO development, including 366 affordable units, case ENV-2019-7241-EIR. This project is in partnership with the Cesar Chavez Foundation as well as National CORE, and affordable units will make up a full 25% of the development, an unusually high percentage in a public-private partnership. We urge the city to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

This project is a defining project for North Hollywood, adjacent to a Metro station which is the third busiest hub in the Metro system. The project, which will repurpose a parking lot and result in no displacement, will include retail and restaurant spaces, office space, and public open space, as well as upgrades to the North Hollywood Station, which will all benefit the surrounding community. The developers are also funding over \$80 million in much needed transit improvements at the site.

The greater Los Angeles region is facing a severe housing shortage, particularly affordable housing. Creating new housing in this neighborhood will help to reduce issues of gentrification and displacement. Abundant Housing LA believes that these housing challenges can only be addressed if everyone in the region does their part. This transformative project will support regional and statewide connectivity and benefit Los Angeles. We urge the city to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

Best Regards,

Jaime Del Rio

Jaime Del Rio
AHLA Field Organizer

Tami Kagan-Abrams

Tami Kagan-Abrams
AHLA Project Director



DAVID A. GOLDBERG
T: 310.254.9027
E: David@AGD-Landuse.com

September 21, 2023

BY EMAIL

President Millman and Honorable Commissioners
City Planning Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 272
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attn: Cecilia Lamas, Commission Executive Assistant II
cpc@lacity.org

Re: Agenda Items 9 & 10 - District NoHo Project (CPC-2019-7239-GPAJ-VZCJ-HD-SP-SN-BL; CPC-2019-7240-DA; ENV-2019-7241-EIR)

Dear President Millman and Honorable Commissioners:

We are writing on behalf of NoHo Development Associates, LLC (“Applicant”) in connection with the District NoHo Project (“Project”), which the City Planning Commission is scheduled to consider at its September 28, 2023 meeting. The Applicant supports the Department of City Planning Recommendation Reports for the Project and requests their adoption by CPC, subject to one requested modification discussed later in this letter.

I. The Project

District NoHo represents a transformative mixed-use, joint transit-oriented development with Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“Metro”) on an approximately sixteen acre site at and around the North Hollywood Metro Station, the third busiest station in the Metro system. Built in phases over the next ten to fifteen years, the Project will provide a significant investment in transit improvements; 1,481 residential units, including approximately 25% at deed-restricted affordable levels (311 Low Income and 55 Moderate Income); approximately 57,000 square feet of community-serving retail and restaurants; two acres of publicly accessible open space for community gathering; approximately 443,000 square feet of office uses; a project-wide labor agreement with a commitment to a skilled and trained labor force; as well as numerous other public benefits.¹

The Project would implement Metro’s vision of an energetic, public-oriented, and pedestrian-scale environment that can endure as a local and regional landmark and play a critical role in defining the continuing evolution of the North Hollywood community. The iconic, high-intensity Project would build upon NoHo’s creative arts-oriented identity, bring residents closer to employment opportunities, promote mass transit and walkability, generate customers for local businesses, and beautify an important gateway to the NoHo Arts District. District NoHo also will

¹ The Project unit count and floor area have been slightly reduced from the maximum totals analyzed in the EIR and permitted under the proposed Specific Plan.



feature a comprehensive public art commitment far in excess of City requirements, along with a dynamic signage program that will activate and serve as a beacon for this new Regional Center within North Hollywood.

The Project arrives at the City Planning Commission after eight years of community outreach, commencing with Metro's original visioning effort that included focus groups, community workshops, open houses, and extensive social media engagement. Since being awarded the RFP by Metro to serve as its joint development partner five years ago, the Applicant has built upon those outreach efforts, holding over 100 meetings with neighbors and stakeholders, and hosting numerous events with local businesses and community groups.

As a result of this extensive community outreach, the Project has received deep and broad support from a wide spectrum of the surrounding North Hollywood community, the labor community, and other stakeholders. The Applicant also has sought to be responsive to public feedback regarding ways to improve the Project, such as requests to increase the amount of affordable housing. In response to these requests, the Project increased its affordable housing commitment to approximately 25% by adding 55 additional Moderate Income Units to the 311 Low Income Units originally proposed.

The Project would provide substantial, far-reaching community benefits, including:

- **Significant Housing Production.** The Project will provide 1,481 housing units on the Valley's busiest bus and rail transit center with housing available to varied income levels and household sizes, significantly expanding housing supply in North Hollywood, and representing a major contribution towards Metro's commitment to grow its portfolio to 10,000 homes by 2030.
- **25% Affordable Housing.** The Project will provide 366 affordable units deed restricted for 99 years, including 311 units restricted at Low Income levels – which is more than twice the requirement under Measure JJJ – and 55 units restricted at Moderate Income levels. Measure JJJ requires that 10% of a project's base density be provided at Low Income levels for up to a 20% density increase, while District NoHo provides over 20% of its units at Low Income Levels and proposes only a 7.5% density increase over base density. To expedite their delivery, the Project's Low Income Units would be developed in two 100% affordable buildings within District NoHo, in partnership with leading affordable housing developers National CORE and Cesar Chavez Foundation and with the endorsement of the Los Angeles Housing Department.
- **Transit Infrastructure Improvements.** In partnership with Metro, the Project will implement multiple significant transit improvements at the North Hollywood Station, including an upgraded Metro B (Red) Line portal on the east side of Lankershim Boulevard; and a new Consolidated Transit Center on the west side of Lankershim Boulevard for the Metro G (Orange) Line, the LADOT Commuter Express, and local/regional buses, featuring enhanced electric bus charging, expanded bus transfer facilities, a transit security center, and operator rest facilities, along with public plazas and retail uses within the historic Lankershim Depot.



- **Publicly Accessible Open Space and Community Gathering.** The Project will feature two acres of publicly accessible plaza areas and open space, including amenities and programming for various functions, such as open-air concerts and performances, farmers markets, arts fairs, civic events, and passive recreation open to residents and the public.
- **Employment and Tax Revenue.** District NoHo will generate employment opportunities for the local community and surrounding area, including over 10,000 full- and part-time construction jobs with a Project-wide labor agreement with a commitment to the use of skilled and trained labor, and over 2,500 long-term operational jobs at full buildout both on-site and throughout the City. The Project is anticipated to generate \$1.0 billion in total economic output from construction-related activity, \$1.1 billion in total economic output annually from Project operations, and \$5.3 million in one-time revenues during construction and \$9 million annually in net new revenues to the City's General Fund.
- **NoHo Arts District Support.** The Project will celebrate and promote the NoHo Arts District through providing the 2,300-square foot Weddington Art Gallery, a community art gallery space that will be built as part of the Project and managed in partnership with a community operator for ten years, free of rent and operating expenses. The Project will also feature a comprehensive public art commitment that will significantly exceed City Arts Development Fee requirements.
- **Preferential Leasing for Local Retailers and Eateries.** The Project will seek to feature local retailers and eateries through preferential leasing opportunities during the first six months of initial marketing and then through ongoing online, social media and broker marketing efforts during the first five years of operations.
- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Amenities and Improvements.** District NoHo will improve pedestrian and bicycle access and safety through a unified streetscape plan that exceeds City requirements; and expanded bicycle infrastructure through a planned Metro Bikeshare Hub on-site and installation of a two-way Class IV bicycle facility on the west side of Fair Avenue from Chandler Boulevard to Cumpston Street.
- **Sustainability.** The Project includes numerous sustainability features that will promote the State's SB 375 plans and greenhouse gas emission targets, the City's Green Building Code, and the City's Green New Deal, and will be designed to achieve LEED certification.

