

**DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND
VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ
CAROLINE CHOE

HELEN LEUNG
KAREN MACK

MARC MITCHELL
VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS
DANA M. PERLMAN

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA**



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

TRICIA KEANE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

June 19, 2019

SENT VIA EMAIL TO EGEIER@GLASIERWEIL.COM, NOT FOLLOWED BY U.S. MAIL

Mr. Geier:

**RE: Follow up on Public Records Act Request For Records Regarding 750-756 North
Edinburgh Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90046 (APN 5527-013-016)**

This letter is a follow up to our letter dated June 10, 2019, and is in response to your letter dated May 29, 2019, which was a follow up to our response letter dated May 17, 2019, seeking from the Department of City Planning pursuant to the California Public Records Act (CPRA) records relating to the above.

Please be advised that we have determined that records withheld were only withheld due to being exempt from production under California Government Code section 6254(k) because they are protected attorney-client communication and/or attorney work-product. There were no documents withheld from production under California Government Code 6255.

Also, please be further advised that all public records have been provided to you, and our Department has no other responsive public documents to your original request dated May 3, 2019. Therefore, we will not be providing the full, un-redacted emails you requested on the second page of your letter. Should you wish to review the files again for any material that may have been added since your office last reviewed the files for this project, you may contact Darlene Navarrete at Darlene.Navarrete@lacity.org or Susan Jimenez at Susan.Jimenez@lacity.org to make an appointment to view the files.

That being said, we did a second search for emails and documents from May 4, 2019, through the date of your request dated May 29, 2019, and have determined we are in possession of public records responsive to your request. Those records are available now. To review them, please contact Darlene Navarrete or Susan Jimenez for an appointment. Please be advised that some of the emails are being withheld due to being exempt from production under California Government Code section 6254 (k) because they are protected attorney-client communication and/or attorney work-product.

(Page 2) PRA Response – Follow up on 750-756 North Edinburgh Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90046
(APN 5527-013-016)

In regards to your request to provide a list of all documents that have been omitted from the production and the reason for such omission please be advised that our Department has already identified the legal grounds for nondisclosure. That being said, we will not be providing a list of the documents omitted as one was never created and creating one is not a requirement of the California Public Records Act.

This response constitutes the final response to your PRA request dated May 29, 2019.

If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at (213) 847-3732.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Beatrice Pacheco".

Beatrice Pacheco
Custodian of Records

BP:bp

**DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND
VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ
CAROLINE CHOE

HELEN LEUNG
KAREN MACK

MARC MITCHELL

VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS
DANA M. PERLMAN

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA**



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

TRICIA KEANE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

June 19, 2019

SENT VIA EMAIL TO EGEIER@GLASIERWEIL.COM, NOT FOLLOWED BY U.S. MAIL

Mr. Geier:

**RE: Public Records Act Request For Records Regarding 750-756 North Edinburgh Ave.,
Los Angeles, CA 90046 (APN 5527-013-016) Alternative 2 and Updated Findings**

This letter is a follow up to our letter dated June 10, 2019, and is in response to your letter dated May 29, 2019, seeking from the Department of City Planning pursuant to the California Public Records Act (CPRA) records relating to the above.

Please be advised that the Department of City Planning has determined it has public records related to your request. Due to the fact that there were so few, we have provided them to you as an attachment to this letter. Please be advised that some of the records are being withheld due to being exempt from production under California Government Code section 6254 (k) because they are protected attorney-client communication and/or attorney work-product.

Also, should you wish to review the files again for any material that may have been added since your office last reviewed the files for this project, you may contact Darlene Navarrete at Darlene.Navarrete@lacity.org or Susan Jimenez at Susan.Jimenez@lacity.org to make an appointment to view the files.

This response constitutes the final response to your PRA request dated May 29, 2019.

If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at (213) 847-3732.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Pacheco
Custodian of Records

BP:bp



Adam Villani <adam.villani@lacity.org>

Technical Modification for ITEM 08 - Central APC today

1 message

Adam Villani <adam.villani@lacity.org>

Tue, May 28, 2019 at 3:50 PM

To: Planning APCCentral <apccentral@lacity.org>, Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

I've placed the attached memo into the Technical Modifications folder for today's meeting and will also bring 22 printed copies to distribute to the APC.



