

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



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

ABC Affordable Bass Community. Housing Crisis Solution

affordable basscommunity <affordablebasscommunity@gmail.com>

Tue, Jan 23, 2024 at 12:35 AM

To: cpc@lacity.org

The establishment of SARAP Centers for the UN house into homes is the solution

SARAP stands for Strategic Advantage Redevelopment Aspirational Program

This comprehensive smart community will address all of the needs of those in need of housing now yes providing a place to live immediately

Wrap-around community services for physical and mental health will also be embedded within the community

Please contact me at your earliest convenience Chuck Thompson 626-243-8200

affordablebasscommunity@gmail.com

Click the link for a short video presentation I'm looking very much forward to working with you soon

#1 ABC affordable bass community solution Short introduction link

<https://youtu.be/Y9eljfbH6Ys>

#2 Housing Crisis Solution video link

https://youtu.be/Y2zL0Tvza_s



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

CPC-2022-7854-ZCJ-SPR-WDI - Consent to Time Extension

Eric Lieberman <ericl@qesqms.com>

Tue, Jan 23, 2024 at 6:49 AM

To: CPC@lacity.org

Cc: "Lamont B. Cobb" <lamont.cobb@lacity.org>, Esther Ahn <esther.ahn@lacity.org>, Linda Gravani <Lindag@lakebalboanc.org>, Egish Kuiumjian <lionsignature@yahoo.com>, Aram Alajajian <Aram@amaincs.com>

The applicant, Lion's Signature, consents to a time extension of Item NO. 7 on the January 25th agenda, CPC-2022-7854-ZCJ-SPR-WDI for the item to be considered from 1/29/2024 to 2/29/2024.

Thank you,

Eric Lieberman

Eric Lieberman

QES Incorporated

14549 Archwood Street

Suite 308

Van Nuys, CA 91405

818.997.8033 phone

www.qesincorporated.com



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

Time Limit Extension: Item 7 CPC-2022-7854-ZCJ-SPRWDI

Lamont B. Cobb <lamont.cobb@lacity.org>

Mon, Jan 22, 2024 at 8:00 AM

To: Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

Cc: Esther Ahn <esther.ahn@lacity.org>, Cecilia Lamas <cecilia.lamas@lacity.org>, Rosie Avetisyan <rosie.avetisyan@lacity.org>, Nayda Cantabrana <nayda.cantabrana@lacity.org>, Andres Sandoval <andres.x.sandoval@lacity.org>, Alexandra Leard <alexandra.leard@lacity.org>

To the members of the City Planning Commission:

CD6 is requesting a extension in the time limit for the review of Item 7, regarding

CPC-2022-7854-ZCJ-SPRWDI
[16949-16955 West Sherman Way](#)

The Council District has received multiple comments from the Lake Balboa community regarding project outreach as well as the overall design. The Neighborhood Council has had difficulty achieving quorum and has not had sufficient time to review the project and provide feedback. Members of the community within the 500' radius also stated they did not receive sufficient notification of the project's public hearing or the applicant's on-site meetings. With an additional month, the community will be able to provide sufficient responses, prioritize their concerns, and participate in the process with the applicant. We request that the Commission consider hearing this item in your February meeting. We have also made this request to the applicant.

Let us know if this is the appropriate process regarding extending the time limit.

Thank you.

--

Lamont B. Cobb*(he/him)**Director of Planning and Land Use*

Office of Councilmember Imelda Padilla



Office: 213-473-7006

City Hall, Room 470

[200 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012](#)Website: cd6.lacity.org

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS

Dear City Planning Commissioners,

The request for this Porter Ranch Specific Plan Amendment to reduce the side yard and front yard of the *only* 105 equestrian lots in this specific plan (out of 2,400 single family lots) is deeply concerning for many reasons and will set a bad precedent for the remaining equestrian lots to be built in Council District 12 as well as anywhere else in the city.

First, it is very disturbing that the Specific Plan requirement "*The yard requirements of LAMC Section 12.07 C shall apply to all lots located in Subareas B and H-1 and to the 40 horsekeeping lots located in Subarea A,*" was missed by such a reputable nationwide single family home developer, Toll Brothers. One only needs to refer to LAMC 12.07 C to get the required setbacks, that's it.