Because of these numerous Project benefits, District NoHo enjoys broad community support and is recommended for approval by the Department of City Planning.

II. Requested Addition to Sign District Ordinance

The Project proposes a unique and vibrant sign program through a Sign District, which the Department of City Planning recommends for approval. As is now typical for Sign Districts in



President Millman and Honorable Commissioners
September 21, 2023
Page 4

the City of Los Angeles, the draft ordinance provides for community beautification by requiring the removal of one square foot of existing off-site signage within the Community Plan area for each square foot of Supergraphic Sign installed and two square feet of existing off-site signage for each square foot of Digital Display installed within the Sign District. However, because the availability of off-site signage to be acquired and retired is uncertain, the City has previously approved an alternative compliance mechanism to achieve the desired beautification and blight reduction. In particular, at the request of Council President Paul Krekorian, and as approved by the City Council, the NoHo West Sign District within the same North Hollywood – Valley Village Community Plan as the Project includes a Visual Environment Improvement Program alternative compliance option that is available where the applicant has demonstrated a good-faith effort to remove existing off-site signs, but is unable to fulfill the sign reduction requirements.

Recognizing that the same challenges to sign reduction may impact development of the District NoHo Sign District, the Applicant has proposed a similar Visual Environment Improvement Program for inclusion in the Sign District, which is attached to this letter at Exhibit A. Under that alternative compliance option, in-lieu fees would be paid to fund improvements to existing parks in the area; landscaping of sidewalks, parkways, and medians in the area; community beautification projects; community cleanups; street and parkway tree planting and graffiti removal. In addition, the installation and ongoing maintenance of substantial beautification improvements to the surrounding area, including landscaped medians and decorative sidewalks, would be required. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that, should the CPC recommend approval of the Sign District, it include the proposed Visual Environment Improvement Program at Exhibit A as an available alternative compliance mechanism to sign reduction.

We appreciate your careful consideration and respectfully request that you recommend approval of the District NoHo Project to the City Council, subject to the Applicant's one requested modification, at your September 28, 2023 meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to read 'D. Goldberg', is positioned above the printed name.

David A. Goldberg

cc: Mayor Karen Bass, Attn: Rachel Freeman
Councilmember Paul Krekorian, Attn: Karo Torossian
Milena Zasadzien, Department of City Planning
Mindy Nguyen, Department of City Planning
Jason McCrea, Department of City Planning
Marie Sullivan, Metro

EXHIBIT A

Section 8.E. Visual Environment Improvement Program. If the applicant has demonstrated a good-faith effort to remove any existing Signs in the Community Plan area, but is unable to fulfill the sign reduction requirements outlined in Subsections A through D, the applicant shall alternatively proceed with the following:

1. **In-Lieu Fee.** In lieu of a sign reduction plan, an applicant may elect to pay the following amounts in community benefit funds to the Council District 2 Real Property Trust Fund to be dedicated to improving the visual environment, use of public open spaces, and benefiting the public realm in Council District 2, as follows:
 - a. The property owner or ground lessee shall contribute funds pursuant to the following schedule:
 - i. \$200 per square foot for each Digital Display, up to \$1,676,600 for up to 8,383 square feet of Digital Displays; and
 - ii. \$100 per square foot for each Supergraphic Sign, up to \$204,900 for up to 2,049 square feet of Supergraphic Signs.
 - b. **Purpose.** The funds shall be used to improve the visual environment in the North Hollywood area within a one mile radius of the property, including, but not limited to the following projects in consultation with the community and under the direction of the Council Office: improvements to existing parks and pocket parks located in this area; landscaping of sidewalks, parkways and medians in the area; community beautification projects; community cleanups; street and parkway tree planting and graffiti removal.
 - c. **Proof of Payment.** The applicant shall submit proof of payment with the application form for Project Compliance.
2. **Additional Maintenance Obligations.** In addition to the above in- lieu payments, the property owner, prior to the issuance of a building permit for the first exterior-facing Digital Display or Supergraphic Sign, shall sign and record a Visual Environment Maintenance Covenant which obligates the property owner to install and maintain the following improvements for the term of the Development Agreement:
 - a. Landscape and improve the medians to the satisfaction of the Council Office for the below street segments:
 - iii. Between Lankershim Blvd and Tujunga Avenue, north of Burbank Boulevard, prior to the receipt of a certificate of occupancy for the development of Subarea 1);
 - iv. Between Lankershim Blvd and Tujunga Avenue, south of Burbank Boulevard (prior to the receipt of a certificate of occupancy for the development of Subarea 1);
 - v. Lankershim Blvd between Weddington Street and Magnolia Blvd (prior to the receipt of a certificate of occupancy for the development of Subarea 8);

and

- vi. Lankershim Blvd between Otsego Street and Hartsook Street (prior to the receipt of a certificate of occupancy for the development of Subarea 5).
 - vii. The minimum maintenance cost for these four medians shall collectively be approximately \$4,800 per year.
 - b. Install four decorative crosswalks at the intersection of Lankershim Blvd and South Chandler Blvd (prior to the receipt of a certificate of occupancy for the development of Subarea 8) to the satisfaction of the Council Office.
 - c. Install three decorative crosswalks at the intersection of Lankershim Blvd and North Chandler Blvd (prior to the receipt of a certificate of occupancy for the development of Subarea 5) to the satisfaction of the Council Office.
 - d. Install four decorative crosswalks at the intersection of Lankershim Blvd and Cumpston Street (prior to the receipt of a certificate of occupancy for the development of Subarea 1) to the satisfaction of the Council Office.
3. Annual Reporting: The property owner shall prepare a report 180 days after the first exterior-facing Digital Display or Supergraphic Sign is installed, and annually thereafter, detailing compliance with the Visual Environment Improvement Program and the requirements of the Sign District. The report shall be submitted to the Council Office and the Department of City Planning for placement in the case file.