Adam Villani, City Planner
Department of City Planning
Major Projects Section
T: (213) 847-3688
221 N. Figueroa St., Room 1350
Los Angeles, CA 90012

 **ITEM 08 Appeal Response and Submission.pdf**
615K



Department of City Planning

City Hall, 200 N. Spring Street, Room 525, Los Angeles, CA 90012

May 28, 2019

TO: Central Area Planning Commission

FROM: Adam Villani, City Planner

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION REPORT FOR
CASE NO. VTT-74201-SL-1A; 750-756 ½ North Edinburgh Avenue**

The following are the Department of City Planning recommended actions for the Central Area Planning Commission to take on this case, as well as proposed revised Findings for the Zoning Administrator's determination dated April 17, 2019 for the original case, VTT-74201-SL, along with responses to the justifications presented in the attachment to the appeal of this case.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Deny** the appeal;
2. **Find** that the Central Area Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project, which includes the Draft EIR, No. ENV-2016-1367-EIR (SCH No. 2017011016), dated August 2018, and the Final EIR, dated January 4, 2019 (Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR), as well as the whole of the administrative record, and

CERTIFY the following:

- 1) The Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- 2) The Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR was presented to the Advisory Agency as a decision-making body of the lead agency; and
- 3) The Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the lead agency.

ADOPT the following:

- 1) The related and prepared Edinburgh Avenue SLS Environmental Findings dated April 17, 2019 and amended as presented in this memo dated May 28, 2019;

DENY the following:

- 1) The related and prepared Edinburgh Avenue SLS Statement of Overriding Considerations and
 - 2) The Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared for the Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR.
3. **Sustain** the decision of the Advisory Agency in **denying** Vesting Tentative Tract No. VTT-74201-SL and
4. **Adopt** the Advisory Agency's Subdivision Findings, dated April 17, 2019.

AMENDMENTS TO CEQA FINDINGS:

Findings of Fact (CEQA) VI.D (Population and Housing).d.ii, first paragraph, delete the following sentence:

~~Multiple expert reports have indicated that the buildings at the Project Site may not be feasible to rehabilitate and they are not currently in a habitable condition.~~

Findings of Fact (CEQA) IX.A (Summary of Findings) is modified as follows:

~~Based upon the following analysis, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15096(g)(2), that no feasible alternative or mitigation measure within its powers will substantially lessen any significant effect of the Project, reduce the significant, unavoidable impacts Project to a level that is less than significant, or avoid any significant impact that the Project will have on the environment. 15091(a)(3), the City cannot make findings that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Additionally, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093(b), the City cannot make a Statement of Overriding Considerations to support approval of the project.~~

Findings of Fact (CEQA) IX.C(b)(iii, iv) (Alternative 2 – Full Preservation Alternative-Findings, Rationale for Findings) are deleted and replaced with the following:

iii. Findings: The Full Preservation Alternative would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts on historical resources with implementation of preservation recommendations, and the resource would remain a designated LAHCM. The Full Preservation Alternative would have similar less than significant construction noise and construction vibration impacts (with mitigation) as the Project since off-site excavation of expansive soils would occur near off-site residences.

The Full Preservation Alternative would have reduced impacts related to air quality, operational noise and vibration, construction and operational traffic, and energy, compared to the Project due to reduced construction activity and smaller unit size. The Full Preservation Alternative would have similar impacts as the Project related to population and housing, since the number of units would remain the same, and similar

impacts as the Project regarding design feature hazards, since less traffic would be generated but sidewalk and roadway improvements would not occur.

iv. Rationale for Findings: The Full Preservation Alternative is presumed to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards, although it would require substantial reconstruction and rehabilitation, including the lifting of the buildings, which would require a lifting and bracing plan due to the poor condition of the structures. Furthermore, new mechanical, electrical, and plumbing could cause additional damage to the buildings, and a rehabilitation plan would be required. However, the Full Preservation Alternative would avoid the deterioration that would continue to occur under Alternative 1, No Project Alternative.

