



SOUTH LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

200 North Spring Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, California, 90012, (213) 978-1300

www.planning.lacity.org

LETTER OF DETERMINATION

MAILING DATE: JULY 29, 2026

Case No.: ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA2-1A

Council District: 10 – Hutt

Plan Area: West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert

Project Site: 2115 West Jefferson Boulevard

Applicant: Hyon Chin Yoon
Representative: Steve S. Kim, GSD Partners

Appellant: John Lee

At its meeting of **July 7, 2026**, the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission took the actions below in conjunction with the following Project.

The Applicant proposed changes to the conditions of Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1, to modify Condition No. 10 to allow closing at 2:00 a.m. instead of the previously approved 11:00 p.m., and eliminate Condition No. 16, which required a state-licensed uniformed security guard from noon to 11:00 p.m.; in conjunction with the sale and dispensing of a full line of alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption from an existing market/liquor store.

1. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(5), the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to “projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves”;
2. **Denied** the appeal and **sustained** the Zoning Administrator’s Determination dated November 25, 2025;
3. **Denied**, pursuant to Chapter 1A Section 13B.2.2.H of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, an approval of plans to modify the conditions of approval associated with Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1, specifically Condition No. 10, to extend the closing time from the previously approved 11:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., and eliminate Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security guard from noon to 11:00 p.m., in conjunction with the sale and dispensing of a full line of alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption from an existing market/liquor store, in the C2-2D-O-HPOZ-CPIO Zone; and
4. **Adopted** the attached Findings.

The vote proceeded as follows:

Moved: Esperias
Second: Socarras
Ayes: Hernandez, Pruitt
Absent: Bates

Vote: 4 – 0



Stephanie Gavidia, Commission Executive Assistant I
South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission

APPEAL PERIOD - EFFECTIVE DATE

The decision of the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission is final effective upon the mailing of this determination letter and not further appealable.

HOW TO FILE AN APPEAL

An appeal application must be submitted and paid for before 4:30 PM (PST) on the final day to appeal the determination. Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal City holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30 PM (PST) on the next succeeding working day. Appeals should be filed early to ensure the Development Services Center (DSC) staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow appellants time to submit payment. Appeals may be filed either online or in person as referenced below:

Forms are available online at <http://planning.lacity.gov/development-services/forms>.

ONLINE APPEAL FILINGS THROUGH ONLINE APPLICATION SYSTEM (OAS)



QR Code to
Online Appeal Filing

Online Application System (OAS): The OAS (<https://planning.lacity.gov/oas>) allows entitlement appeals to be submitted entirely online. Appeal fees may be paid for by credit card or e-check.

IN PERSON APPEAL FILINGS



QR Code to Forms
for In-Person Appeal
Filing

Drop off at DSC. Appeals of this determination can be submitted in-person at the Metro or Van Nuys DSC locations, as well as the South Los Angeles DSC on Tuesdays and Thursdays only, and payment can be made by credit card or check.

- a. City Planning has established drop-off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop off appeal applications;
- b. Alternatively, appeal applications can be filed with staff at DSC public counters.

CITY PLANNING DEVELOPMENT SERVICES CENTERS – PUBLIC COUNTERS

Office	Address	Phone Number	Email
Metro DSC	201 N. Figueroa St 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012	(213) 482-7077	planning.figcounter@lacity.org

Van Nuys DSC	6262 Van Nuys Blvd Suite 251 Van Nuys, CA 91401	(818) 374-5050	planning.mbc2@lacity.org
South LA DSC <i>Tuesday and Thursday Only</i>	8475 S. Vermont Ave, 1st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90044	(213) 978-1465	planning.southla@lacity.org

City Planning staff may follow up with the appellant via email and/or phone if there are any questions or missing materials in the appeal submission, to ensure that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

SCHEDULING CASE CONDITION CLEARANCE AND BUILDING PERMIT SIGN-OFFS

This grant is not a permit or license and any permits and/or licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper public agency. If any Condition of this grant is violated or not complied with, then the applicant or their successor in interest may be prosecuted for violating these Conditions the same as for any violation of the requirements contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).



QR Code to BuildLA
Appointment Portal for
Condition Clearance

In order to clear conditions and/or obtain building permit sign-offs, you must make an [appointment](#) with the Department of City Planning's Development Services Center (DSC). You may schedule a Case Condition Clearance Appointment with the DSC at appointments.lacity.org after the effective date of the determination..

See instructions on how to prepare for your appointment at planning.lacity.gov/project-review/case-filings

Attachments: Zoning Administrator Determination Letter dated November 25, 2025

cc: Phyllis Nathanson, Associate Zoning Administrator

OFFICE OF ZONING ADMINISTRATION
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 763
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1318

ESTINEH MAILIAN
CHIEF ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

ASSOCIATE ZONING ADMINISTRATORS

JACK CHIANG
HENRY CHU
TIM FARGO
JONATHAN A. HERSHEY, AICP
PHYLLIS NATHANSON
CHRISTINE SAPONARA
COURTNEY SHUM
CHRISTINA TOY LEE
JORDANN TURNER

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA**



KAREN BASS
MAYOR

**LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT
OF CITY PLANNING
EXECUTIVE OFFICES**

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR
KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER
SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
planning.lacity.org

Decision Date: November 25, 2025

Last Day to Appeal: December 10, 2025

Hyon Chin Yoon (A)
Century Plaza
2115 West Jefferson Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90018

Steve S. Kim (R)
GSD Partners
800 West 1st Street, Unit 1907
Los Angeles, CA 90012

CASE NO. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA2
CLASS 2 CONDITIONAL USE – PLAN
APPROVAL
2115 West Jefferson Boulevard
West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert
Community Plan Area
Zone: C2-2D-O-HPOZ-CPIO
C.D: 10 - Hutt
D.M.: 120B189
CEQA: ENV-2024-2789-CE
Legal Description: Fraction Lot 3,
Block 2, Jefferson St. Park Tract

Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), Chapter 1A, Section 13B.2.2.H, I hereby
DENY:

an Approval of Plans to modify the conditions of approval associated with Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1, specifically Condition No. 10, to extend the closing time from the previously approved 11:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., and eliminate Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security guard from noon to 11:00 p.m., in conjunction with the sale and dispensing of a full line of alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption from an existing market/liquor store, in the C2-2D-O-HPOZ-CPIO Zone.

As the applicant's request has been denied, there are no changes to the conditions imposed pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1, the determination letter for which was issued October 17, 2016. The conditions imposed pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1 remain unchanged.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After thorough consideration of the statements contained in the application, the plans submitted therewith, and the statements made at the public hearing and in correspondence submitted to the case file, all of which are by reference made a part hereof, as well as knowledge of the property and surrounding district, I find that the requirements and prerequisites for granting the requested plan approval under the provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 1A, Section 13B.2.2.H have not been established, based on the following facts:

BACKGROUND

The subject site is an irregular-shaped approximately 16,164 square-foot property comprised of three lots with approximately 130 feet of frontage on the north side of Jefferson Boulevard and approximately 125 feet of frontage on the west side of Arlington Avenue. The property backs onto an alley adjacent to its northerly property line. The subject property is within the jurisdiction of the West Adams – Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community, which designates the property for Community Commercial land use, corresponding to the CR, C1.5, C2, C4, R3, R4, RAS3, and RAS4 Zones. The subject property is zoned C2-2D-O-HPOZ-CPIO and is thus consistent with the existing land use designation. The subject property is also located within the Specific Plan: South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales (ZI-1231), Redevelopment Project Area: Mid City Recovery (Billboard)(ZI-2440), Historic Preservation Overlay Zone: Jefferson Park (ZI-2440), State Enterprise Zone: Los Angeles (ZI-2374), Redevelopment Project Area: Mid-City Recovery (ZI-2488), Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone, Community Plan Implementation Overlay: West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert, Corridor Subarea A: Neighborhood-Service Corridor, and within 3.45 km from the Puente Hills Blind Thrust Fault Zone. The project request is not defined as a project under the Community Plan Implementation Overlay: West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert.

