

From: Kevin Hryciw <khryciw@ausd.net>
Sent time: 05/29/2020 08:58:57 AM
To: Mindy.Nguyen@lacity.org
Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; david.ryu@lacity.org; vince.bertoni@lacity.org; kevin.keller@lacity.org
Subject: Public Comment--Hollywood Center Project Environmental Case: ENV-2018-2116-EIR State Clearinghouse No.: 2018051002 Opposition
Attachments: Hollywood Center Opposition Letter.pdf

May 31, 2020

TO: Department of City Planning

City of Los Angeles 221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1350 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Attn: Mindy Nguyen, City Planner via Email: Mindy.Nguyen@lacity.org

CC: Eric Garcetti, LA City Mayor (mayor.garcetti@lacity.org) Mitch O'Farrell, LA City Council Member District 13 (councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org) Central Hollywood Neighborhood Council District (alex@mcapus.com) David Ryu, LA City Council Member District 4 (david.ryu@lacity.org) Vince Bertoni, Director of City Planning (vince.bertoni@lacity.org) Kevin Keller, Officer of City Planning (kevin.keller@lacity.org)

RE: Public Comment--Hollywood Center Project Environmental Case: ENV-2018-2116-EIR State Clearinghouse No.: 2018051002 **Opposition**

Dear Department of City Planning, Mindy Nguyen, Mayor Garcetti and Councilmember O'Farrell,

I am a resident/homeowner at the Broadway Hollywood Building Stakeholder and Historic Resource: The building and sign are a LA Historical-Cultural Monument and the building is a contributor to the Hollywood Blvd Commercial and Entertainment District with its primary entrance now located at 1645 Vine Street, at the corner of Hollywood Blvd. The building is identified in the EIR as: 6300 Hollywood Boulevard (B.H. Dyas Department Store Building/Broadway Department Store), Map No. B.12. **I strongly oppose the current plans for the Hollywood Center Project.**

I am shocked that the EIR was released on April 15, in the middle of a pandemic, with only a 45-day comment period. To expect me to review a 1500-page document in the middle of a Shelter at Home order that has completely disrupted my daily life is clearly inappropriate. My review has necessarily been limited by this administrative failure.

The EIR fails to adequately examine the very negative aesthetic impact of the Hollywood Center. Its two gigantic skyscrapers irreversibly damage the integrated visual look of the Hollywood area from whatever direction you look. Additionally, an iconic feature of Hollywood is the Broadway Hollywood sign, which can be viewed by cars on the 101 Freeway as they enter Hollywood. This view will be lost. The aesthetic damage is equally severe at the Broadway Hollywood (and neighboring buildings), since the Hollywood Center will block views of such Hollywood landmarks as the Hollywood Sign and the Griffith Park Observatory, diminishing the aesthetic and cultural significance of the building. Furthermore, the 40+ story tower would dwarf in scale one of the most iconic buildings in all of Hollywood, Capitol Records. In addition to reducing the visual significance of Capitol Records at Hollywood and Vine, the tower, given its location relative to the sun and its enormous height would cast a dark shadow on the Capitol Records Building.

Perhaps most importantly, the EIR is completely deficient in its conclusion that the Hollywood Center will have no significant transportation impact. Before the pandemic traffic was jammed at the Hollywood/Vine intersection. This has been exacerbated by the recent installation of a four-way walk sign (which was not taken into account in the EIR). Traffic will be even worse in future years since diminished ridership on public transportation will result from concerns over the spreading of infectious diseases in crowded spaces. Neither of these factors is considered in the EIR.

The Broadway Hollywood will be particularly negatively impacted because its only entrance is a narrow alley that can be entered only by going south on Vine past Hollywood Blvd and then turning right. The increase in traffic at the Hollywood/Vine intersection will make it even more difficult to enter our building.

Notwithstanding this, the EIR reaches the ridiculous conclusion that the Hollywood Center Project will result in no increased traffic. I am shocked by this conclusion and request that the traffic study be redone appropriately.

