

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 4:00 p.m. Thursday of the week prior to the meeting, which are not integrated by reference or exhibit in the Staff Report.
- **“Secondary Submissions”**: Compliant submissions received after the Initial Submission deadline up to 24-hours prior to the Commission meeting are contained in this file and bookmarked by the case number.
- **“Day of Hearing Submissions”**: Compliant 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 BOOKMARKS ONLINE:

****If you are using Explorer, you 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.


INITIAL SUBMISSIONS

The following submissions by the public are in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures (ROPs), Rule 4.3a. Please note that “compliance” means that the submission complies with deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) AND the number of copies. The Commission’s ROPs can be accessed at <http://planning.lacity.org>, by selecting “Commissions & Hearings” and selecting the specific Commission.

The following submissions are not integrated or addressed in the Staff Report but have been distributed to the Commission.

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

ENABLE BOOKMARKS ONLINE:

**If you are using Explorer, you 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.



Planning CHC <chc@lacity.org>

URGENT: Yucca-Vine Tower: HCM Amendment / City Council vote this Friday

Kathleen Perricone <kathleen.perricone@gmail.com>

Mon, May 27, 2024 at 5:09 PM

To: Planning CHC <chc@lacity.org>

Please distribute to Commissioners immediately

Dear Cultural Heritage Commissioners,

My name is Kathleen Perricone, and I prepared and presented to you the HCM nomination for the Mountain States Life Building / Yucca-Vine Tower, which you unanimously recommended for full designation on April 18. Your appreciation of the building's architectural and historical value has been encouraging throughout this process.

Please excuse me emailing you on a holiday weekend, but City Council will vote on the Yucca-Vine Tower's HCM nomination this Friday, and time is of the essence.

As you may know, Councilmember Hugo Soto-Martinez rejected the Commission's recommendation to include all exteriors/interiors in the HCM. At the start of the PLUM meeting last Tuesday, his planning director Emma Howard announced the amendment, which narrows the period of significance from 1929-1931 to 1929 only:

I support the report and recommendations from the Cultural Heritage Commission dated May 2, 2024, item 2 on today's 5/21/24 Planning and Land Use Management Committee Agenda (CF 24-0510), relative to the inclusion of Mountain States Life Building/Yucca-Tower, for the property located at 6301 -6317 W. Yucca Street with the following amendment to limit the designation to include the exterior of the property and interior features dating from the original 1929 construction and excluding any later interior alterations.

This statement is ambiguous, and the way it's written does not unequivocally articulate what is included/excluded. At first glance, it seems the exterior is included in the designation as well as interior features dating from the original 1929 construction, but later alterations are excluded. However, what has not been stated publicly by Soto-Martinez's office, but by Emma Howard over email, is that they are citing the OHR staff report as context for the amendment — and it clearly states the east wing and the west wing's second story (both of which were built by Henry L. Gogerty) are merely "alterations."

But that is categorically false in regards to the East Wing: the permit was pulled in October 1929, the same month the *LA Times* reported construction had begun on the two-story structure ("Life Insurance Unit Expanding," Oct. 20, 1929; see attached). By January 11, 1930, it was completed ("Mountain States in Good Gain," Jan. 11, 1930; see attached). Additionally, the West Wing was not owned by Mountain States but rather Hollywood real estate moguls Alfred Z. and Harold O. Taft. The brothers built the Piggly-Wiggly in 1929, and the 1930 second-story addition was their company's office.

The east and west wings are significant character-defining features, and if not protected under the HCM, the two structures are vulnerable to redevelopment that will destroy the Yucca-Vine Tower's overall architectural integrity.

According to CD13's Emma Howard, "the motion clarification we added was reviewed and drafted closely with the Office of Historic Resources." It's baffling that OHR approved this watered-down version of the CHC's expert recommendation. It's an evisceration of Gogerty's earliest example of Art Deco. And it could set a precedent.

At the April 18 hearing, Commissioner Richard Barron asked Lambert Giessinger his thoughts on AMDA's request to carve out the interior from the HCM. Giessinger replied there was "good reason to *not* exclude the interior," such as the stairs not meeting the code for new construction. "If the building is historic and all of the elements in it are, then you kind of get to keep those things... I suspect there's more benefit to including the interior than not."

Giessinger's public statement to the Commission is a complete 180 from OHR's current stance, which cites the alterations in the Staff Report as the reason for excluding post-1929 features in the HCM. Interestingly, it was this same "alterations" passage that AMDA read *verbatim* during their April 18 presentation. And now, it's the only thing influencing Soto-Martinez's amendment.

City Council will vote on the Yucca-Vine Tower's HCM nomination this Friday, May 31, at 10 a.m., and I expect them to acquiesce to Soto-Martinez's amendment.