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

9/28/2023 Re Case ENV-2019-7241-EIR

Cynthia Clemons <cclemons88@everyactioncustom.com>

Wed, Sep 20, 2023 at 3:37 PM

Reply-To: cclemons88@gmail.com

To: cpc@lacity.org

Dear Commission Executive Assistant II Cecilia Lamas,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed 1481-unit mixed-use District NoHo development, including 366 affordable units. This project is in partnership with the Cesar Chavez Foundation as well as National CORE, and affordable units will make up a full 25% of the development, an unusually high percentage in a public-private partnership. I urge the city to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

This project is a defining project for North Hollywood, adjacent to a Metro station which is the third busiest hub in the Metro system. The project, which will repurpose a parking lot and result in no displacement, will include retail and restaurant spaces, office space, and public open space, as well as upgrades to the North Hollywood Station, which will all benefit the surrounding community. The developers are also funding over \$80 million in much needed transit improvements at the site.

The greater Los Angeles region is facing a severe housing shortage, particularly affordable housing. Creating new housing in this neighborhood will help to reduce issues of gentrification and displacement. Abundant Housing LA believes that these housing challenges can only be addressed if everyone in the region does their part. This transformative project will support regional and statewide connectivity and benefit Los Angeles. I urge the City Planning Commission to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

Sincerely,

Ms. Cynthia Clemons

5000 San Vicente Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90019-2914

cclemons88@gmail.com



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

9/28 District NoHo; CPC-2019-7239-GPAJ-ZCJ-HD-SP-SN-BL; CPC-2019-7240-DA

Kathryn Weibezahl <kathryn.weibezahl@gmail.com>

Sun, Sep 24, 2023 at 12:39 PM

To: "cpc@lacity.org" <cpc@lacity.org>, "jason.mccrea@lacity.org" <jason.mccrea@lacity.org>

Hello,

My name is Kathryn and I am a constituent of Councilmember Ramen. I am a resident of the City of Los Angeles, and I am strongly opposed to the District NoHo project as currently presented.

Los Angeles is in a homeless crisis that has been made worse by a history of discrimination and racist policies. The city needs to create over 400,000 rental units, and over 50% need to be low and moderate- income housing, according to the LA Housing Element.

The current plans for the District NoHo development call for 75%-80% of the housing units to be market rate, concierge-serviced, luxury apartments on public land in one of the largest joint development projects in the city. These plans are contrary to the goals, objectives, and policies of the LA Housing Element. In addition, on public land that is owned by the city/Metro, the goal of housing construction should be to address the low- to moderate income housing crisis.

Please do not approve this project as currently configured. At LEAST 35% of units should be designated low and moderate-income housing.

All the best,
Kathryn Weibezahl
Los Feliz



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

9/28/2023 Re Case ENV-2019-7241-EIR

Robert Hogg <hogg.robert93@everyactioncustom.com>
Reply-To: hogg.robert93@gmail.com
To: cpc@lacity.org

Fri, Sep 22, 2023 at 2:15 PM

Dear Commission Executive Assistant II Cecilia Lamas,

As a student at CSUN and a frequent visitor of North Hollywood via transit, I am writing to express my support for the proposed 1481-unit mixed-use District NoHo development, including 366 affordable units. The project, which will repurpose a parking lot and result in no displacement as well as upgrades to the North Hollywood Station, benefits the community while funding over \$80 million in much needed transit improvements at the site. Dense housing is much needed near transit hubs in the Valley.

Sincerely,
Robert Hogg
18155 Andrea Cir N Unit 1 Northridge, CA 91325-1183
hogg.robert93@gmail.com



September 28, 2023

City Planning Commission
Van Nuys City Hall, Council Chamber, 2nd Floor
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, California 91401

RE: Item No. 10 - Pro-Housing Neighbors Support District NoHo

Commission President Millman and Members of the City Planning Commission,

We, the volunteers of Abundant Housing LA's Southeast San Fernando Valley Chapter, support the District NoHo project (CPC-2019-7239-GPAJ-VZCJ-HD-SP-SN-BL) located at 11163-11347 and 11264-11280 West Chandler Boulevard; 11204-11270 West Cumpston Street; 5300-5320 North Bakman Avenue; and 5311-5373 and 5356-5430 North Lankershim Boulevard.

Abundant Housing LA (AHLA) is a grassroots nonprofit organization working to solve Southern California's housing crisis by advocating for more housing at all levels of affordability. AHLA envisions a Los Angeles County where everyone can find a home they can afford, that meets their needs, in their neighborhood of choice, and where we can live in sustainable and diverse communities. AHLA's Southeast San Fernando Valley Chapter is made up of pro-housing neighbors who recognize the urgent need to build housing and support more housing in their backyards.

The District NoHo project would result in a mixed-use development of 1,527 residential units (including 1,216 market-rate units and 311 affordable units), retail/restaurant uses, and office space, on a 16-acre site. The project would redevelop several vacant lots and an existing parking lot within the NoHo Arts District, adjacent to the Metro North Hollywood Station. This project has been on our radar for years and we are eager to see some positive change in our community. We applaud the applicant for proposing 25% affordable housing and thank Metro for the opportunity to build housing, especially housing near one of the busiest transit centers in the city. Given these reasons, we respectfully ask for your support for District NoHo as proposed.

Sincerely,

Southeast San Fernando Valley For All
A chapter of Abundant Housing LA

cc: Councilmember Paul Krekorian, District 2

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS

My name is Brandon Araujo and I have been a licensed Civil Engineer registered in the State of California for over a decade. My professional background includes working for public agencies on matters related to transportation and traffic management.

Despite its loss in court, the City continues to maintain its misguided belief that this development qualifies for TOC Tier 3 incentives.

The City's ever-shifting rationale as to how this site qualifies as a TOC Tier 3 project now states that the Pico Blvd and Fairfax Avenue intersection qualified as a Major Transit Stop due to:

-Line 217 and Rapid 780 along Fairfax Avenue; and

-Line 7 and Line R7 along Pico Boulevard.

The City is under the belief that:

- 1) It can add two different bus lines together; and
- 2) That "Rapid" bus lines used to determine a site's TOC Tier do not have to meet the 15-minute frequency of service interval required of a Major Transit Stop

The City made these same arguments in court.

Here's what the Court had to say about it.

As whether or not the City may add two different bus lines together: "[there] is no clear authority for the proposition that bus lines may be so combined. Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.22 A.31 and the TOC Guidelines are silent on whether bus lines may be combined to the meet the 15-minute service interval requirement."