Furthermore, the Full Preservation Alternative would meet three of the six Project Objectives and potentially meet one other. It would meet the Project Objectives of providing a diversity of housing choices within the neighborhood, would provide housing with high quality architecture and landscape design, and would provide high quality housing to accommodate demand within a Transit Priority Area. The project would potentially meet the objective to develop an economically viable residential project. It would not meet the objective to redevelop the Project Site with residential buildings and a site design that is consistent with the existing and proposed Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation, although it would be consistent with the Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation. It would also not meet the objective to support sustainable design through development that would optimize site energy efficiency, water conservation, and runoff water quality, since it would not be built using modern green building standards, although renovation of an existing building rather than building a new one has environmental benefits because fewer new resources are required.

Portions of Findings of Fact (CEQA) IX.E (Environmentally Superior Alternative) are modified as follows:

~~Alternative 2 would not meet current LAMC parking requirements, and therefore parking impacts would be greater compared to the Project. However, of the six Project Objectives, Alternative 2 would only partially meet three, and not meet two objectives. Alternative 2 would only partially meet the Project Objectives of providing housing with high quality architecture and landscape design, providing high quality housing to accommodate demand within a Transit Priority Area, and providing sustainable design through development. Under Alternative 2, the housing units would be rehabilitated rather than newly constructed to meet modern residential design standards, although Alternative 2 would include new landscaping and would provide housing within a Transit Priority Area. Although Alternative 2 would be subject to less intensive energy conservation and green building design standards, overall the construction and operation of this Alternative would require less energy consumption than the Project. Alternative 2 would not meet the Project Objective of redeveloping the Project Site with residential buildings and a site design that is consistent with the existing and proposed HGP and underlying zoning because no new housing would be provided. Alternative 2 would not meet the Project Objective of developing an economically viable residential Project, based on the Market Analysis (provided in Appendix H of the Draft EIR).~~

Furthermore, the Full Preservation Alternative would meet three of the six Project Objectives and potentially meet one more. It would meet the Project Objectives of providing a diversity of housing choices within the neighborhood, would provide housing with high quality architecture and landscape design, and would provide high quality housing to accommodate demand within a Transit Priority Area. It would potentially meet the objective to develop an economically viable residential project. It would not meet the objective to redevelop the Project Site with residential buildings and a site design that is consistent with the existing and proposed Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation, although it would be consistent with the Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation. It would also not meet the objective to support sustainable design through development that would optimize site energy efficiency, water conservation, and runoff water quality, since it would not be built using modern green building standards, although renovation of an existing building rather than building a new one has environmental benefits because fewer new resources are required.

Findings of Fact (CEQA) X.F (CEQA Considerations) paragraph (h) is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:

h. As the City has not approved the project, no Mitigation Monitoring Program is adopted.

APPEAL RESPONSE:

The following are responses to the justifications presented in the attachment to the appeal for this case:

1. The certification of the EIR indicates that the City of Los Angeles, acting as the Lead Agency for this project, meets the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15090(a), that is, that the final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the final EIR was presented to the decision-making body (the Advisory Agency) of the lead agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR, and that the final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgement and analysis. As the City was unable to make the findings necessary for a Statement of Overriding Considerations (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093), no Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted, the project was denied, and no mitigation monitoring plan was adopted.
2. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. The findings are now internally consistent with the decision to deny the project.
3. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15092(b), a public agency shall not decide to approve a project with significant environmental impacts unless it determines that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in Section 15093. It is within the lead agency's discretion to determine whether the benefits of a project outweigh its significant impacts.

Additionally, while the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. Full preservation of the site would achieve three of the six Project Objectives outlined in the EIR, and potentially one other, and, most importantly, would avoid the significant environmental effect of the demolition of the historic resource on the site, City of Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument (LAHCM) No. 1105.

4. It is within the City's discretion to determine what constitutes consistency with the General Plan. In the project's case, the demolition of a designated Historic Cultural Monument is clearly contrary to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, specifically its Cultural and Historical policy on page II-9 to "continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities."