I am appealing to the Cultural Heritage Commission to please address the Amendment and its rejection of your recommendation. Please hold the OHR accountable for their endorsement of Soto-Martinez's motion to reduce this Art Deco masterpiece — and a century of extraordinary Hollywood history — down to one single year, 1929. It's shameful, and the community deserves a true explanation before City Council rushes to make a decision.

Thank you very much for your time.
Kathleen Perricone

2 attachments



East Wing construction_The_Los_Angeles_Times__Oct_20__1929_.jpg.png
814K



East Wing construction complete_The_Los_Angeles_Times__Jan_11__1930_.jpg.png
1147K



Planning CHC <chc@lacity.org>

CHATEAU LA MARTINE; 627 S NORMANDIE AVE CHC-2024-2182-HCM

Matthew Soufer <Matthews@cpmusa.com>

Wed, May 1, 2024 at 1:49 PM

To: "chc@lacity.org" <chc@lacity.org>

Cc: Greg Torossian <Greg@cpmusa.com>

To Whom It May Concern:

I represent the ownership regarding the above case which is scheduled for a hearing on May 2nd. I have asked the appropriate parties for an extension. Barring a denial, please see below for my comments regarding why I do not want this building to become a historical cultural monument. These may be used at the hearing:

The designation of a building as a Historic/Cultural Monument in Los Angeles is a significant matter that can impact not only the fabric of the city but also the sustainability of the housing market, particularly for owners and tenants who have been navigating the tumultuous economic aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. In response to the criteria put forth for such a designation, we present the following refined arguments against the nomination of our building for Historic/Cultural Monument status:

Criteria: Association with a "Master" Architect, Builder, or Designer

- **Counterpoint to Notability:** The assertion that the building in question was created by a "master" architect, in this case, Max Maltzman, hinges on a relatively obscure mention within the LA Times. Recognition in a newspaper does not elevate an individual to the status of a master architect whose works demand preservation. Were we to accept such a premise, we would inadvertently set a precedent that could qualify innumerable structures in Los Angeles for similar designation based solely on brief public mention. This would not only dilute the special recognition intended by a Historic/Cultural Monument designation but would also threaten the practical use and necessary evolution of the city's housing stock.

Criteria: Association with Important Historic Events or Personages

- **Lack of Direct Historical Connection:** It is critical to differentiate between buildings that are directly associated with historically significant events and those that are tangentially related. The construction of apartment buildings in the Wilshire area, spurred by the expansion of railway lines, was a common response to urban growth rather than a direct reflection of the railways' historical significance. To equate the two would be to misconstrue the nature of urban development and to unjustly elevate common responses to infrastructure changes to the status of historic importance. Doing so could indiscriminately sweep a broad array of properties into the historic fold, which is neither practical nor intended by the guidelines of designation.

Criteria: Association with Important Movements or Trends

- **Social and Cultural Significance:** While the development trends of the early to mid-20th century have indeed shaped Los Angeles, it is the broader pattern of development rather than individual, unremarkable examples of housing that are historically significant. The building in question does not embody any particular social or cultural movement distinct from countless similar structures erected in the same period. Its designation as a Historic/Cultural Monument based on this criterion would be tantamount to a freeze on the organic evolution of the city's housing landscape, which must be allowed to adapt to current and future needs.

Practical and Economic Hardships

- **Post-Pandemic Viability Concerns:** The economic realities faced by property owners, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, must be weighed heavily. With the pandemic's lingering effects causing hardships such as decreased rent collection and stringent eviction restrictions, the added constraints of a historical designation pose a significant threat to the economic viability of maintaining such properties. A Historic/Cultural Monument designation typically comes with

rigorous restrictions on alterations, enhancements, and repairs, which can lead to increased maintenance costs and decreased ability to adapt to market demands—factors that could potentially make serving tenants and operating the building unsustainable.

In conclusion, while we respect and appreciate the intent behind the preservation of Los Angeles' historical and cultural heritage, the proposed designation of our building does not meet the requisite criteria and threatens to impose undue hardship on property owners and tenants alike. It is our position that this designation is not only inappropriate considering the specific historical context and economic implications but could also set a concerning precedent for the indiscriminate conservation of buildings, thereby hampering the dynamic growth and adaptation essential to the city's future.

Please confirm receipt of this email

Thank You,

Matthew Soufer

Windsor Prime LLC

3251 W. 6th St #109

Los Angeles, CA 90020



Planning CHC <chc@lacity.org>

Please preserve Taix

Rachel Sondag <rachelesondag@gmail.com>

Thu, May 30, 2024 at 6:06 AM

To: chc@lacity.org

Hello,

I was shocked and deeply saddened to learn about a potential development in Echo Park that would demolish one of the most beloved places on the East Side. I'm urging you to preserve the building as it is, inside and out.