As to the second point, the idea that the Tier 3 category does not contain a 15-minute service requirement, the Court replied "While the definition of "Tier 3" does not itself mention the 15-minute service interval requirement, this requirement is located under the heading "Type of Major Transit Stop." It follows that the "Two Rapid Buses" which intersect must qualify for inclusion within a "Major Transit Stop," and must satisfy the 15-minute service interval requirement.

The City's own TOC Guidelines reiterate this finding. In Appendix A of the TOC Guidelines, the City calculates the frequency of service interval for Metro Rapid 750 and when it is shown that its frequency of service interval is greater than 15 minutes, the City's guidelines state "[Metro Rapid 780] is ineligible for inclusion in a Major Transit Stop."

Hence, any bus lines the City cites in support of its TOC Tier Determination must meet the 15-minute frequency of service interval *on their own*. It was already demonstrated in Court and the Court agreed that Rapid 780 did not meet this requirement and is ineligible for inclusion in a Major Transit Stop.

The same can be said for Rapid 7. At the time of the original TOC Tier determination, Rapid 7 did not meet the 15-minute service interval requirement nor does it meet the 15-minute service interval requirement today. Calculations for this line, both at the time of the original TOC Tier determination and today, are attached hereon.

Since neither of the rapid bus lines cited by the City meet this fundamental requirement of a Major Transit Stop, the City cannot authorize the use of TOC Tier 3 incentives for this project.

-Brandon Araujo, P.E.

Brandon Araujo, P.E.
September 28, 2023
CPC Hearing

Attachments

			Origin Departure Time (A)	Destination Arrival Time (B)	Median Time (A) + (B-A)/2	Number of Trips During Peak Period	Frequency of Service Interval 420/(Total Number of Trips During Morning and Afternoon Peak Hours)	
Line	Direction	Peak Period						
R7	Eastbound	Morning	6:41	7:32	7:06	8	<u>15.56</u>	
R7	Eastbound	Morning	6:55	7:49	7:22			
R7	Eastbound	Morning	7:09	8:07	7:38			
R7	Eastbound	Morning	7:23	8:24	7:53			
R7	Eastbound	Morning	7:37	8:38	8:07			
R7	Eastbound	Morning	7:51	8:52	8:21			
R7	Eastbound	Morning	8:05	9:06	8:35			
R7	Eastbound	Morning	8:19	9:20	8:49			
R7	Eastbound	Morning	8:33	9:34	9:03			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	2:09	3:32	2:50	19		
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	2:23	3:46	3:04			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	2:37	4:00	3:18			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	2:51	4:14	3:32			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:00	4:26	3:43			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:05	4:31	3:48			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:16	4:46	4:01			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:19	4:49	4:04			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:33	5:07	4:20			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:47	5:24	4:35			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:01	5:38	4:49			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:15	5:52	5:03			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:29	6:06	5:17			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:43	6:20	5:31			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:57	6:34	5:45			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	5:11	6:48	5:59			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	5:25	6:58	6:11			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	5:39	7:07	6:23			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	5:53	7:17	6:35			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	6:07	7:31	6:49			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	6:27	7:46	7:06			
R7	Westbound	Morning	6:05	6:54	6:29	11	<u>15.5555556</u>	
R7	Westbound	Morning	6:19	7:08	6:43			
R7	Westbound	Morning	6:33	7:27	7:00			
R7	Westbound	Morning	6:47	7:45	7:16			
R7	Westbound	Morning	6:55	7:53	7:24			
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:01	8:05	7:33			
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:15	8:22	7:48			
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:29	8:42	8:05			
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:43	9:05	8:24			
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:57	9:19	8:38			
R7	Westbound	Morning	8:11	9:33	8:52			
R7	Westbound	Morning	8:25	9:47	9:06			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	2:15	3:21	2:48	16		
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	2:29	3:35	3:02			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	2:43	3:49	3:16			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	2:57	4:03	3:30			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	3:11	4:17	3:44			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	3:25	4:31	3:58			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	3:40	4:50	4:15			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	3:55	5:05	4:30			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	4:10	5:20	4:45			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	4:25	5:35	5:00			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	4:40	5:50	5:15			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	4:55	6:05	5:30			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	5:10	6:20	5:45			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	5:25	6:35	6:00			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	5:42	6:52	6:17			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	5:57	7:07	6:32			
R8	Westbound	Afternoon	6:12	7:20	6:46			

Since the frequency of service interval in the both the east- and westbound directions is greater than 15 minutes, Line R7 is ineligible for inclusion of a Major Transit Stop based on the bus schedules in effect on February 16, 2020.

Calculations for Line Rapid 7 effective on February 16, 2020

Line	Direction	Peak Period	Origin Departure Time (A)	Destination Arrival Time (B)	Median Time (A) + (B-A)/2	Number of Trips During Peak Period	Frequency of Service Interval 420/(Total Number of Trips During Morning and Afternoon Peak Hours)		
R7	Eastbound	Morning	7:00	7:57	7:28	5	<u>26.25</u>		
R7	Eastbound	Morning	7:20	8:17	7:48				
R7	Eastbound	Morning	7:40	8:37	8:08				
R7	Eastbound	Morning	8:00	9:02	8:31				
R7	Eastbound	Morning	8:20	9:22	8:51				
R7	Eastbound	Morning	8:40	9:42	9:11				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	2:20	3:29	2:54	11			
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	2:40	3:49	3:14				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:00	4:27	3:43				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:15	4:42	3:58				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	3:35	4:26	4:00				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:00	5:27	4:43				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:20	5:47	5:03				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	4:40	6:07	5:23				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	5:00	6:27	5:43				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	5:20	6:47	6:03				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	5:40	7:02	6:21				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	6:02	7:24	6:43				
R7	Eastbound	Afternoon	6:23	7:45	7:04				
R7	Westbound	Morning	6:20	7:14	6:47	5		<u>26.25</u>	
R7	Westbound	Morning	6:41	7:35	7:08				
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:02	8:06	7:34				
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:23	8:42	8:02				
R7	Westbound	Morning	7:44	9:03	8:23				
R7	Westbound	Morning	8:05	9:24	8:44				
R7	Westbound	Morning	8:45	10:04	9:24				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	2:05	3:19	2:42	11			
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	2:25	3:39	3:02				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	2:45	3:59	3:22				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	3:05	4:19	3:42				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	3:25	4:39	4:02				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	3:45	4:54	4:19				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	4:05	5:14	4:39				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	4:28	5:24	4:56				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	4:53	5:49	5:21				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	5:18	6:14	5:46				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	5:43	6:39	6:11				
R7	Westbound	Afternoon	6:08	7:04	6:36				
Since the frequency of service interval in the both the east- and westbound directions is greater than 15 minutes, Line R7 is ineligible for inclusion of a Major Transit Stop based on the bus schedules in effect on August 13, 2022.									