There are many unanswered questions surrounding this request such as how many equestrian lots have been built with illegal non-conforming front and side yard setbacks, and is there specific detail information from Building and Safety as to how many violations currently exist, and if so, what are they? I conducted some research and made some field observations to try to get some answers.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Sub Area A, the 40 equestrian lots have *already been developed* with a few homes in the finishing phases of construction.
2. Based on my observation (see attached photos/aerials), there are some lots that do not appear to have a 10 foot access even on one side and many do not have a 10-foot access next to the driveway that adjoins the street as required per the subject tract conditions of approval "*A minimum 10-foot unobstructed vehicular access path to the corral shall be reserved, to be located on the same side as the driveway.*"
3. Sub Area B, the 65 equestrian lots have **NOT been constructed** yet except for a model home. The area is currently being graded and leveled into separate lots.
4. The zoning in Sub Area A per ZIMAS reads as [T]RE-1 which does not exist in the Zoning Code. It is unclear what the correct zoning is for these 40 lots but this should be made known before you make a decision as it is relevant.
5. The zoning in Sub Area B per ZIMAS is [T]RE20-1. In addition to the Specific Plan requirement that equestrian lots use the RA zone yard setbacks, it is important to know that even the existing **RE20 zone actually requires 10 foot side yard setbacks**, not just on one side yard.
6. It is unclear based on the applicant's maps "Equestrian Site Plan Yard Set Back Exhibit" dated 9/21/2023, what exactly is the proposed front yard setback for each of these equestrian lots? The 15 foot arrow from the centerline of the street to the *unidentified* dashed line around the entire lot is not clear what that measurement is supposed to represent.

The amendment to the Specific Plan sets a bad precedent. It is clear what the community's intentions were for these equestrian lots and that should not be ignored, and it seems underhanded to try to change that after having to wait 34 years for these lots to be developed. The RA yard requirement was not a mistake. The equestrian lots were intended to look

distinctively different from the other properties in the specific plan with more yard space all around as most equestrian properties have and want. And these are the same requirements as other equestrian subdivisions that have been developed in the community and including one project currently being developed by the *same developer* in Chatsworth, also in Council District 12. If this amendment is approved, then the same thing will happen to the other equestrian lots. It's just wrong and undoes the compromises and hard work that went into approving these projects between the equestrian community and the developer.

It seems inappropriate to grant a specific plan amendment to accommodate this mistake. If these lots are zoned RE20, then the amendment does not even comply with the RE20 zone.

For the 40 equestrian lots in Sub Area A, a suggestion is to require that specific plan exceptions be filed, hopefully at the developer's expense, not the homeowners. The findings of hardship could be made in that everyone down the line, the developer, planning, and building and safety apparently all missed the incorrect yard setbacks.

For the 65 equestrian lots in Sub Area B, a big fat NO to the amendment. These lots have not been developed yet. There is no reason to grant this amendment.

I hope will you take your time with this and get more information before making a decision. A Hearing Officer hearing really should have taken place for this precedent setting.

Sincerely,

Marianne King

CD12 resident and equestrian advocate

Attached photos below:



This is a google earth aerial of a portion of Sub Area A (lot 9 to lot 18 left to right on west side). The two red checked sites do not appear to have a 10 foot side yard setback (zoom in). The other marked lot has a 10-foot side yard on other side of the site, not next to the driveway thus not accessible by vehicle.



This is looking west along the north end of Sub Area A. The property with red arrow (lot 17) appears to have two 5-foot side yards with the driveway in the middle (zoom in). The right side yard appears to be obstructed with a tree. Without gate access, it is hard to tell for sure. That is why B&S should clearly identify what is on the ground and in violation. The maps may not be accurate.

January 23, 2024

Samantha Millman, President
Monique Lawshe, Vice President
Maria Cabildo, Commissioner
Caroline Choe, Commissioner
Ilissa Gold, Commissioner
Helen Leung, Commissioner
Karen Mack, Commissioner
Jacob Noonan, Commissioner
Elizabeth Zamora, Commissioner
City Planning Commission
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
E-mail: cpc@lacity.org

Trevor Martin, City Planner
City of Los Angeles
200 North Spring Street, Room 763
Los Angeles, CA 90012
E-mail: trevor.martin@lacity.org

**Subject: SAFER Appeal – CEQA Infill Exemption
Arapahoe Apartments Project
Case Nos.: DIR-2022-7885-SPR-HCA-1A; ENV-2022-7886-CE
City Planning Commission Hearing Date: January 25, 2024**

Dear President Millman, Vice President Lawshe, and Honorable City Planning Commissioners:

This technical letter is submitted in response to comments contained in the Lozeau Drury LLP letter dated January 11, 2024, regarding the Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) appeal of the Planning Director's September 7, 2023, decision to exempt the Arapahoe Apartments Project (Case Nos.: DIR-2022-7885-SPR-HCA-1A; ENV-2022-7886-CE) ("Project") from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to the Infill Exemption (14 CCR §15332). SAFER's appeal is scheduled to be heard at the City Planning Commission's meeting on January 25, 2024.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

I. The Project Does Not Qualify for CEQA's Infill Exemption Because the Project Will Result in Significant Air Quality Impacts from Emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter.

Overview

The position taken in the appeal by SAFER is that emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) from Project construction would result in a significant impact to the public in the vicinity of the Project site because the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) CEQA cancer risk threshold of 10 in one million would be exceeded. However, this would not be the case because no exceedance would occur.