The property is developed with an L-shaped single-story approximately 6,593 square-foot mini-shopping center, known as the Century Plaza, at the northwest corner of the property, with an associated 16-space surface parking lot in front of the building. Establishments in the shopping center include commercial uses and restaurants. The subject establishment, known as Century Liquor at the time of application (May 1, 2024), is an approximately 2,733 square-foot liquor store and market at the northwest corner of the shopping center. The establishment had been operating as Century Liquor, owned by the applicant, under ABC License No. 21-515534, issued to the applicant. However, that license was canceled on January 28, 2025, and transferred on that date to License No. 21-662048, for a business at the same address named Circus Liquor, owned by Circus Liquor Arlington, Inc.

The subject establishment was granted deemed-approved conditional use status to sell alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption by the City Planning Commission in 1993, pursuant to CPC-92-0974-PA-RLA, with a set of conditions that included hours of operation requiring closing by 9:00 p.m., Sunday through Thursday, and by 10:00 p.m., Friday and Saturday. The conditions included the requirement for a licensed security guard. In 2010,

pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB, the applicant's request to expand the hours of operation to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, was approved, but the request to eliminate the required security guard was denied. The grant also required the applicant to file a Plan Approval in one year and limited the term of the grant to a period of five years.

In 2016, the applicant's required Plan Approval, pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1, was approved with modifications to the conditions of approval. The modifications included the elimination of Condition No. 28, which restricted the area devoted to alcohol sales and display to no more than 250 square feet of floor space and instead making it a recommendation for the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) to consider in issuing or renewing the ABC license. This was done because while the City of Los Angeles can regulate local land use, the State of California has sole jurisdiction over regulating how the sale of alcoholic beverages is conducted. The 2016 Plan Approval also eliminated the term limit required by Condition No. 29. No changes were approved to Condition No. 10, which limited the hours of operation to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, or to Condition No. 16, which required a state-licensed uniformed security guard.

The applicant is now requesting a second Plan Approval in order to relax restrictions placed on the establishment's operations. This type of Plan Approval is initiated by the applicant and is solely for the purpose of considering requested changes to existing conditions of approval. It differs from Plan Approvals that are required of applicants for the purpose of evaluating compliance with and the effectiveness of conditions imposed. It should be noted that while the purpose of the subject Plan Approval request is not a comprehensive evaluation of compliance with the previous conditions, the Zoning Administrator can take reported non-compliance into account in deciding whether to grant the applicant's requested changes. In addition, while an approval of the applicant's request could be made subject to additional conditions of approval, a denial of the applicant's request, logically, could not be subject to any additional conditions, as there would not be any approval to which new conditions could be tied.

With respect to the specifics of the subject Plan Approval application, the applicant requests that Condition No. 10 be modified to allow hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., daily, in lieu of the current approved hours of operation, which are 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, and that Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security guard from noon to 11:00 p.m., be eliminated. The condition prohibits the security guard from involvement in business operations and requires the security guard to patrol inside and outside the premises, to discourage loitering, rowdiness, public drinking, and criminal activity on and around the site. The applicant has volunteered to install surveillance cameras throughout the premises in lieu of the security guard.

The Zoning Administrator received 17 emails and letters from the public, inclusive of one letter from the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council, as well as a letter from Councilwoman Heather Hutt, representing City Council District 10, all in strong opposition to the applicant's request. An email from Councilwoman Hutt's Planning Deputy, Hakeem Parke-Davis, received more recently, reiterated their office's request that the applicant's

proposal be denied as there have been multiple alcohol-related incidents since the public hearing. In addition to requesting denial of the applicant's proposed changes, he also requested adding a requirement for a new floor plan, since the area of liquor displays has completely changed and grown. At the public hearing, seven members of the public, inclusive of a representative of the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council, as well as Hakeem Parke-Davis, representing City Council District 10, spoke in opposition to the applicant's request. The Zoning Administrator also received an email from the Southwest Vice Unit of the Police Department indicating no objections to the applicant's request to close later, which he referenced as 1:00 a.m. However, because the email from Southwest Vice included an inaccurate reference to the applicant's request, the Zoning Administrator followed up with Southwest Vice to confirm their position. In response, Southwest Vice submitted another email, dated November 6, 2025, that recommended there be no change to closing time previously approved and no change to the state-licensed security guard requirement.

From correspondence, public testimony, and changes to the ABC license, it appears that the applicant, who remains the property owner, is no longer the business operator. In response to emails from City Planning Office of Zoning Administration staff to the applicant's representative requesting clarity regarding changes to the operation, including changes to the business name or operator, the representative stated that the applicant is still the property owner and remains the applicant; he provided no additional information.

At the public hearing, the applicant's request was taken under advisement until April 24, 2025, to allow time for the applicant to meet with City Council District 10 and for the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council to meet and render a position on the project. At a later date, the applicant's representative requested that the record be kept open another 60 days, until June 24, 2025.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

The surrounding area is fully developed and surrounded by commercial and residential uses and within very close proximity to the Leslie N. Shaw Park and the Jefferson - Vassie D. Wright Memorial Branch Library. Property to the north, across an alley, is in the R1-1-O-HPOZ Zone and developed with single family residences. Property to the east, across Arlington Avenue, is in the C2-1VL-O-HPOZ-CPIO Zone and developed with commercial uses, including restaurants and offices, and residences. A church is located at the northeast corner of Jefferson Boulevard and Cimarron Street. Property to the south, across Jefferson Boulevard, is in the C2-2D-HPOZ-CPIO Zone and developed with a senior housing. Property to the west is in the C2-2D-O-HPOZ-CPIO and C2-1VL-O-HPOZ-CPIO Zone and developed with commercial uses, a day care, a museum, a public library, and a park.

STREETS

Jefferson Boulevard, adjacent to the south, is a Modified Avenue II dedicated to a right-of-way width of 83 feet and roadway width of 56 feet and improved with an asphalt roadway and concrete curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Arlington Avenue, adjacent to the east, is an Avenue III dedicated to a right-of-way width of 72 feet and a roadway width of 46 feet and improved with an asphalt roadway and concrete curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Alley, adjacent to the north, has a right of way width of 12 feet and improved with an asphalt roadway.

Previous Cases, Affidavits, Permits, and Orders on the Subject Property:

Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1 – On October 17, 2016, the Office of Zoning Administration approved an approval of Plans to renew an existing conditional use permit for the off-site sale of a full line of alcoholic beverages with hours of operation of 24 hours, daily and to extend the term of the grant. The hours of operation of the market were limited to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily.

Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB – On August 7, 2010, the Office of Zoning Administration denied a request for the removal of Condition No. 11 of CPC 92-0974(PA)(RLA) which requires at least one licensed security guard during all hours of operation, on an approximately 16,185 square-foot site. The Zoning Administrator also approved a request for a Conditional use Permit, to permit the sale and dispensing of a full line of alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption, in conjunction with the relocation and expansion of an existing 1,400 square-foot market to 2,733 square feet within the same shopping center and modifying prior Condition No. 5 of CPC 92-0974(PA)(RLA) to extend the hours of operation to 7 a.m. to 11 p.m., seven days a week, in lieu of Monday through Thursday 8 a.m. to 9p.m., and in lieu of the midnight closing time requested by the applicant.

Case No. ZA-97-0586(RV) – On December 31, 1997, the Office of Zoning Administration determined that the market/liquor store did not constitute a public nuisance and had not resulted in repeated nuisance activities. Therefore, no changes were imposed on the previous conditions of operation, pursuant to Case No. CPC 92-0974-PA-RLA.

Previous Cases, Affidavits, Permits, and Orders on the Surrounding Properties:

Staff utilized a 500-foot radius map via the Zoning Information Mapping Access System (ZIMAS) and the Planning Case Tracking System (PCTS), seeking past Zoning Administrator determinations associated with the sales and dispensing of alcoholic beverages.

No Previous Cases, Affidavits, Permits, and Orders on the Surrounding Properties

Public Correspondence

Hakeem Parke-Davis, Planning Deputy, City Council District 10, in an email dated November 7, 2025, stated their office requests that the determination deny the request for lenient hours and security, as the conditions are still needed as they are. Since the hearing, there have been multiple incidents at Leslie Shaw Park and the library within a few hundred feet of the liquor store involving alcohol and warranting concern. These included public drunkenness in the park accompanied by loitering and public consumption, as well as drunkenness reported among the unhoused at the adjacent public library. Deny the concessions and add provisions for a new floor plan, since the area of liquor displays has completely changed and grown.

Sergeant II Salvador Cervantes, Southwest Vice, Los Angeles Police Department, in an email dated November 6, 2025, recommended that the closing time remain or be no later than 11:00 p.m. to be consistent with other similar businesses in the surrounding area, stating that it has been their experience that being open much later into the night can attract vehicles with loud music in the parking lot, causing a nightly disturbance for the community members residing directly behind the location and in the immediate area. Southwest Vice also recommends that the condition requiring the presence of a state-licensed security guard remain. As with other liquor stores in the area with the same condition, a security guard can serve as a deterrent to loitering and drinking in the parking lot of the location, as well as other crimes that negatively affect the business and surrounding community. It can also reduce the amount of radio calls for Police service.

Heather Hutt, City Councilwoman, 10th District, Los Angeles, City Council, in a letter dated May 30, 2025, expressed strong opposition to the applicant's request, concurring with the sentiment of the community and the UNNC Governing Board to deny this request and uphold the existing conditions of operation. Personal observations during recent visits to the vicinity include an increase in litter originating from the store and expanded display and floor space for alcoholic beverages, the latter of which violates Condition No. 23 of the existing CUB approval that limits the area dedicated to alcohol display. The requested changes in the conditions of approval would exacerbate existing problems in the neighborhood. The proximity of multiple sensitive use entities, including a public park, library, churches, and pre-schools makes adherence to the conditions more critical. In addition, the requested change in entitlement is being pursued by parties different from the current owner and operator, and the applicant on the application. The California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) cancelled the applicant's ABC license, and the new owner/operator of the establishment, Circus Liquor, Arlington, was awarded the ABC license on January 28, 2025, which raises serious questions about the legitimacy of the application and the accountability of the current operator. Given these observations and the documented violations of the existing CUB approval, particularly the expansion of the alcohol sales space and the apparent misrepresentations by the applicant, it is imperative that the previous Zoning Administrator decisions be upheld, and the owner/operator continue to be required

to comply with all the conditions of operations.

Paula Southern, President, United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council (UNNC), in a letter dated April 23, 2025, stated that the UNNC Governing Board requests that the applicant's request be denied, the previous Zoning Administrator's decisions upheld, and that the operator of the establishment be required to comply with Condition Nos. 10 (hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.) and 16 (a licensed, uniformed security guard). Extending the hours to sell alcohol and eliminating the presence of a licensed, uniformed security guard will not maintain or increase public safety but rather result in a worsening of documented problems in the neighborhood. In addition, the UNNC expressed concern that during the Zoning Administration hearing on the case, it was revealed that as of January 28, 2025, the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) cancelled the applicant's ABC license to operate. The new owner/operator of the establishment is Circus Liquor, Arlington, which was awarded the ABC license on January 28, 2025. At the time of the hearing, the applicant was no longer the license holder or the owner/operator of Century Liquor. The applicant did not inform the Department of City Planning of this change, and the applicant and the applicant's representative misrepresented the applicant's standing on this case, both at the hearing and at the meeting with the UNNC Planning and Zoning Committee on March 19, 2025. The misrepresentation calls into question the representations made in the application and the justifications for the request provided by the applicant's representative, as well as the role of Circus Liquor, Arlington in this process. The current operator, Circus Liquor, Arlington may be in violation of Condition Nos. 23, 35, 36, and Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.29. The UNNC asks that the violations and misrepresentations by the applicant, the applicant's representative, and possibly by Circus Liquor, Arlington be addressed.

Steve S. Kim, applicant's representative, in an email dated April 22, 2025, responded to City Planning staff that there are no changes to the application. The applicant is the owner of the property and the shopping center.

Steven Peckman, on behalf of Jefferson Park United, in a letter dated April 21, 2025, raised questions and made the following points, summarized as:

- Since the applicant no longer operates the establishment, does she lack standing in the application, and does that invalidate the application?
- Condition No. 7 requires a new conditional use authorization to modify the previous grant. Since the applicant is no longer the owner/operator of Century Liquor, the operator is in violation.
- Condition No. 23 limits the square footage of space devoted to alcohol sales and display to no more than 250 square feet. If the operator has expanded the area, then they are in violation.
- Condition No. 35 requires that a document signed by the new owner/operator attesting to understanding the conditions be submitted to City Planning within 30 days. If this was not completed, the applicant and operator are in violation.
- Condition No. 36 requires that if there is a change in ownership or operator, within 30

days, the new owner or operator is to be given a copy of the conditions, and evidence is to be submitted to City Planning by the new owner or operator. If the operator has not done this, they are in violation.

- Non-compliance with the conditions is a violation of the Code and subject to the same penalties as any other violation.
- Deny the applicant's request to modify Condition Nos. 10 and 16. Continue to limit the hours of operation to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. and continue to require the licensed, uniformed security guard. Modifying these conditions as requested by the applicant will worsen public safety problems in the neighborhood.

Marius Stelly, in an email dated March 25, 2025, stated that for the safety of patrons and the community, the requirement for the security guard and ending the sale of alcoholic beverages at 11:00 p.m. should be kept in place. These measures help maintain safety for the community and surrounding businesses.