Calculations for Line Rapid 7 effective on August 13, 2022

Channel Law Group, LLP

8383 Wilshire Blvd.
Suite 750
Beverly Hills, CA 90211

JULIAN K. QUATTLEBAUM, III
JAMIE T. HALL *
CHARLES J. McLURKIN

Writer's Direct Line: (310) 982-1760
jamie.hall@channellawgroup.com

*ALSO Admitted in Texas

September 27, 2023

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Van Nuys City Hall Council Chamber, 2nd Floor
14410 Sylvan Street, Van Nuys, CA 91401
E-Mail: cpc@lacity.org

Re: Reconsideration and Re-Hearing of DIR-2020-2067-TOC-1A; 1447 Hi Point Street

This office represents Hi Point Neighbors Association ("Petitioner"), an unincorporated association and the Petitioner in Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCP02223. Petitioner includes abutting owners Annette Wong, Brandon Araujo and Elaine Johnson, each of whom were Appellants in the above-referenced entitlement. Petitioner objects to the City Planning Commission's ("CPC") re-approval and re-hearing.

I. The Commission Lacks Authority to Re-Hear and Re-Decide the Entitlement

To be clear, the Superior Court *did not remand* the matter to this Commission for re-hearing. It issued a final order under CCP § 1094.5(f) rather than remanding the matter under § 1094.5(e). Its order is clear: the City "shall set aside its Tier 3 Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) approval[.]"

This Commission has no authority to reconsider a final decision without explicit authority to do so. Heap v. City of Los Angeles (1936) 6.Cal.2d 405, 407 (jurisdiction limited by charter and ordinance). The Supreme Court rejected an argument that such authority may be implied, highlighting the practical and political dangers of allowing a commission to re-hear final decisions. *Id.* at pp. 407-08.

Under Charter Section 551, the authority of the CPC consists of making recommendations on certain matters and performing "other functions prescribed by the Charter or ordinance." Neither the Charter nor any ordinance authorizes the CPC to take further action on a final approval ordered to be set aside by a court. *See* LAMC §§ 12.24-U and 12.24.1 (enumerating the CPC's authority).

The City has adopted several provisions granting a body explicit authority to re-consider its otherwise final decisions, including Charter § 1017 (authorizing reconsideration of Board of Civil Service Commissioners decision on discharge) and City Council Rule 51 (authorizing reconsideration of Council actions). The City has also adopted nuanced procedural rules to address uncommon circumstances involving

appeals, litigation and entitlement expiration including LAMC §§ 11.5.10 (triggering new appeal rights following withdrawal of appeal prior to hearing) and 12.25-B (staying expiration during litigation).

The CPC's Rules and Regulations authorize reconsideration only at the same meeting or the next meeting (Rule 8.3) – not two and a half years later, after a court has ordered that an approval be set aside. Under Charter § 245, actions of commissions are final after five regular meeting days of the City Council, unless the Council votes to review the action in that time. The City's approval was final when the Commission denied Petitioner's appeal and approved the TOC incentives. The City Council never exercised its authority under Charter § 245(b) to waive the Commission's action and remand the matter for reconsideration. The Commission has no authority acting on an appeal it has already disposed of. See California Country Club v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 18 Cal.App.4th 1425, 1434-36 (extension of time cannot revive expired approval).

Thus, the Commission's authority was exhausted when it denied the appeal, did not reconsider the matter and did not have the matter remanded to it by Council. Its only authority to further act on DIR-2020-2067-TOC-1A is to comply with the Court's order and set aside the approval – no more, no less.

II. Any Action Requires a New Application, Director's Determination and Right of Appeal

The Director of Planning – not the CPC – is the initial decisionmaker for TOC approvals. LAMC § 12.22-A.31 requires that a TOC application “shall be made on a form provided by the Department of City Planning, and shall follow the procedures” in LAMC § 12.22 A.25.(g).” LAMC § 12.22-A.25(g)(2)(i) specifies that the Director – not the CPC – “shall be the initial decision maker for applications” seeking incentives. The Director shall then transmit their decision “by First Class Mail to the applicant and to all owners of properties abutting, across the street or alley from, or having a common corner with the subject property, and to the Certified Neighborhood Council.” Here, there is no evidence that the Director received any application, issued any determination, or provided notice to property owners entitled to notice.

III. The Hearing Violates Due Process Rights of Petitioner and Members of the Public

Rule 4.3 of the CPC Rules and Operating Procedures requires that staff reports for cases shall be made available on-line seven days before each meeting. Petitioner attempted to review the staff report upon receipt of the agenda but was not able to open the document via the link. Only on September 26, 2023 was the link operable. Moreover, the CPC has failed to provide notice reasonably calculated to apprise persons with constitutionally protected interests of its unlawful re-hearing. Instead of physically posted notice and radius mailers to persons within 500 feet, notice was given only to abutting owners and interested parties. As applied to this Project, the limited noticing procedures found at LAMC § 12.22-A.25(g)(2)(i)(f) are inadequate and unconstitutional. Petitioner further objects that the CPC's approval of the incentives would deprive its members of appellate rights granted by Charter § 563(b)(2).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jamie T. Hall', written in a cursive style.

Jamie T. Hall

September 27, 2023

Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Van Nuys City Hall
Council Chamber, 2nd Floor
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, California 91401
E-Mail: cpc@lacity.org

Re: DIR-2020-2067-TOC-1A (the “Project”)
1447 South Hi Point Street

Dear Honorable Commissioners of the Los Angeles City Planning Commission:

My office represents Hi Point M, LLC (“Real Party”). This letter responds to Hi Point Neighbors Association’s (“Petitioner”) arguments contained in its September 27, 2023 letter.

Petitioner contends that the City Planning Commission (“CPC”) does not have the authority to set aside its Tier 3 approval, consider new evidence, and redecide Petitioner’s appeal. Rather, Petitioner argues that the CPC not only must set aside its Tier 3 approval, but must also deny the Project in its entirety, thus requiring Real Party to submit a new application for the same Project. In support of its position, Petitioner relies on Code of Civil Procedure § 1094.5(f) and a case from 1936, *Heap v. City of Los Angeles* (1936) 6.Cal.2d 405, 407. *Heap* is not relevant here, as it involved a *sua sponte* decision by a commission to reverse its prior ruling, and not a reconsideration of a decision that a court-ordered writ required be set aside. Additionally, Petitioner’s argument regarding § 1094.5(f) also fails as that statute is clear that a respondent may use its discretion to take further action in compliance with a writ.