Please do not destroy the soul and cultural wealth of our community; the loss will be profound. Taix is so beautiful -- is a point of historic pride and a place of communal gathering -- the music and art festivals, the bands playing live gigs in the bar, even the neon and the old exterior. It's a way residents connect to the past and with one another.

I lived a block away for 8 years. Taix and the Taix Square IS Echo Park.

I read about the Holland group and former councilman Mitch O'Farrell's rewriting of the Landmark status, then saw a rendering of the proposed development and was horrified -- such thoughtless, ugly, unwelcoming, and generic housing. I know we are in a housing crisis, but there are so many other areas for that potential development, not the historic gem of the neighborhood. The project seems like many other projects through which LA's heritage is sold off to rich, short-sighted investors without taste or reverence for the community or its culture.

Pardon my passion here. I just really care. And I appreciate your time.

Thank you,
Rachel Sondag

--

Rachel Sondag
[Writer-Actor](#) | [Art](#)



Planning CHC <chc@lacity.org>

Case Number: CHC-2024-2182-HCM ENV-2024-2183-CE Cultural Heritage Commission

Greg Torossian <Greg@cpmusa.com>

Tue, May 28, 2024 at 1:49 PM

To: "chc@lacity.org" <chc@lacity.org>, "andrez.parra@lacity.org" <andrez.parra@lacity.org>

Hello,

I am the Owner Representative for **627 S. Normandie Avenue**

Here is my case:

The designation of a building as a Historic/Cultural Monument in Los Angeles is a significant matter that can impact not only the fabric of the city but also the sustainability of the housing market, particularly for owners and tenants who have been navigating the tumultuous economic aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. In response to the criteria put forth for such a designation, we present the following refined arguments against the nomination of our building for Historic/Cultural Monument status:

Criteria: Association with a "Master" Architect, Builder, or Designer

- **Counterpoint to Notability:** The assertion that the building in question was created by a "master" architect, in this case, Max Matzman, hinges on a relatively obscure mention within the LA Times. Recognition in a newspaper does not elevate an individual to the status of a master architect whose works demand preservation. Were we to accept such a premise, we would inadvertently set a precedent that could qualify innumerable structures in Los Angeles for similar designation based solely on brief public mention. This would not only dilute the special recognition intended by a Historic/Cultural Monument designation but would also threaten the practical use and necessary evolution of the city's housing stock.

Criteria: Association with Important Historic Events or Personages

- **Lack of Direct Historical Connection:** It is critical to differentiate between buildings that are directly associated with historically significant events and those that are tangentially related. The construction of apartment buildings in the Wilshire area, spurred by the expansion of railway lines, was a common response to urban growth rather than a direct reflection of the railways' historical significance. To equate the two would be to misconstrue the nature of urban development and to unjustly elevate common responses to infrastructure changes to the status of historic importance. Doing so could indiscriminately sweep a broad array of properties into the historic fold, which is neither practical nor intended by the guidelines of designation.

Criteria: Association with Important Movements or Trends

- **Social and Cultural Significance:** While the development trends of the early to mid-20th century have indeed shaped Los Angeles, it is the broader pattern of development rather than individual, unremarkable examples of housing that are historically significant. The building in question does not embody any particular social or cultural movement distinct from countless similar structures erected in the same period. Its designation as a Historic/Cultural Monument based on this criterion would be tantamount to a freeze on the organic evolution of the city's housing landscape, which must be allowed to adapt to current and future needs.

Practical and Economic Hardships

- **Post-Pandemic Viability Concerns:** The economic realities faced by property owners, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, must be weighed heavily. With the pandemic's lingering effects causing hardships such as decreased rent collection and stringent eviction restrictions, the added constraints of a historical designation pose a significant threat to the economic viability of

maintaining such properties. A Historic/Cultural Monument designation typically comes with rigorous restrictions on alterations, enhancements, and repairs, which can lead to increased maintenance costs and decreased ability to adapt to market demands—factors that could potentially make serving tenants and operating the building unsustainable.

In conclusion, while we respect and appreciate the intent behind the preservation of Los Angeles' historical and cultural heritage, the proposed designation of our building does not meet the requisite criteria and threatens to impose undue hardship on property owners and tenants alike. It is our position that this designation is not only inappropriate considering the specific historical context and economic implications but could also set a concerning precedent for the indiscriminate conservation of buildings, thereby hampering the dynamic growth and adaptation essential to the city's future.

Thank you,
Greg Torossian