Brett Landenberger and Scott Waterman, neighbors, in similar emails dated March 24 and 25, 2025, respectively, requested that Century Liquor not be allowed to extend alcohol sales until 2:00 a.m. and that the requirement for a security guard not be removed. These are minimum protections for the people using neighboring areas, such as Leslie Shaw Park, Jefferson Branch Library, various churches, pre-schools and day cares, as well as nearby residents. The current closing time and security guard requirement have ensured safer operations at this location for the past 15 years and should continue as is.

Adam "Manhoso" Janeiro, 25-year resident of Jefferson Park, in an email dated March 24, 2025, stated that Century Liquor would like to operate unfettered, but the alley directly behind the establishment has devolved into a rogue's den. The evidence of substance abuse is so widespread, more libertine parameters are ill-advised.

Marina Moevs, neighbor, in an email dated March 24, 2025, strongly urged leaving in place the requirements to end alcohol sales at 11:00 p.m. and have a licensed security guard during business hours. The community worked hard to put the requirements in place, and they have worked well for the past 15 years.

Colleen Davis, neighbor, in an email dated March 24, 2025, stated she has lived across the alley from the establishment since 2000 and is opposed to the applicant's request. These conditions were imposed as a result of ongoing public safety concerns exacerbated by the sale of alcoholic beverages. The library and park are approximately 250 feet away, and public drinking, rowdiness, and loitering in the alley, in the park, and along Prescott Court continue to expose residents to inappropriate behavior and crime. In recent years, the public safety situation has deteriorated, and the ready availability of alcoholic beverages at Century Liquor worsens the problems. The community needs the restrictions more than ever.

Steven Peckman, on behalf of Jefferson Park United, in a letter dated March 23, 2025, asked that the applicant's request be denied and that Condition No. 10, which required closing by 11:00 p.m., and Condition No. 16, which required a licensed, uniformed security guard, be

maintained. These were imposed by the two previous Zoning Administrators. The security guard requirement was imposed to prevent crime, loitering, and public drinking. Closing by 11:00 p.m. was imposed even though the applicant requested later hours. The establishment is within 1,000 feet of sensitive uses, such as a public park, public library, four houses of worship, three pre-schools/day care/camp facilities, and single and multi-family residences. The applicant's representative presented the project to the UNNC Planning and Zoning Committee and stated there have been no noted incidents at the store. The community members responded that the public safety measures in place for more than 15 years have contributed to the reduction, not elimination, of crime in the neighborhood. However, they continue to observe alcohol related incidents at and around the establishment, including in the nearby park, in the alley behind the store and adjacent to single-family residences, and on Prescott Court, between Jefferson and 31st Street, and between the park and the library. Extending the hours of operation and eliminating the licensed, uniformed security guard will worsen problems in the neighborhood.

Rosie Brown, a neighbor, in an email dated March 23, 2025, indicated her opposition to the applicant's request. The request violates the South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales Specific Plan meant to protect the community. The City initially required a uniformed security guard and limited hours to prevent crime, loitering, and public drinking. Removing these protections contradicts public safety measures, which jeopardizes safety near the park, library, the church, and stakeholders living near and on Jefferson Boulevard. The City required the limited operating hours and security guard because the community requested and fought for those conditions.

LB, a neighbor, in an email dated March 22, 2025, indicated strong opposition to the applicant's request. Only occasionally there are people drinking at night on 31st Street, but there is an ongoing issue with people drinking or camping/living in the alley between the liquor store and 31st Street. Recently, there was a fire there that damaged three homes. Easier and later access to alcoholic beverages will exacerbate these issues. The later hours were initially proposed in 2008. The ending of alcoholic beverages sales at 11:00 a.m. or earlier and the licensed, uniformed security guard are important to the safety of the neighborhood.

Priya Autrey and Kristin Riddick, neighbors, in similar emails dated March 18 and 19, 2025, respectively, indicated their strong opposition to the applicant's request. The conditions imposing limited hours of operation and requiring a uniformed security guard have ensured safer operation of the establishment compared to other liquor stores in the area. The establishment is close to a park, public library, a church, and residences. Removal of the requirements would be detrimental to the safety of area residents, as well as open the establishment to increased robberies and other crimes. The neighborhood already experiences a notable amount of vandalism, gang activity, thefts, assaults, and illicit drug sales and use. The community cannot risk any additional invitations for criminal activity stimulated by this business.

Bret Autrey, a neighbor, in an email dated March 18, 2025, indicated his strong opposition

to the applicant's request. Reducing the safety measures at the liquor store that is close to residences, a library, and a public park is the opposite of what the community needs just because the applicant wants to make a little extra money at the expense of everyone's safety.

Gabrielle Tanedo, in an email dated March 18, 2025, requested that the applicant's request be denied. Extended hours for the sale of alcoholic beverages and elimination of the security guard would jeopardize safety near the park and library. The request violates the South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales Specific Plan, which exists to prevent harm to the nearby parks, libraries, and residential areas. The City originally required the security guard and limited hours to prevent crime, loitering, and public drinking. Removing these protections directly contradicts public safety measures.

Deborah Stein, a neighbor, in an email dated March 17, 2025, expressed her opposition to the applicant's request. Increasing the availability of alcohol and removing the security guard will make it less safe to walk to the park and use the library. Recently a man was shooting up in the park. The police responded and the neighborhood helped ensure the park is being kept safe. The requested changes would lead to more such incidents. The request violates the South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales Specific Plan, which exists to prevent harm to nearby parks, libraries, and residential areas. The City originally required the uniformed security guard and the limited hours to prevent crime, loitering, and public drinking. Removing these protections directly contradicts public safety measures.

John Ryan Chaffee and Guenever Goik, neighbors, in an email dated March 13, 2025, strongly opposed the applicant's request with significant safety concerns regarding the proposed changes. The community already struggles with drug-related incidents. Allowing the liquor store to operate later at night without a security guard would amplify these serious issues and jeopardize the safety of children and families. The previous determination for this establishment imposed the subject conditions to discourage loitering, rowdiness, public drinking, and criminal activity. Removing these protective conditions contradicts the City's original determination that they are essential for public safety. Furthermore, the business itself acknowledges existing safety concerns by having installed bulletproof glass in the cashier area. Approving extended hours would directly violate the intent of the South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales Specific Plan, which explicitly instructs the City to prevent adverse impacts on sensitive community locations, such as parks, libraries, and residential neighborhoods. Approving the applicant's request would benefit a single business at a significant cost to community safety.

Sergeant II Salvador Cervantes, Southwest Vice, Los Angeles Police Department, in emails dated February 5 and 8, 2025, indicated that it is a liquor store under new ownership requesting to change their hours from 7:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. It was named Century Liquor previously and now the application says Century Plaza, as they are also expanding into the unit next to it. Vice has no objections to the request.

Public Hearing

A Notice of Public Hearing was sent to owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the property for which an application was filed with the Department of City Planning. The purpose of the hearing was to obtain testimony from affected and/or interested persons regarding the project. All interested persons were invited to attend the public hearing where they could listen, ask questions or present testimony regarding the project. Interested parties were also invited to submit written comments regarding the request prior to the hearing. The public hearing was held on March 25, 2025. Since Zoning Administration hearings are not subject to the Brown Act, the public hearing was conducted entirely telephonically and by videoconference.