The Court’s Writ in this case states that “Respondent ... shall set aside its Tier 3 Transit Oriented Communities (‘TOC’) approval in ... Case No. DIR-2020-2067-TOC, for the reasons set forth in the Ruling attached hereto as Exhibit A,” and further states that “Nothing in this Writ shall limit or control in any way the discretion legally vested in Respondent.” The Writ aligns § 1094.5(f), which provides the following:

The court shall enter judgment either commanding respondent to set aside the order or decision, or denying the writ. Where the judgment commands that the order or decision be set aside, it may order the reconsideration of the case in light of the court’s opinion and judgment *and may order respondent to take such further action as is specially enjoined upon it by law, but the judgment shall not limit or control in any way the discretion legally vested in the respondent.*

Here, the Court did not order the City to deny the Project. Rather, the Court only required the City to set aside (and not to vacate) the Tier 3 approval for the reasons set forth in the ruling. Moreover, the Court specifically did not limit or control the City’s discretion.

By ordering the City to set aside its Tier 3 approval, the Court ordered the City to set aside its denial of Petitioner's appeal only for the reasons set forth in the ruling. Accordingly, by setting aside its decision to deny the appeal, Petitioner's appeal is reopened as to its Tier 3 approval, which requires the CPC either to grant the appeal based on the evidence considered in the Court's ruling or to consider new evidence and decide the appeal based on the Court's analysis in its ruling. At the August 24th CPC meeting, the CPC choose the latter option, and nothing in the Writ or the ruling limits the CPC's ability to choose this latter option. Accordingly, the CPC has the authority to rehear and decide its Tier 3 approval of the Project.¹

Additionally, Petitioner's arguments on due process violations also fail. Real Party was able to access and download the Agenda and Staff Report for the CPC Meeting on September 20, 2023. Additionally, noticing was proper as the City provided 24-days' notice to abutting property owners, which is more time than is required under the relevant statute. *See* LAMC §§ 12.22-A.25(g)(2)(i)(f) (requiring 10-days' notice).²

Regards,



ERNEST J. GUADIANA

¹ Case law further supports the CPC's ability to reconsider the its prior approval. *See National Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Downey*, 98 Cal.App.2d 586, 594 (1950) (Where an administrative agency has not conducted a hearing properly, or has committed error of law, or if evidence is insufficient to support the findings, and it is still possible under the circumstances for the agency to exercise its discretion, court should remand matter to agency for further consideration); *Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover*, 39 Cal.2d 260, 268 (1952) (Where determinative powers are vested in a local administrative agency, and court finds its decision lacks evidentiary basis, or hearing was denied or it was otherwise erroneous, it is proper procedure to remand matter to agency for further and proper proceedings rather than for court to decide matter on merits); *Save Oxnard Shores v. California Coastal Com.*, 179 Cal.App.3d 140, 150 (1986) (In absence of express requirement that public hearing be conducted, due process is not violated when administrative agency obviates judicial review by vacating its decision in voluntary compliance with writ of administrative mandamus); and, *National Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Downey*, 98 Cal.App.2d 586, 594 (1950) (Where an administrative agency has not conducted a hearing properly, or has committed error of law, or if evidence is insufficient to support the findings, and it is still possible under the circumstances for the agency to exercise its discretion, court should remand matter to agency for further consideration).

² Moreover, Real Party notes that Petitioner's members are each abutting property owners who received notice of the hearing. Thus, Petitioner cannot argue due process violations.



T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205

1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612

www.lozeaudrury.com
Marjan@lozeaudrury.com

September 27, 2023

Via Email

Los Angeles City Planning Commission
City of Los Angeles
200 N. Spring Street, Rm. 763
Los Angeles, CA 90012
cpc@lacity.org

More Song, City Planner
City Planning Commission
City of Los Angeles
200 N. Spring Street, Rm. 763
Los Angeles, CA 90012
more.song@lacity.org

Re: Appeal on Proposed CEQA Infill Exemption for the 5240 Lankershim Boulevard Mixed-Use Project, September 28, 2023 City Council Meeting, Agenda Item No. 7

Dear President Millman and Honorable Commissioners of the Planning Commission,

I am writing on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (“SAFER”) regarding the Class 32 Infill Development Categorical Exemption (“Class 32 Exemption”) for a mixed-use project at 5240 Lankershim Blvd. (“Project”).

SAFER objects to the City of Los Angeles’ (“City”) Hearing Officer decision to exempt the Project (DIR-2022-6485-TOC-SPR-VHCA) from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) because the Project fails to meet the requirements for a Class 32 Exemption. An Initial Study must be prepared to determine the appropriate level of CEQA review. With support from independent experts, this letter summarizes the main issues that precludes reliance on a Categorical Exemption. In-depth analysis, along with exhibits supporting our findings, can be reviewed in the case file submitted to the City on September 26, 2023.

DISCUSSION

I. Due to Potential Soil Gas Contamination, the Unusual Circumstances Exception Precludes Reliance on the Class 32 Exemption.

Categorical exemptions are inapplicable “where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.” (14 CCR 15300.2(c).) Soil contamination at a proposed project site creates a fair argument that there may be significant adverse impacts, which necessitates the preparation of an EIR. In *McQueen v. Mid-Peninsula Board*, 202 Cal.App.3d 1136, 1149, the court held, “the known existence of....hazardous wastes on property to be acquired is an unusual circumstance threatening the environment” and the project may not be exempted from CEQA review. *Association for a Cleaner Environment v. Yosemite Comm. College*, 110 Cal.App.4th 629 (2004) (presence of hazardous materials makes CEQA exemption improper).

As explained in more detail below, the known presence of VOCs in the soil of the Project site is an unusual circumstance. Baseline’s findings regarding the Project’s exposure of toxic concentrations on future residential tenants is a fair argument that this unusual circumstance will have adverse environmental impacts. Given the gravity of this finding and potential legal violations that may result, the City cannot proceed with issuing a Class 32 Exemption for the Project because there is a fair argument that the Project will have environmental impacts.

II. The Project May Have Significant Air Quality and Vapor Intrusion Impacts.

The Project will have significant air quality impacts on residential tenants, and the Exemption’s analysis failed to adequately analyze such impacts. Soil vapor intrusion is a well-documented phenomenon that occurs when volatile toxic organic chemicals vaporize and pass through porous cement foundations. As the independent consulting firm Baseline points out, a 2021 sub-slab oil gas survey only analyzed volatile organic compounds (VOCs) concentrations for a commercial building. (Ex. A, p. 5.) Here, Applicant’s Project is a mixed-use development, which includes 128 residential units. Baseline’s analysis of the “maximum predicted indoor air concentrations for benzene and tetrachloroethene **exceeds the DTSC’s screening levels for a residential property** using DTSC’s current established attenuation factor of 0.03 for sub-slab soil gas samples. Therefore, the vapor intrusion of VOCs would pose a substantial health risk to future residents on the project site and result in a potentially significant impact.” (*Id.*, pp. 5-6 (emph. added).) These findings constitute substantial evidence that the Project will have significant vapor intrusion impacts that the City fails to analyze. Proceeding under a Class 32 Exemption is inappropriate, and the City must prepare a health risk assessment and initial study.