Key technical issues with the SAFER analysis are briefly discussed below.

Overestimation of DPM Annual Average Mass Emission Rate

SAFER Analysis: SAFER modeled the on-site off-road construction equipment exhaust 10-micron (PM₁₀) mass emissions as DPM emanating as an area source from the proposed construction site. From the California Emissions Estimator Model[®] (CalEEMod) output (Attachment 1 of the Yorke Technical Letter Report), an average daily DPM emission rate of 0.0984 pounds per day (lbs/day) was calculated on a weighted average basis. To obtain the average emission rate in grams per second (g/sec), SAFER used an average work day of 13.33 hours per day (hrs/day) for Monday through Friday, 7 am to 9 pm, and Saturday, 8 am to 6 pm (i.e., 80 hours per 6-day work week). This calculation yielded a DPM emission rate 0.00093 g/sec, which, in turn, yielded an “annual average” DPM concentration (C) of 0.156 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³), based on ISCST3¹ dispersion model parameters. This “annual average” DPM concentration resulted in a predicted cancer risk at affected receptors of 21.8 in one million for an annual exposure duration of 1 year based on the total construction period of 12 months, and a chronic hazard index (HIC) of 0.0313.

Yorke Response: The DPM mass emissions averaging time (i.e., 13.33 hours per day) used by SAFER is incorrect and thus caused risk to be overpredicted. Because cancer and chronic health risks are computed on an annual average exposure basis, the annual average emission rate must be internally consistent, i.e., total annual mass emissions averaged over 365 days per year, 24 hours per day. When averaged over 1 year (365 days x 24 hours/day x 3,600 seconds/hour), the corrected annual average DPM emission rate is 0.00035 g/sec, which is 38% of SAFER’s 0.00093 g/sec. This corrected emission rate lowers the annual average DPM concentration (C) to 0.059 µg/m³ (i.e., $0.38 \times 156 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3 = 0.059 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

With no other changes in modeling parameters, this corrected annual average DPM concentration results in a predicted cancer risk at affected receptors of 8.3 in one million (i.e., $0.38 \times 21.8 = 8.3$) for an annual exposure duration of 1 year based on the total construction period of 12 months. Thus, the predicted cancer risk is below the South Coast AQMD threshold of 10 in one million, which is less than significant (LTS). Further, the HIC is lowered to 0.012, which is also LTS.

SAFER cited the 2015 Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD’s *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*. However, because the proposed Project is in Los Angeles, the 2017 South Coast AQMD’s *Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401, 1401.1 and 212, Version 8.1* applies and should have been followed. Also, the ISCST3 model is obsolete, replaced by the American Meteorological Society (AMS)/Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Regulatory Model (AERMOD).

II. The Project Does Not Qualify for CEQA’s Infill Exemption Because the Project Will Result in Significant Indoor Air Quality Impacts from Emissions of Formaldehyde.

Overview

Guidelines Applicability

The position taken in the appeal by SAFER that emissions of formaldehyde would result in a potentially significant impact to the public has no foundation in CEQA. The South Coast AQMD

¹ Industrial Source Complex Short Term Dispersion Model, Version 3.

Arapahoe Apartments Project

Case Nos.: DIR-2022-7885-SPR-HCA-1A; ENV-2022-7886-CE

City Planning Commission Hearing Date: January 25, 2024

January 23, 2024

Page 3 of 5

CEQA cancer risk threshold of 10 in one million for a project is based on an environmental exposure, not for future residents living in a project. The South Coast AQMD administers air quality rules and regulations for the South Coast Air Basin that are designed to protect public health and welfare. This requires that a project evaluate locations and areas within the air basin where the public may have access, also known as ambient air quality. Ambient air does not include areas indoors or inside buildings or residences, or interior air spaces that are controlled by heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. These engineered systems manage air flow throughout interior spaces, separate from the ambient air that is regulated by the South Coast AQMD. Therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for applying the South Coast AQMD's environmental standard for cancer risk to the exposure of future residents to formaldehyde emissions generated from materials and furnishings inside a building. Moreover, there is no environmental standard for this to be evaluated under CEQA at all because it does not impact any environmental resource area within the scope of a CEQA analysis; therefore, a lead agency would be remiss to even consider such an argument when evaluating the merits of the proposed Project.