The applicant's representative delivered a presentation highlighting the following points:

- Provided a history of the liquor store. Since 1960, the store has been a part of the community. The liquor store was established in 1960 and purchased by the current owner in 1995, who has operated the store since.
- In 2010, the owner wanted to invest in the community. They demolished the existing building and built the shopping center. They have been model citizens and very responsible in the community.
- The applicant is requesting extended hours to close at 2:00 a.m. instead of 11:00 p.m., as previously approved, and eliminate the requirement for a licensed uniformed security guard.
- An email was forwarded to City Planning staff indicating that the Police Department does not oppose the applicant's request.
- The new hours of operation are of concern to the community.
- They presented the request to the Neighborhood Council, where community members voiced their concern.
- The applicant's husband passed away three and a half years ago, so now the applicant is in charge on her own.
- The requirement for the security guard from noon to closing is detrimental to business.
- Requesting that the case be taken under advisement, as requested by City Council District 10, to allow time for the project to be considered by the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council.

Following the presentation, the Zoning Administrator asked questions, which were answered, summarized as:

Zoning Administrator: Does the subject tenant space have its own address. 2115 Jefferson and Unit B is on the door. The application identifies it as Unit A.

Applicant's Representative: The subject establishment is 2115 Jefferson Boulevard.

Zoning Administrator: What is the name of the establishment?

Applicant's Representative: Century Liquor.

Zoning Administrator: Did the first Plan Approval (PA1) case have a limited term requiring a Plan Approval at this time, or was the Plan Approval filed only because of the request to modify the conditions of approval?

Applicant's Representative: The applicant is only requesting to modify the conditions of approval.

Zoning Administrator: Why does the applicant want to stay open until 2:00 a.m.?

Applicant's Representative: The demand is there, based on patrons that frequent the establishment, who have asked the applicant to stay open later. Staying open late is convenient for the neighbors. The previous grant allowed 24 hours of operation but PA1 terminates alcohol sales at 11:00 p.m.

Zoning Administrator: Why does the applicant want to eliminate the requirement to provide a security guard?

Applicant's Representative: The security guard is detrimental to business and the economy, because it is costly. The Police Department, which frequents the establishment, says they are one of the best operated businesses in the area. Their presence has deterred problems. Employing a security guard from noon to 11:00 p.m. is too costly; it totals \$13,000 per month. The applicant will continue to work with the Police Department.

The hearing was then opened for public testimony. Seven members of the public spoke, inclusive of a representative from the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council and a representative of the West Adams Heritage Association, making the following points:

- Condition Nos. 10 and 16 should be kept as is. The conditions imposed are working. They have not eliminated the problems, but the problems are under control because of the conditions.
- The applicant previously requested the extended hours and the elimination of the security guard, and it was opposed then.
- The security guard is supposed to monitor the entire premises, not just the interior of the establishment, from noon until closing at 11:00 p.m.
- Patrol is to discourage loitering, public drinking, rowdiness, criminal activity.
- There is a big problem in the alley behind the store, which is influenced by what people buy at the store.
- There are no changed circumstances that would reduce the need for the security guard.
- The reason the store and shopping center were rebuilt is not exactly as the applicant's representative has portrayed it. The previous store burned down during the civil unrest

due to the Rodney King incident. The owner did not rebuild because of reinvestment in the community.

- The subject liquor store is less of a problem than others in the neighborhood, but that is because of the conditions of approval previously imposed and which the neighbors worked hard to get. Removal of the restrictions will return the store to the prior poor situation.
- The applicant is a good neighbor, but the security guard is part of that.
- There was no effort to reach out to the community in advance.
- There is an uptick of litter, impacted by the sale of liquor from the store. Liquor bottles are discarded in the alley.
- The conditions should be strengthened. The situation has worsened since the conditions were imposed. There are unhoused people in the alley now.
- Fires, crime, property damage originating in the alley.
- Condition No. 37 states that should there be a change in ownership, the Zoning Administrator reserves the right to require a Plan Approval.

Hakeem Parke-Davis, representing City Council District 10, testified that this is a storied location; it has a history of civil unrest after the Rodney King incident. The Zoning Administrator should consider who is requesting the change in conditions. The establishment is no longer owner operated. A new group, known as Circus Liquor Arlington, has taken ownership. They are a corporation that operates other liquor stores. They are renovating the store and providing a more expansive display of alcoholic beverages, which is not in line with previous approvals. The establishment is in close proximity to sensitive uses. There is litter, fugitive beer cans and bottles at the park in trash cans. There is no impression from the Police Department that crime is not of concern. There have been a number of alcohol-related incidents in the vicinity. The applicant on the application is the property owner, and not the current operator of the establishment. The ABC license has been updated with a new operator. Council District 10 is not in support of the applicant's request. He spoke to the operator, Mr. Michael. In the short time he was there, they were interrupted by a gang member who wanted to bargain for the price of a bottle of liquor. Another individual wanted to sell a bottle of cologne. The operator gave him \$50 to get him to go away.

The representative from the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council requested the record be kept open until April 8, 2025, to allow time for the Neighborhood Council to meet, vote, and submit a letter regarding the applicant's request.

The Zoning Administrator took the take under advisement and left the record open for 30 days, until April 24, 2025, to allow time for the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council to meet and render a position on the applicant's request and for the applicant to meet with City Council District 10.

AUTHORITY FOR PLAN APPROVAL

Section 13B.2.2.H. of Chapter 1A of the Los Angeles Municipal Code provides in part:

"H." Modification of Entitlement:

Development of Site. On any lot or portion of a lot on which an approved or deemed-approved conditional use is permitted pursuant to the provisions of this Section, new buildings or structures may be erected, enlargements may be made to existing buildings, and existing uses may be extended on an approved site, provided that plans are submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator, and, where applicable, the use is consistent with the provisions of Sec. 12.24 C (Existing Uses) of Chapter 1 (General Provisions and Zoning).

BASIS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS

A particular type of development is subject to the conditional use process because it has been determined that such use of property should not be permitted by right in a particular zone. All uses requiring a Conditional Use Permit from the Zoning Administrator are located within Section 12.24 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. In order for an Approval of Plans to permit the continued sale and dispensing of a full line of alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption to be authorized, certain designated findings have to be made in the affirmative. In these cases, there are additional findings in lieu of the standard findings for most other conditional use categories.

GENERAL CLASS 2 CONDITIONAL USE FINDINGS, PURSUANT TO LAMC, CHAPTER 1A, SECTION 13B.2.2.

1. **The project will NOT enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood or will perform a function or provide a service that is essential or beneficial to the community, city or region.**

The subject site is an irregular-shaped approximately 16,164 square-foot property comprised of three lots with approximately 130 feet of frontage on the north side of Jefferson Boulevard and approximately 125 feet of frontage on the west side of Arlington Avenue. The property backs onto an alley adjacent to its northerly property line. The property is developed with an L-shaped single-story approximately 6,593 square-foot mini-shopping center, known as the Century Plaza, at the northwest corner of the property, with an associated 16-space surface parking lot in front of the building. Establishments in the shopping center include commercial uses and restaurants. The subject establishment, known as Century Liquor at the time of application, is an approximately 2,733 square-foot liquor store and market at the northwest corner of the shopping center. The establishment had been operating as Century Liquor, owned by the applicant, under ABC License No. 21-515534, issued to the applicant. However, that license was canceled on January 28, 2025, and transferred on that date to License No. 21-662048, for a business at the same address named Circus Liquor, owned by Circus Liquor Arlington, Inc.

