

>>> Stephanie Landau <stephanielandau@yahoo.com> 1/25/2010 8:24 PM >>>

Issues in our Valley Village that I have a problem with:

1. Erroneous Underlying Zoning: The Zoning on this property is incorrect, and should have been downzoned as part of the AB 283 Zoning/Community Plan Consistency Program. This is important because it effects the BASE number of units the developer was entitled to "by right" and the mistakes spiral forth from there with the number of Density Bonus Units awarded, and the nature and size of the entitlements

2. CEQA

Issue - CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC IMPACTS -- the City was given a flawed and faulty Traffic Study from the Developer and reviewed wrongly by DOT which has been evaluated and rebutted by a community-commissioned Traffic Expert.

3.. CEQA

Issue - This project directly VIOLATES THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES CEQA THRESHOLDS GUIDE FOR SHADE AND SHADOW, The community presented their own expert study to refute the study paid for and provided by the Developer.

4. Economic

Feasibility Issue: The City did not seek input as to whether the incentive requested by the developer was necessary to provide financial justification for the request. The community has provided evidence with alternate pro-formas that found that the project economics were favorable without waiving the development standards. The city can make Findings that refute the assertion that the incentives requested were required to make the project economically feasible and failed to do so.

5. Inconsistency

of Protocol and Policy Implementation:

Planning failed to follow its own protocol, and the law in effect at the time, when evaluating the materials presented by the developer. Additionally, they misled the community when verifying what law applied to this project.

6. The

Planning Department made their Determination relying upon a Site Plan Review which was performed for the previously approved- with-conditions 78-unit condo project. The community maintains a new Site Plan Review must be performed again in light of this SB1818 project's tripling of existing density. This Site Plan Review required a public hearing which was denied to the community.

7. City

Planning and the City Attorney "narrowed the focus" of the City Planning Commission to NOT CONSIDER many of the items of the Appeal including ZONING, SITE PLAN while omitting others as if they didn't exist). They testified these were items that the CPC could NOT consider, and so the CPC didn't.