Materials Selection

As SAFER pointed out in their analysis of potential formaldehyde exposure risks to future residents of the proposed Project, using composite wood products that meet the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Phase 2 Formaldehyde Air Toxics Control Measure (ATCM) and CARB-certified ultra-low emitting formaldehyde (ULEF) standards has the potential to emit formaldehyde that could accumulate in the indoor space if sufficient ventilation is not provided. When preparing their calculations on potential formaldehyde emissions in the indoor air space, SAFER used the presumption that CARB Phase 2 formaldehyde compliant materials would be installed, which could lead to cancer risks in excess of Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) guidelines. However, SAFER also stated that there are wood composite products available that are manufactured with no added formaldehyde (NAF) resins, which would ensure that future formaldehyde emissions would not exceed the OEHHA cancer risk criteria. The types of materials used in the SAFER calculations appear to be based on speculation, and since other materials are available on the market with lower formaldehyde content, it is possible that the Project could be built with NAF products. It should also be noted that both of the studies that SAFER references were for occupied homes where cooking was performed, potentially with gas kitchen stoves. In particular, the second study (HENGH) requested that occupants not use (open) the windows. We concur with SAFER that it is a good practice to evaluate building materials prior to installing them in a building to allow for selection of specific materials/furnishings and specify minimum outdoor air ventilation rates to mitigate exposure risks prior to procurement; this could be conducted as a separate design process element independent of the CEQA review.

Key technical issues with the SAFER analysis are briefly discussed below.

Overestimation of Formaldehyde Mass Emissions

SAFER Analysis: "For this calculation [SAFER] utilized the floor area (2,272 ft²), the ceiling height (8.5 ft), and the number of bedrooms (4) as defined in Appendix B (New Single-Family Residence Scenario) of the Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic

Chemical Emissions for Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers, Version 1.1, 18 of 19
2017, California Department of Public Health, Richmond, CA.”

Yorke Response: The floor area used in the formaldehyde mass emission rate calculation was over three times the floor area of the average dwelling unit size of the proposed Project. Per Site Plan Sheet A1.2, the residential uses are 74,121 square feet (sf) and the number of residential units is 109; thus, the average residential use size is 680 sf. Because the floor area used in the formaldehyde mass emission rate calculation was 2,272 sf, the formaldehyde mass emission rate used for the risk assessment was overestimated by more than a factor of three. Further, the mass emission rate calculation was based on a single-family residence scenario, while the proposed Project is multi-family residence, which are different land uses with different construction methods and design features.

Overestimation of Exposure Period

SAFER Analysis: “Assuming that the residential occupants inhale 20 m³ of air per day, the average 70-year lifetime formaldehyde daily dose is 482 µg/day for continuous exposure in the residences. This exposure represents a cancer risk of 120 per million, which is more than 12 times the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million. For occupants that do not have continuous exposure, the cancer risk will be proportionally less but still substantially over the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million (e.g., for 12/hour/day occupancy, more than 6 times the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million).”

“In addition, we note that the average outdoor air concentration of formaldehyde in California is 3 ppb, or 3.7 µg/m³, (California Air Resources Board, 2004), and thus represents an average pre-existing background airborne cancer risk of 1.85 per million. Thus, the indoor air formaldehyde exposures describe above exacerbate this pre-existing risk resulting from outdoor air formaldehyde exposures.”

Yorke Response: It is highly unlikely that a 70-year lifetime exposure to substantial concentrations of formaldehyde could occur because formaldehyde off-gassing from building materials decreases substantially within months of product installation. Thus, elevated levels of formaldehyde would not be maintained over 70 years. Consistent with this phenomenon, CARB recommends airing out new furnishings that may off-gas formaldehyde for several days before bringing them indoors. Another CARB recommendation is to consider purchasing used furnishings because the bulk off-gassing process has already occurred. Also, the cited CARB outdoor air concentration of formaldehyde is 20 years old and obsolete.

Inappropriate Use of SCAQMD Significance Threshold

SAFER Analysis: “Therefore, the cancer risk of a resident living in a California home with the median indoor formaldehyde concentration of 36 µg/m³, is 180 per million as a result of formaldehyde alone. The CEQA significance threshold for airborne cancer risk is 10 per million, as established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD, 2015).”

Yorke Response: As discussed above, the South Coast AQMD significance thresholds are for outdoor ambient air quality, i.e., effects of a project’s emissions upon public health, such as off-site receptors. The South Coast AQMD thresholds are not applicable to indoor air quality (IAQ). The

South Coast AQMD significance thresholds were also updated in April 2023, superseding the cited 2015 thresholds.

CONCLUSION

As detailed above, the proposed Project would not result in significant or presumptive risks to the public or building occupants. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (805) 293-7867.

Sincerely,



Bradford L. Boyes, BSEnVE, MBA, QEP | Ventura Office
Principal Engineer
Yorke Engineering, LLC
BBoyes@YorkeEngr.com

cc: Mr. Shawn Shamsian
EL Investment LLC
18375 Ventura Boulevard, #155
Tarzana, CA 91356
E-mail: ShawnShamsian@SBCGlobal.net

Mr. Ramin Shillian
EL Investment LLC
18375 Ventura Boulevard, #155
Tarzana, CA 91356
E-mail: RaminShillian@Yahoo.com