The applicant is now requesting a second Plan Approval in order to relax restrictions placed on the establishment's operations. Specifically, the applicant requests that Condition No. 10 be modified to allow hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., daily, in lieu of the current approved hours of operation, which are 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, and that Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security guard, be eliminated. The applicant has volunteered to install surveillance cameras throughout the premises in lieu of the security guard.

The applicant maintains that the establishment has been a part of the community since 1960 and was acquired by the applicant in 1995. In 2010 the applicant demolished the existing building and built the current shopping center. The applicant states that there is customer demand for later hours and claims that the security guard's presence is detrimental to business and is a heavy cost burden for the applicant.

The business provides a convenient location for community residents and visitors to purchase alcoholic beverages and adds to the commercial diversity of the area. However, neighbors, Council District 10, United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council, and the Police Department have been very clear in correspondence and public testimony that the applicant's proposed changes to the previously approved conditions of approval would not benefit the community, and as a result the Zoning Administrator has denied the applicant's request to modify the conditions of approval as proposed.

Therefore, the project as proposed will NOT perform a function or provide a service that is beneficial to the community, city or region.

2. **The project's location, size, height, operations and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare and safety.**

The subject establishment was granted deemed-approved conditional use status to sell alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption by the City Planning Commission in 1993, pursuant to CPC-92-0974-PA-RLA, with a set of conditions that included hours of operation requiring closing by 9:00 p.m., Sunday through Thursday, and by 10:00 p.m., Friday and Saturday. The conditions included the requirement for a licensed security guard. In 2010, pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB, the applicant's request to expand the hours of operation to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, was approved, but the request to eliminate the required security guard was denied. The grant also required the applicant to file a Plan Approval in one year and limited the term of the grant to a period of five years.

The surrounding area is fully developed and surrounded by commercial and residential uses and within very close proximity to the Leslie N. Shaw Park and the

Jefferson - Vassie D. Wright Memorial Branch Library. Property to the north, across an alley, is in the R1-1-O-HPOZ Zone and developed with single family residences. Property to the east, across Arlington Avenue, is in the C2-1VL-O-HPOZ-CPIO Zone and developed with commercial uses, including restaurants and offices, and residences. A church is located at the northeast corner of Jefferson Boulevard and Cimarron Street. Property to the south, across Jefferson Boulevard, is in the C2-2D-HPOZ-CPIO Zone and developed with a senior housing. Property to the west is in the C2-2D-O-HPOZ-CPIO and C2-1VL-O-HPOZ-CPIO Zone and developed with commercial uses, a day care, a museum, a public library, and a park.

In 2016, the applicant's required Plan Approval, pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1, was approved with modifications to the conditions of approval. The modifications included the elimination of Condition No. 28, which restricted the area devoted to alcohol sales and display to no more than 250 square feet of floor space and instead making it a recommendation for the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) to consider in issuing or renewing the ABC license. This was done because while the City of Los Angeles can regulate local land use, the State of California has sole jurisdiction over regulating how the sale of alcoholic beverages is conducted. The 2016 Plan Approval also eliminated the term limit required by Condition No. 29. No changes to Condition No. 10, which limited the hours of operation to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, or to Condition No. 16, which required a state-licensed uniformed security guard, were approved.

The applicant is now requesting a second Plan Approval in order to relax restrictions placed on the establishment's operations. Specifically, the applicant requests that Condition No. 10 be modified to allow hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., daily, in lieu of the current approved hours of operation, which are 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, and that Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security guard, be eliminated. The condition prohibits the security guard from involvement in business operations and requires the security guard to patrol inside and outside the premises, to discourage loitering, rowdiness, public drinking, and criminal activity on and around the site. The applicant has volunteered to install surveillance cameras throughout the premises in lieu of the security guard.

The Zoning Administrator has denied the applicant's request to modify the identified conditions, because the changes proposed would be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood. The applicant and operations of the establishment will be subject to the conditions of approval imposed in 2016, pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1.

The applicant has appeared to conceal that she will no longer operate the establishment and that it has been acquired by another operator. The lack of transparency regarding this matter was revealed in correspondence received as well as in testimony at the public hearing. While the establishment was operated by the applicant at the time of application, which was in May 2024, operations appear to

have changed hands in January 2025, when the ABC license was transferred to another entity. The applicant's representative further obfuscated the issue when City Planning staff reached out asking the applicant to update the application materials after the public hearing. This lack of transparency has eroded community confidence and trust. In addition, the new operator has no track record at this location. It is reasonable to wait and see how the new operator conducts the business before relaxing any of the conditions.

In addition, stakeholders in 17 emails and in testimony by seven people, City Council District 10, United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council, and Los Angeles Police Department Southwest Vice have clearly expressed strong opposition to the proposed later hours of operation and elimination of the state-licensed security guard. The consensus is that the surrounding area, inclusive of the alley behind the subject establishment, contains multiple sensitive uses, such as a library, a park, residences, houses of worship, and day care facilities/preschools and continues to experience alcohol-related issues. Incidents have been reported at the park, in the alley that separates the subject shopping center from single-family residences, and between the park and the library. The requested later hours are not consistent with other businesses in the area and will attract additional nuisance activity, such as loud music, nightly disturbance, rowdy behavior, public consumption of alcoholic beverages, loitering, inappropriate behavior, and crime. The state-licensed security guard's presence has acted as a deterrent and reduced the incidence of such negative impacts, but these nuisance and unlawful activities will increase if the state-licensed security guard is no longer required. The limited hours and required security are maintaining safety in the area. The community previously requested and fought hard to have the subject conditions imposed and did so to minimize the incidence of negative behaviors, such as crime, loitering, and public drinking. The applicant has previously proposed the requested modifications, which were denied. The circumstances in the subject neighborhood have not improved but have worsened, so there is no justification for later hours or the elimination of the security guard at this time.

Therefore, the requested changes to the conditions of approval will NOT be compatible with and WILL adversely affect and further degrade adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood

3. The project substantially conforms with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan, and any specific plan.

The General Plan is the City's roadmap for future growth and development. The General Plan Elements establish goals, policies, purposes, and programs that provide for the regulatory environment in managing the City, and for addressing environmental concerns and problems. The majority of the policies derived from these elements are implemented in the form of Municipal Code requirements. The General Plan is comprised of the Framework Element, seven state-mandated

elements, and four additional elements. The Framework Element establishes the broad overall policy and direction for the General Plan. Objective 7.3 of the Framework Element sets a goal to “maintain and enhance the existing businesses in the City” and Policy 7.3.2 encourages the establishment and retention of “neighborhood commercial activities within walking distance of residential areas.”

The Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan divides the City into 35 Community Plans. The subject property is within the jurisdiction of the West Adams – Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community, which designates the property for Community Commercial land use, corresponding to the CR, C1.5, C2, C4, R3, R4, RAS3, and RAS4 Zones. The subject property is zoned C2-2D-O-HPOZ-CPIO and is thus consistent with the existing land use designation. The subject property is also located within the Specific Plan: South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales (ZI-1231), Redevelopment Project Area: Mid City Recovery (Billboard)(ZI-2440), Historic Preservation Overlay Zone: Jefferson Park (ZI-2440), State Enterprise Zone: Los Angeles (ZI-2374), Redevelopment Project Area: Mid-City Recovery (ZI-2488), Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone, Community Plan Implementation Overlay: West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert, Corridor Subarea A: Neighborhood-Service Corridor, and within 3.45 km from the Puente Hills Blind Thrust Fault Zone. The project request is not defined as a project under the Community Plan Implementation Overlay: West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert.

The West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert Community Plan text is silent with regard to the sale and dispensing of alcohol. In such cases, the Zoning Administrator must interpret the intent of the Plan. Specifically, the project addresses the following objectives and policies of the West Adams – Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community Plan:

Commercial

Goal LU14: A Community that conserves, enhances and regenerates its distinctive “main street” character by promoting continued pedestrian orientation of commercial areas.

The establishment is a desirable element within the subject diverse commercial area. However, the requested later hours and elimination of the required security guard threatens the health and maintenance of the commercial area’s “main street” character by removing guardrails that preserve the safety and desirability of the existing commercial corridor and surrounding residential neighborhood. The requested changes to the conditions of approval will degrade and threaten rather than enhance and regenerate the area.

Therefore, the requested changes to the conditions of approval DO NOT substantially conform to the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan and the West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert Community Plan.

**SUPPLEMENTAL CONDITIONAL USE FINDINGS - ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES,
PURSUANT TO LAMC, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 12.24 W.1**

4. **The proposed use WILL adversely affect the welfare of the pertinent community.**

The subject site is an irregular-shaped approximately 16,164 square-foot property comprised of three lots with approximately 130 feet of frontage on the north side of Jefferson Boulevard and approximately 125 feet of frontage on the west side of Arlington Avenue. The property backs onto an alley adjacent to its northerly property line.

The applicant has applied for a Plan Approval to request that Condition No. 10 be modified to allow hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., daily, in lieu of the current approved hours of operation, which are 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, and that Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security guard from noon to 11:00 p.m., be eliminated. The condition prohibits the security guard from involvement in business operations and requires the security guard to patrol inside and outside the premises, to discourage loitering, rowdiness, public drinking, and criminal activity on and around the site. The applicant has volunteered to install surveillance cameras throughout the premises in lieu of the security guard. The proposed changes were previously requested and denied. Though undisclosed by the applicant, the establishment has been recently acquired by a new operator with no track record at the current location, which is in close proximity to a number of sensitive uses. The applicant has requested the changes to increase business and lower operating costs.

Negative impacts commonly associated with the sale of alcoholic beverages, such as criminal activity, public drunkenness, and loitering are mitigated by the imposition of conditions requiring responsible management and deterrents against loitering. The Zoning Administrator has denied the applicant's request. The subject conditions were previously requested by the community, imposed as a condition of approval, and retained over the years to protect against these negative impacts. Please see further rationale for denying the applicant's request and preserving the subject conditions as they now stand under Finding No. 2.

Therefore, the proposed changes to the conditions of approval WILL adversely affect the welfare of the pertinent community.

5. **The granting of the application will not result in an undue concentration of premises for the sale or dispensing for consideration of alcoholic beverages, including beer and wine, in the area of the City involved, giving consideration to applicable State laws and to the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control's guidelines for undue concentration; and also giving consideration to the number and proximity of these establishments within a one thousand foot**

radius of the site, the crime rate in the area (especially those crimes involving public drunkenness, the illegal sale or use of narcotics, drugs, or alcohol, disturbing the peace, and disorderly conduct), and whether revocation or nuisance proceedings have been initiated for any use in the area.

According to the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) licensing criteria, 3 on-sale consumption licenses and 1 off-sale consumption licenses are allocated to the subject census tract (Census Tract 2190.1). Currently, there is a total of one active on-sale license and three active off-sale licenses in this census tract:

- (3) Type 21 – Off-Sale General
- (1) Type 41 – On-Sale Beer and Wine – Eating Place

Concentration can be undue when the addition of a license will negatively impact a neighborhood. However, concentration is not undue when the approval of a license does not negatively impact an area, but rather such license provides a public service and benefits the community, public welfare, and convenience. In this case, the granting of the application will not result in an additional license, as the subject establishment already exists, has been operating for years, and represents one of the existing Type 21 ABC licenses.

The establishment itself provides a desired amenity and service and enhances the community. The project site is located in West Adams – Baldwin Hills – Leimert, a dense mixed-use area of the City. The number of existing licenses exceeds the number allocated to the subject census tract, the number of alcohol-serving establishments is to be expected in an area which functions as a commercial and activity center. In active commercial areas where there is a demand for licenses beyond the allocated number, the ABC has recognized that high-activity retail and commercial centers are supported by significant employee population, in addition to the increasing resident population base in the area. The ABC has discretion to approve an application if there is evidence that normal operations will not be contrary to public welfare and will not interfere with the quiet enjoyment of property by residents.

In this case, the applicant is initiating a Plan Approval to relax restrictions placed on the establishment's operations. Specifically, the applicant is requests that Condition No. 10 be modified to allow hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., daily, in lieu of the current approved hours of operation, which are 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, and that Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security, be eliminated. The condition prohibits the security guard from involvement in business operations and requires the security guard to patrol inside and outside the premises, to discourage loitering, rowdiness, public drinking, and criminal activity on

and around the site. The applicant has volunteered to install surveillance cameras throughout the premises in lieu of the security guard.

According to statistics provided by the Los Angeles Police Department's South Division Vice Unit, within Crime Reporting District No. 335, which has jurisdiction over the subject property, a total of 27 crimes were reported in 2024 (26 Part I and 1 Part II crimes), compared to the Citywide Average of 89 crimes and the High Crime Reporting District Average of 106 crimes. Part II Crimes reported include (0) Drug Abuse Violations, (0) Driving Under the Influence, (0) Liquor Laws, (1) Disorderly Conduct, (0) All Other Offenses. Arrests for this calendar year may reflect crimes reported in previous years.

The above statistics indicate that the crime rate in the reporting district where the subject site is located is lower than the Citywide Average, however, no evidence was submitted for the record establishing any link between the subject site and the area's crime rate. However, the Zoning Administrator has denied the applicant's request because stakeholders, Council District 10, United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council, and the Police Department's Southwest Vice maintain that the current approved hours of operation and the presence of the state-licensed security guard are instrumental in impeding and deterring nuisance and criminal activity and improve public safety.

Therefore, the granting of the applicant's request to expand the hours of operation and eliminate the state-licensed security guard will not result in an increase in establishments selling alcoholic beverages but WILL result in an increase of incidents involving public drunkenness, the illegal sale or use of narcotics, drugs, or alcohol, disturbing the peace, and disorderly conduct.