III. The Project May Have Potentially Significant Noise Impacts Not Adequately Analyzed in the Exemption.

A project cannot qualify for CEQA’s Class 32 Exemption if the project results in significant noise impacts. 14 CCR § 15332(d). While the Exemption shows that the Project would not result in any significant effects relating to noise, Baseline’s additional analysis shows that noise levels measured from the Kaiser Permanente’s southern façade may exceed significance thresholds. This building, which abuts the Project site, is a sensitive receptor but noise measurements were only measured from the western façade (which faces the street).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons specified above, the City cannot invoke a Class 32 Exemption. Accordingly, the City must prepare an Initial Study to determine the appropriate level of environmental review to undertake. Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,


Marjan Abubo
Lozeau | Drury LLP



Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council

Certified May 27, 2003

P.O. Box 635 • Tujunga, CA 91043-0635 • 818-951-7411 • Website: stnc.org

February 10, 2022

Via: Email

Los Angeles City Planning Department

Attn: City Planners

Phillip Bazan – phillip.bazan@lacity.org

Eric Claros – eric.claros@lacity.org

Expedited Processing Section – planning.expedited@lacity.org

RE: Case #CPC-2021-9909-DB-SP-SPP-HCA AND ENV-2021-9910-EAF

7577 West Foothill Blvd. Tujunga, CA 91042

NON-SUPPORT OF PROJECT: Proposed 46-unit, 42-foot tall Multi-Family Apartment building located in the Foothill Blvd Corridor Specific Plan C2-1, CR-1VL & RD2-1 zones.

Summary: The Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council (STNC) Land Use Committee (LUC) met with the owner's representative, Edgar Khalatian, at our January 10, 2022 public meeting. Mr. Khalatian gave a power point presentation.

The Sunland Tujunga Neighborhood Council strongly opposes this proposed project for the following reasons:

- ❖ **Request for a Specific Plan Amendment & Special Plan Project Permit Compliance:** The project violates the commercial-only provisions of the Foothill Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (FBCSP), does not meet the needs of the community, requests numerous changes and entitlements to enable building the project and would negatively impact the quality of life and the safety of the neighboring community. It should be noted that the project is prohibited under the commercial-only provisions of the FBCSP. The developer is requesting an amendment to the FBCSP to create a new target area to allow for residential construction. This would create an undesirable precedent.
- ❖ **Community concerns:** Sunland-Tujunga needs commercial development to provide new jobs, small business opportunities, and entertainment venues such as restaurants for the community. The community is concerned that this developer has not made any arrangements for developing appropriate improvements to the infrastructure, such as water, sewage, electricity, adequate emergency fire evacuation routes, traffic and adjacent traffic / parking congestion. The small-town nature of this community and the mountain views are all valuable aspects of Sunland-Tujunga and protected by zoning overlays. The size and density of this project will tower over the three street intersections of Plainview Avenue, Foothill Boulevard and Day Street and will block the mountain and Valley views for surrounding properties – which the community insists is the unique quality and basis of their property value. The increased density, without adequate study and without infrastructure improvements will diminish the enjoyment of the neighboring properties and decrease property values for the current residents and property owners.
- ❖ **Traffic, Parking and Safety Concerns:** The streets around the project are narrow. No accommodation for guest parking has been made except to say the guest can park on Wilsey which already is over- crowded with very limited city street parking; and yet the developers have not included improvements to ameliorate this problem. Further, Plainview, Foothill and Day Street converge into one intersection directly in front of the project, creating confusion and hazards for both drivers and pedestrians. The traffic problems existing at this three-street intersection have not been addressed by the developers and will increase with the additional vehicles from this development.
- ❖ **Ingress and Egress:** The developers show just one ingress and one egress to the parking structure at Plainview. It is unclear in the plans how the developer will mitigate the existing and soon- to-be created traffic problems.
- ❖ **Evacuation Concerns:** Foothill Boulevard is the only commercial corridor in this community and serves as the only evacuation route for all of the residents of Sunland-Tujunga, both on the East and West sides of the town. In the event of another wild fire, or other natural disasters requiring immediate evacuation, the congestion of residents at this intersection would increase the bottleneck danger already existing.



Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council

Certified May 27, 2003

P.O. Box 635 • Tujunga, CA 91043-0635 • 818-951-7411 • Website: stnc.org

- ❖ **Environmental Concerns:** Since the turn of the last century, those with crippling respiratory illnesses looked to Sunland-Tujunga as one of only two places in the world with the ideal air quality for healing respiratory conditions. After spending a brief holiday in Tujunga, settled at the time by only a handful of households, California Poet Laureate and Mission Play author John Steven McGroarty promptly moved here after sleeping through the night for the very first time, finally able to breathe. An asthmatics colony through the 1980s, people feared that Tujunga Valley would lose the healing quality of its air after the opening of the 210 freeway, but although the quality deteriorated through to the early years of the 21st Century, the last of the AQMD's readings showed it tentatively holding on. To this day, approximately half the households of Sunland-Tujunga have an asthmatic who relies on the fragile air quality the Lung Association has called endangered. The growth in population represented by a development of this size with its incumbent additional vehicles' fossil fuel emissions and natural gas methanes could easily tip the air quality from its life-sustaining magic for asthmatics to just another Valley community blanketed by a persistent brown haze of pollution.
- ❖ **Aesthetics:** Overall, this gigantic building looming over the intersection would be out of character with the community. It would decrease rather than increase the quality of life for the area, both in terms of reduced aesthetics and by not providing the commercial products and services that our Sunland-Tujunga residents do need.

The STNC recommends that the request to amend the FBCSP be denied. The community remembers that this property has a long and successful history of restaurant use and recognizes its highest and best use is for a restaurant, specifically family-style. The economic feasibility of a restaurant has been established. It is zoned for restaurant use including the two zoning overlays, so it is legally feasible. The past one-story restaurants with onsite parking, ingress and egress from both Foothill Blvd and Plainview, shows a commercial restaurant is physically possible. Further, the community insists that if alternate uses outside of the zoning overlays are considered, that (1) an EIR be required to address the concerns noted above (2) all impacts of such an egregious development on the community be studied, (3) mitigating actions including wild fire evacuation, water use, utilities infrastructure and traffic be addressed and (4) that these issues be resolved before project approval.

Upon the recommendation of the STNC's Land Use Committee, the Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council, at its February 9, 2022 meeting voted to oppose this application by a vote of **19** (yea), 0 (nay), 0 (abstained) and 0 (recused).

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments and considering the community. If you have any questions, please contact us by email at secretary@stnc.org or phone 818-951-7411.

