

**ERRATA TO THE FINAL  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
FOR  
THE HOLLYWOOD & GOWER PROJECT**

---

State Clearinghouse Number: **200801113**

**Prepared by:**

Los Angeles Department of City Planning

**April 2019**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Project Design Refinements .....	2
3. Correction to Number of Hauling Days.....	4
4. Specific Revisions to EIR Text .....	4

---

# ERRATA TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE HOLLYWOOD & GOWER PROJECT

---

## 1. Introduction

This Errata makes minor technical corrections and clarifications to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Hollywood & Gower project (Project). These EIR modifications clarify and refine the EIR and provide supplemental information to the City decision-makers and the public. CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states:

*New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:*

- *A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
- *A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
- *A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*
- *The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that “[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR... A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.”

The information added pursuant to this Errata does not disclose a new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure or substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact. Nor does it contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the Applicant has declined to adopt. Additionally, information provided in this Errata does not present a feasible Project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the EIR. All of the information added pursuant to this Errata merely clarifies, corrects, adds to, or makes insignificant modifications to information in the EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Errata and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR.

## 2. Project Design Refinements

Following publication of the Final EIR, the Applicant has made several minor refinements to the Project’s design, as depicted in the Project plans dated April 26, 2019 and attached as Exhibit A. These design refinements do not result in any change to the Project’s uses, residential density, residential or commercial floor area, floor area ratio (FAR), building height, building footprint, or depth of subterranean excavation, as those Project characteristics are described in the EIR. Accordingly, any potential environmental effects related to uses, density, floor area, or FAR (e.g., air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, operational noise, traffic, public services, utilities, energy) would not change as a result of these refinements. In addition, any potential environmental effects related to excavation or impervious surfaces (e.g., cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality) would not change as a result of these refinements. Furthermore, no new or different aesthetic impact would result from these design refinements, as the Project is an infill mixed-use residential project within a transit priority area, and pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 20199(d) and City of Los Angeles Zoning Information File No. 2452, aesthetic impacts shall not considered be considered significant impacts on the environment.

The Project’s design refinements are described in detail below.

### Relocation of Units to 4<sup>th</sup> Floor and Minor Amenity Deck Design Revisions

As described in the Final EIR, the Applicant moved the three formerly proposed ground-level residential units along Gower Street to the fifth level of the Project, within the residential tower. As a result, the fifth level of the Project became the lowest level containing residential units. As described in the Final EIR, the relocation of these units resulted in minor changes to the Project’s unit mix and associated parking and open space requirements, as well as a withdrawal of the formerly requested Zoning Administrator’s Adjustment for reduced side and rear yards.

Following further design refinement, the Applicant is now proposing to locate three residential units at the fourth level of the Project, which will become the lowest level containing residential units. In addition, several minor design refinements have been made to the fourth level amenity deck, including the provision of a non-occupiable roof garden along the east side of the

fourth level of the deck in lieu of a shared outdoor space, and elimination of a balcony outside of fitness center, resulting in the removal of a glass railing. Following the location of residential units to the fourth level as well as the above-described design refinements to the outdoor amenity deck, the Project would continue to meet all applicable Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) setback requirements at its lowest level containing residential units, as a westerly side yard of at least 16 feet and a southerly rear yard of at least 20 feet would be provided at the fourth level of the Project. The Project will also continue to meet all applicable parking and open space requirements.

#### Removal of Helipad

The original Project design included a rooftop helipad in compliance with the City's Fire Code and Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) Requirement No. 10. In conjunction with the refinement of the Project's rooftop amenity area described below, and as part of the Applicant's effort to add additional shaping to the top of the Project's decorative "exo-frame" for additional visual interest, the Applicant has elected to provide the additional fire and life safety features prescribed by LAFD Requirement No. 10 under "Option 2 EHLF Equivalency." Accordingly, a helipad is no longer required and would not be included as part of the Project.

#### Reorientation of Rooftop Amenity Area

The original Project design included an outdoor rooftop amenity deck oriented to the north, which is now being revised to orient to the south. In conjunction with this reorientation, the Project will no longer provide a rooftop helipad, as described above. Noise levels associated with the re-oriented rooftop amenity deck would be similar to the original Project, as the potential maximum number of people would be similar to the Project (i.e., 107 people) and the amplified sound system sound level would continue to comply with Project Design Feature PDF I-5 (i.e., maximum 85 dBA at 25 feet from the amplified speaker sound system). Consistent with the analysis in Section IV.I, Noise, of the Draft EIR, operational noise levels associated with the re-oriented rooftop amenity would be effectively attenuated to the off-site sensitive receptors, based on distance and shielding provided by the building design (i.e., roof edge/parapet walls). As such, the reorientation of the rooftop amenity area will not result in any new or different operational noise impacts resulting from occupancy and use of the area, as increases in ambient noise levels during concurrent occupancy of the Project's outdoor areas would not exceed applicable thresholds of significance.

#### Reduction in Building Stories

In conjunction with the relocation of residential units to the fourth level, the refinement of the rooftop uses, and realization of design efficiencies resulting from these changes, the Project's number of above-grade stories is being reduced from 22 stories to 21 stories. The maximum height of the Project, measured pursuant to the LAMC, will remain approximately 252 feet. No changes are being made to the Project's density or floor area.

#### Refinement of Parking Garage Façade

Following receipt of comments from the Department of City Planning and its Professional Volunteer Program members, the Applicant has revised the architectural treatment of the Project's podium structure. Specifically, the new podium enclosure will utilize custom sized, solid (nonperforated) metal panels featuring a custom silkscreen pattern. These panels will be staggered in plan to allow air to flow between them, prevent visibility into and light spill outwards from the parking levels, and help create shadow and visual interest at the base of the building that is compatible with the shadow and articulation of the tower portion. It is proposed that the panels will be surrounded by a white "exo-frame" consistent in material as the tower portion above.

In addition, the elevation of the rear wall of the small courtyard adjacent to the Fonda has been lowered to align with the guardrail surrounding the Project's outdoor amenity deck on the fourth level, and this wall also features solid metal panels with staggered vertical joints. This treatment is also found on the Gower Street elevation near the Project's vehicular entry, which will complement the clear storefront glass that will enclose the Project's leasing area on the ground floor, thereby enhancing both visibility and activated street-life along Gower. These aesthetic refinements do not result in any changes to the Project's residential density, height, FAR, or other associated development envelope characteristics.

In sum, these design refinements do not result in any new or different Project uses, density, or intensity of development, and merely reflect minor changes to the internal configuration of the Project's residential uses and associated amenity areas. Accordingly, these refinements do not constitute significant new information pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

### **3. Correction to Number of Hauling Days**

In Response to Comment 3-3 of the Final EIR (page II-24 of the Final EIR), a reference was made to the Project's hauling operations lasting for approximately 65 work days. This was an error, as the Draft EIR and traffic study consistently analyzed hauling activities occurring for up to 89 days. Accordingly, the reference to 65 days in Response to Comment 3-3 is replaced by a reference to 89 days. This correction merely makes Response to Comment 3-3 consistent with the rest of the EIR, and therefore does not constitute significant new information pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

### **4. Specific Revisions to EIR Text**

All references in the EIR to the lowest-level of the Project containing residential units, inclusion of a helipad, orientation of the rooftop amenity area, and number of stories, shall be considered to be revised as described above under Section 2. All references in the EIR to the number of hauling days shall be considered to be 89 days, as described above under Section 3. No other revisions to the EIR text are necessary or proposed.