6. **The proposed use will not detrimentally affect nearby residentially zoned communities in the area of the City involved, after giving consideration to the distance of the proposed use from residential buildings, churches, schools, hospitals, public playgrounds and other similar uses, and other establishments dispensing, for sale or other consideration, alcoholic beverages, including beer and wine.**

The project site is zoned for commercial uses and will continue to be utilized as such with the continued use as a liquor store. The following sensitive uses are located within a 600-foot radius of the site:

Residential	
Single-Family Residences	
School, Church, Hospital, Park, Library	
Jefferson – Vassie D. Wright Memorial Branch Library	2211 West Jefferson Boulevard

Leslie N Shaw Park	2233 West Jefferson Boulevard
Teach to Reach LLC	2303 West Jefferson Boulevard
No Building Blocks Day Care Center	2313 West Jefferson Boulevard
Westminster Presbyterian Church of Los Angeles	2230 West Jefferson Boulevard
Iglesia Evangelica Puerta de las Aguas Church	2326 West Jefferson Boulevard
Iglesia de Jesus Cristo Canaan Church	2092 West Jefferson Boulevard
Trinity Baptist Church	2040 West Jefferson Boulevard
Perry – Meadows Day Care Center	1986 West Jefferson Boulevard
Cheerful Helpers Child and Family Study Center	1986 West Jefferson Boulevard
Holy Name of Jesus Catholic Church	1977 West Jefferson Boulevard
Sower Ministry Los Angeles	1955 West Jefferson Boulevard
Holy Name of Jesus School	1955 West Jefferson Boulevard

Consideration has been given to the distance of the subject establishment from the above-referenced sensitive uses. The subject establishment is located in an urbanized neighborhood with a variety of institutional and residential uses.

The subject establishment was granted deemed-approved conditional use status to sell alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption by the City Planning Commission in 1993, pursuant to CPC-92-0974-PA-RLA, with a set of conditions that included hours of operation requiring closing by 9:00 p.m., Sunday through Thursday, and by 10:00 p.m., Friday and Saturday. The conditions included the requirement for a licensed security guard. In 2010, pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB, the applicant's request to expand the hours of operation to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, was approved, but the request to eliminate the required security guard was denied. The grant also required the applicant to file a Plan Approval in one year and limited the term of the grant to a period of five years.

In 2016, the applicant's required Plan Approval, pursuant to Case No. ZA-2008-2049-CUB-PA1, was approved with modifications to the conditions of approval. The modifications included the elimination of Condition No. 28, which restricted the area devoted to alcohol sales and display to no more than 250 square feet of floor space and instead making it a recommendation for the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) to consider in issuing or renewing the ABC license. This was done because while the City of Los Angeles can regulate local land use, the State of California has sole jurisdiction over regulating how the sale of alcoholic beverages is conducted. The 2016 Plan Approval also eliminated the term limit required by Condition No. 29. No changes were approved to Condition No. 10, which limited the

hours of operation to 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, or to Condition No. 16, which required a state-licensed uniformed security guard.

The applicant has applied for a Plan Approval to request that Condition No. 10 be modified to allow hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., daily, in lieu of the current approved hours of operation, which are 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., daily, and that Condition No. 16, which requires a state-licensed uniformed security guard from noon to 11:00 p.m., be eliminated. The condition prohibits the security guard from involvement in business operations and requires the security guard to patrol inside and outside the premises, to discourage loitering, rowdiness, public drinking, and criminal activity on and around the site. The applicant has volunteered to install surveillance cameras throughout the premises in lieu of the security guard. The proposed changes were previously requested and denied.

The requested later hours are not consistent with other businesses in the area and will attract additional nuisance activity, such as loud music, nightly disturbance, rowdy behavior, public consumption of alcoholic beverages, loitering, inappropriate behavior, and crime. The state-licensed security guard's presence has acted as a deterrent and reduced the incidence of such negative impacts, but these nuisance and unlawful activities will increase if the state-licensed security guard is no longer required. The limited hours and required security are maintaining safety in the area. The community previously requested and fought hard to have the subject conditions imposed and did so to minimize the incidence of negative behaviors, such as crime, loitering, and public drinking. The applicant has previously proposed the requested modifications, which were denied. The circumstances in the subject neighborhood have not improved but have worsened, so there is no justification for later hours or the elimination of the security guard at this time.

Therefore, the proposed changes to the conditions of approval WILL detrimentally affect nearby residentially zoned communities or other sensitive uses in the area.

ADDITIONAL MANDATORY FINDINGS

7. The National Flood Insurance Program rate maps, which are a part of the Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan adopted by the City Council by Ordinance No.186,952, have been reviewed and it has been determined that this project is located within a 500-year flood zone.

APPEAL PERIOD - EFFECTIVE DATE

This grant is not a permit or license, and any permits and/or licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper public agency. If any Condition of this grant is violated or not

complied with, then the applicant or their successor in interest may be prosecuted for violating these Conditions the same as for any violation of the requirements contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

This determination will become effective after the end of appeal period date on the first page of this document, unless an appeal is filed with the Department of City Planning. An appeal application must be submitted and paid for before 4:30 PM (PST) on the final day to appeal the determination. Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal City holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30 PM (PST) on the next succeeding working day. Appeals should be filed early to ensure the Development Services Center (DSC) staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow appellants time to submit payment.

An appeal may be filed utilizing the following options:

Online Application System (OAS): The OAS (<https://planning.lacity.org/oas>) allows entitlement appeals to be submitted entirely electronically by allowing an appellant to fill out and submit an appeal application online directly to City Planning's DSC, and submit fee payment by credit card or e-check.

Drop off at DSC. Appeals of this determination can be submitted in-person at the Metro or Van Nuys DSC locations, and payment can be made by credit card or check. City Planning has established drop-off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop off appeal applications; alternatively, appeal applications can be filed with staff at DSC public counters. Appeal applications must be on the prescribed forms and accompanied by the required fee and a copy of the determination letter. Appeal applications shall be received by the DSC public counter and paid for on or before the above date or the appeal will not be accepted.

Forms are available online at <http://planning.lacity.org/development-services/forms>. Public offices are located at:

Metro DSC
(213) 482-7077
201 N. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
planning.figcounter@lacity.org

Van Nuys DSC
(818) 374-5050
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard
Van Nuys, CA 91401
planning.mbc2@lacity.org

South LA DSC
(In person appointments
available on Tuesdays and
Thursdays 8am-4pm only)
8475 S. Vermont Avenue
1st Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90044
planning.southla@lacity.org

City Planning staff may follow up with the appellant via email and/or phone if there are any questions or missing materials in the appeal submission, to ensure that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Verification of condition compliance with building plans and/or building permit applications are done at the City Planning Metro or Valley DSC locations. An in-person or virtual appointment for Condition Clearance can be made through the City's BuildLA portal (appointments.lacity.org). The applicant is further advised to notify any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.



QR Code to
Online Appeal
Filing



QR Code to Forms for In-
Person Appeal Filing



QR Code to BuildLA Appointment Portal
for Condition Clearance

Inquiries regarding the matter shall be directed to Andres Gutierrez, Planning Staff for the Department of City Planning at (213) 682-6399 or andres.gutierrez@lacity.org.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Phyllis Nathanson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

PHYLLIS NATHANSON
Associate Zoning Administrator

PN:AC:AT:AG:mc

CC: Councilmember Heather Hutt
Tenth Council District
Abutting Property Owners
Interested Parties