Sincerely,

Lydia Grant

Lydia Grant, President
Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council

cc: Councilmember Monica Rodriguez, CD7 councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org
paola.bassignana@lacity.org
dominick.ortiz@lacity.org
anissa.raja@lacity.org

Owner's Rep: Edgar Khalatian ekhalatian@mayerbrown.com



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

9/28/2023 Re Case ENV-2019-7241-EIR

Jason Brown <jbrown@everyactioncustom.com>

Thu, Sep 28, 2023 at 7:35 AM

Reply-To: jbrown@wetdesign.com

To: cpc@lacity.org

Dear Commission Executive Assistant II Cecilia Lamas,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed 1481-unit mixed-use District NoHo development, including 366 affordable units. This project is in partnership with the Cesar Chavez Foundation as well as National CORE, and affordable units will make up a full 25% of the development, an unusually high percentage in a public-private partnership. I urge the city to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

This project is a defining project for North Hollywood, adjacent to a Metro station which is the third busiest hub in the Metro system. The project, which will repurpose a parking lot and result in no displacement, will include retail and restaurant spaces, office space, and public open space, as well as upgrades to the North Hollywood Station, which will all benefit the surrounding community. The developers are also funding over \$80 million in much needed transit improvements at the site.

The greater Los Angeles region is facing a severe housing shortage, particularly affordable housing. Creating new housing in this neighborhood will help to reduce issues of gentrification and displacement. Abundant Housing LA believes that these housing challenges can only be addressed if everyone in the region does their part. This transformative project will support regional and statewide connectivity and benefit Los Angeles. Having been a resident of Van Nuys for 12 years, I have personally witnessed the growth in our unhoused within the area, and can with authority that without development of low income housing units, this trend will continue to grow. It is essential to build more available low income units for both the community of mobile unhoused near the metro station, and many in the area whom are the margins of homelessness. I urge the City Planning Commission to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

Sincerely,

Jason Brown

6736 Woodley Ave Apt 10 Van Nuys, CA 91406-5933

jbrown@wetdesign.com



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

9/28/2023 Re Case ENV-2019-7241-EIR

Jillian Burgos <jillianburgos@everyactioncustom.com>

Thu, Sep 28, 2023 at 9:53 AM

Reply-To: jillianburgos@gmail.com

To: cpc@lacity.org

Dear Commission Executive Assistant II Cecilia Lamas,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed 1481-unit mixed-use District NoHo development, including 366 affordable units. This project is in partnership with the Cesar Chavez Foundation as well as National CORE, and affordable units will make up a full 25% of the development, an unusually high percentage in a public-private partnership. I urge the city to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

This project is a defining project for North Hollywood, adjacent to a Metro station which is the third busiest hub in the Metro system. The project, which will repurpose a parking lot and result in no displacement, will include retail and restaurant spaces, office space, and public open space, as well as upgrades to the North Hollywood Station, which will all benefit the surrounding community. The developers are also funding over \$80 million in much needed transit improvements at the site.

The greater Los Angeles region is facing a severe housing shortage, particularly affordable housing. Creating new housing in this neighborhood will help to reduce issues of gentrification and displacement. Abundant Housing LA believes that these housing challenges can only be addressed if everyone in the region does their part. This transformative project will support regional and statewide connectivity and benefit Los Angeles. I urge the City Planning Commission to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

Sincerely,

Jillian Burgos

10939 Morrison St Apt 306 North Hollywood, CA 91601-5125

jillianburgos@gmail.com



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

9/28/2023 Re Case ENV-2019-7241-EIR

jaime del rio <jaime@everyactioncustom.com>
Reply-To: jaime@abundanthousingla.org
To: cpc@lacity.org

Wed, Sep 27, 2023 at 4:29 PM

Dear Commission Executive Assistant II Cecilia Lamas,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed 1481-unit mixed-use District NoHo development, including 366 affordable units. This project is in partnership with the Cesar Chavez Foundation as well as National CORE, and affordable units will make up a full 25% of the development, an unusually high percentage in a public-private partnership. I urge the city to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

This project is a defining project for North Hollywood, adjacent to a Metro station which is the third busiest hub in the Metro system. The project, which will repurpose a parking lot and result in no displacement, will include retail and restaurant spaces, office space, and public open space, as well as upgrades to the North Hollywood Station, which will all benefit the surrounding community. The developers are also funding over \$80 million in much needed transit improvements at the site.

The greater Los Angeles region is facing a severe housing shortage, particularly affordable housing. Creating new housing in this neighborhood will help to reduce issues of gentrification and displacement. Abundant Housing LA believes that these housing challenges can only be addressed if everyone in the region does their part. This transformative project will support regional and statewide connectivity and benefit Los Angeles. I urge the City Planning Commission to approve the project with the Density Bonus and incentives.

Sincerely,
jaime del rio
7453 Denny Ave Sun Valley, CA 91352-5115
jaime@abundanthousingla.org

September 27, 2023

Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Van Nuys City Hall
Council Chamber, 2nd Floor
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, California 91401
E-Mail: cpc@lacity.org

RE: Letter of Support CPC-2019-7239-GPAJ-VZCJ-HD-SP-SN-BL The District NoHo Project

Dear Dear Honorable Commissioners of the Los Angeles City Planning Commission:

It is my pleasure to write a letter in support of the The District NoHo Project, the subject project in Items 9 and 10 of the Los Angeles City Planning Commission (the "Commission") Regular Meeting Agenda being held on September 28, 2023.

Council District 2 of the City of Los Angeles, where this project is located, is in dire need of more housing, especially affordable housing. According to the McKinsey Global Institute, "the shortage of affordable housing depresses GDP across the metro area by more than 2 percent. This translates into \$18 billion to \$22 billion in lost output every year for the City of LA". The 2022 Sixth Affordable Housing Outcomes Report states that LA County needs to add approximately 499,430 affordable homes to meet the current demand among renter households at or below 50 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI). This critical project will transform underused parking lots into 1,500 much needed affordable housing units with 1 out of every 4 units being designated as affordable housing. This project will make a much needed dent in Los Angeles' enormous need for more housing, especially affordable housing.

This project will not only bring Los Angeles closer to its housing goals, but will also provide this region with important, high quality union jobs and inject much needed economic activity into the local economy. These jobs will provide opportunities to Angelenos to play an important role in the creation of more affordable housing. This will also uplift the local community and economy by decreasing blight and making the neighborhoods surrounding this project safer.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the Commission to approve The District NoHo Project. This project will allow Los Angeles to take a leap forward towards meeting its critical housing goals.

Sincerely,



Manny Gonez
Candidate for Los Angeles City Council, Council District 2 and North Hollywood Resident