Finally, the EIR notes that the Hollywood Center may take up to six years to build. This will clearly result in major traffic disruption for a long period. This factor by itself demands that the utmost scrutiny be given to the project before it disrupts Hollywood for the better part of a decade. It is clear to me that such scrutiny has not occurred.

While I am not supportive of the project in its current plan, I am supportive of Alternative 2 approach:

Alternative 2: Development under Existing Zoning Alternative The Development Under Existing Zoning Alternative (Alternative 2) would conform to the Project Site's existing zoning designation. The development of Alternative 2 with a mix of residential, retail, and restaurant uses would be similar to the Project, although residential uses would be proportionally reduced to reflect the reduction in floor area ratio (FAR) from 6.973:1 over the Project Site under the Project to 3:1, except for a small section in the northwest corner of the West Site, which would be developed to an FAR of 2:1. Alternative 2 would be developed with a total of 30,176 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, which is the same as the floor area of retail and restaurant uses provided by the Project. Alternative 2 would include approximately 36,141 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which would form a paseo through the Project Site. No performance stage would be located within the paseo off of Vine Street on the East Site.

Alternative 2 would provide a total of 384 market-rate residential units and no senior affordable units. Alternative 2's residential component would be provided within two high-rise buildings, one each on the East Site and West Site, respectively. Each building would provide 192 market-rate residential units. **The East Building would be 18 stories and reach a height of 243 feet at the top of the 18th story and 293 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The West Building would be 14 stories and reach a height of 195 feet at the top of the 14th story and 235 feet at the top of the bulkhead.** The senior affordable buildings would not be constructed under Alternative 2 as this is zoning compliant alternative does not trigger Measure JJJ [Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 11.5.11)]. A three-level subterranean parking structure containing 300 spaces would be provided on the East Site, and a two-level subterranean parking structure containing 193 parking spaces would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 493 parking spaces. Vehicle and bicycle parking would be provided in accordance with LAMC requirements. The total floor area for Alternative 2 would be approximately 480,516 square feet, which would result in an FAR of 2.96:1, and represent an approximately 62.7-percent reduction in the Project's total floor area and a 62.3-percent reduction compared to the Project with the East Site Hotel Option.

In closing, **I strongly oppose the current plans for the Hollywood Center Project.**

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kevin Hryciw', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Kevin Hryciw, Ed.D.

Hollywood Center Opposition Letter.pdf

May 31, 2020

TO: Department of City Planning

City of Los Angeles 221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1350 Los Angeles,
CA 90012 Attn: Mindy Nguyen, City Planner via Email:
Mindy.Nguyen@lacity.org

CC: Eric Garcetti, LA City Mayor (mayor.garcetti@lacity.org) Mitch O'Farrell, LA City Council Member District 13 (councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org) Central Hollywood Neighborhood Council District (alex@mcapus.com) David Ryu, LA City Council Member District 4 (david.ryu@lacity.org) Vince Bertoni, Director of City Planning (vince.bertoni@lacity.org) Kevin Keller, Officer of City Planning (kevin.keller@lacity.org)

RE: Public Comment--Hollywood Center Project Environmental Case: ENV-2018-2116-EIR State Clearinghouse No.: 2018051002 **Opposition**

Dear Department of City Planning, Mindy Nguyen, Mayor Garcetti and Councilmember O'Farrell,

I am a resident/homeowner at the Broadway Hollywood Building Stakeholder and Historic Resource: The building and sign are a LA Historical-Cultural Monument and the building is a contributor to the Hollywood Blvd Commercial and Entertainment District with its primary entrance now located at 1645 Vine Street, at the corner of Hollywood Blvd. The building is identified in the EIR as: 6300 Hollywood Boulevard (B.H. Dyas Department Store Building/Broadway Department Store), Map No. B.12. **I strongly oppose the current plans for the Hollywood Center Project.**

I am shocked that the EIR was released on April 15, in the middle of a pandemic, with only a 45-day comment period. To expect me to review a 1500-page document in the middle of a Shelter at Home order that has completely disrupted my daily life is clearly inappropriate. My review has necessarily been limited by this administrative failure.

The EIR fails to adequately examine the very negative aesthetic impact of the Hollywood Center. Its two gigantic skyscrapers irreversibly damage the integrated visual look of the Hollywood area from whatever direction you look. Additionally, an iconic feature of Hollywood is the Broadway Hollywood sign, which can be viewed by cars on the 101 Freeway as they enter Hollywood. This view will be lost. The aesthetic damage is equally severe at the Broadway

Hollywood (and neighboring buildings), since the Hollywood Center will block views of such Hollywood landmarks as the Hollywood Sign and the Griffith Park Observatory, diminishing the aesthetic and cultural significance of the building. Furthermore, the 40+ story tower would dwarf in scale one of the most iconic buildings in all of Hollywood, Capitol Records. In addition to reducing the visual significance of Capitol Records at Hollywood and Vine, the tower, given its location relative to the sun and its enormous height would cast a dark shadow on the Capitol Records Building.

Perhaps most importantly, the EIR is completely deficient in its conclusion that the Hollywood Center will have no significant transportation impact. Before the pandemic traffic was jammed at the Hollywood/Vine intersection. This has been exacerbated by the recent installation of a four-way walk sign (which was not taken into account in the EIR). Traffic will be even worse in future years since diminished ridership on public transportation will result from concerns over the spreading of infectious diseases in crowded spaces. Neither of these factors is considered in the EIR.

The Broadway Hollywood will be particularly negatively impacted because its only entrance is a narrow alley that can be entered only by going south on Vine past Hollywood Blvd and then turning right. The increase in traffic at the Hollywood/Vine intersection will make it even more difficult to enter our building.

Notwithstanding this, the EIR reaches the ridiculous conclusion that the Hollywood Center Project will result in no increased traffic. I am shocked by this conclusion and request that the traffic study be redone appropriately.

Finally, the EIR notes that the Hollywood Center may take up to six years to build. This will clearly result in major traffic disruption for a long period. This factor by itself demands that the utmost scrutiny be given to the project before it disrupts Hollywood for the better part of a decade. It is clear to me that such scrutiny has not occurred.

While I am not supportive of the project in its current plan, I am supportive of Alternative 2 approach:

Alternative 2: Development under Existing Zoning Alternative The Development Under Existing Zoning Alternative (Alternative 2) would conform to the Project Site's existing zoning designation. The development of Alternative 2 with a mix of residential, retail, and restaurant uses would be similar to the Project, although residential uses would be proportionally reduced to reflect the reduction in floor area ratio (FAR) from 6.973:1 over the Project Site under the Project to 3:1, except for a small section in the northwest corner of the West Site, which would be developed to an FAR of 2:1. Alternative 2 would be developed with a total of 30,176 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, which is the same as the floor area of retail and restaurant uses provided by the Project. Alternative 2 would include approximately

36,141 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which would form a paseo through the Project Site. No performance stage would be located within the paseo off of Vine Street on the East Site.

Alternative 2 would provide a total of 384 market-rate residential units and no senior affordable units. Alternative 2's residential component would be provided within two high-rise buildings, one each on the East Site and West Site, respectively. Each building would provide 192 market-rate residential units. **The East Building would be 18 stories and reach a height of 243 feet at the top of the 18th story and 293 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The West Building would be 14 stories and reach a height of 195 feet at the top of the 14th story and 235 feet at the top of the bulkhead.** The senior affordable buildings would not be constructed under Alternative 2 as this is zoning compliant alternative does not trigger Measure JJJ [Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 11.5.11)]. A three-level subterranean parking structure containing 300 spaces would be provided on the East Site, and a two-level subterranean parking structure containing 193 parking spaces would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 493 parking spaces. Vehicle and bicycle parking would be provided in accordance with LAMC requirements. The total floor area for Alternative 2 would be approximately 480,516 square feet, which would result in an FAR of 2.96:1, and represent an approximately 62.7-percent reduction in the Project's total floor area and a 62.3-percent reduction compared to the Project with the East Site Hotel Option.

In closing, **I strongly oppose the current plans for the Hollywood Center Project.**

Sincerely,



Kevin Hryciw