Additionally, while the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. Full preservation of the site would achieve three of the six Project Objectives outlined in the EIR, and potentially one other, and, most importantly, would avoid the demolition of the historic resource on the site, City of Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument (LAHCM) No. 1105.

5. While the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. Policies that encourage the creation of housing do not require that the City approve all housing development projects, especially since in this case the total number of dwelling units would not change.
6. The denial of this project does not violate the Housing Accountability Act because it has a specific, adverse impact, the demolition of Historic Cultural Monument No. 1105, which would violate the objective policy in the Conservation Element of the General Plan on page II-9 to "continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities." Furthermore, Section 65589.5(e) of the Government Code notes that the Housing Accountability Act does not relieve the City from making the findings required pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code or otherwise complying with CEQA. Since the City cannot make the findings necessary for a Statement of Overriding Considerations to approve the project, it cannot approve the project, and the Housing Accountability Act does not override this.
7. While the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. The City's obligation to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation do not require that the City approve all housing development projects, especially since in this case the total number of dwelling units would not change, and the findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations cannot be made.

8. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. Since an economically viable alternative to the project exists, the denial does not constitute a taking of private property without just compensation.
9. All procedural requirements for the evaluation and denial of the project have been met. The City is under no obligation to approve a project presented to it for a discretionary entitlement, and all findings have been made to support the City's determination. Furthermore, the Applicant/Appellant does not state in what way they claim the Applicant's due process rights have been violated.
10. No examples are given for what constitutes a "similarly situated small lot subdivision." Indeed, every development project is unique, and in this case there is a designated Historic Cultural Monument on the site that would be demolished by the project, and an economically feasible preservation alternative. The City's decision does not constitute a violation of equal protection.

Please consider these amendments to the Findings and responses to the justifications of the appeal of this project in your consideration of the appeal, VTT-74201-SL-1A.

Thank you,



Adam Villani, City Planner
Department of City Planning, Major Projects Section



Adam Villani <adam.villani@lacity.org>

Updated findings distributed at APC

3 messages

Elisa Paster <epaster@glaserweil.com>
To: "adam.villani@lacity.org" <adam.villani@lacity.org>

Wed, May 29, 2019 at 9:30 AM

Hi Adam,

Will you send me an electronic copy of the updated findings that were distributed yesterday at APC? The copies disappeared.

Thanks!

Elisa

Glaser Weil

Elisa Paster | Partner

Century City Office: 10250 Constellation Blvd., 19th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90067

Main: 310.553.3000 | Direct: 310.556.7855 | Fax: 310.843.2655

E-Mail: epaster@glaserweil.com | www.glaserweil.com



This message and any attached documents may contain information from the law firm of Glaser Weil Fink Howard Avchen & Shapiro LLP that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not read, copy, distribute or use this information. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and then delete this message.

Adam Villani <adam.villani@lacity.org>
To: Elisa Paster <epaster@glaserweil.com>

Wed, May 29, 2019 at 11:01 AM

Here it is. This is the same file that was printed out and distributed yesterday.

[Quoted text hidden]



Adam Villani, City Planner
Department of City Planning
Major Projects Section
T: (213) 847-3688
221 N. Figueroa St., Room 1350
Los Angeles, CA 90012



ITEM 08 Appeal Response and Submission.pdf
615K

Elisa Paster <epaster@glaserweil.com>
To: Adam Villani <adam.villani@lacity.org>

Wed, May 29, 2019 at 11:02 AM

Thanks!

Elisa Paster | Partner

Century City Office: 10250 Constellation Blvd., 19th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90067

Main: 310.553.3000 | **Direct:** 310.556.7855 | **Fax:** 310.843.2655

E-Mail: epaster@glaserweil.com | www.glaserweil.com

[Quoted text hidden]



Adam Villani <adam.villani@lacity.org>

Technical Modification for ITEM 08 - Central APC today

1 message

Adam Villani <adam.villani@lacity.org>

Tue, May 28, 2019 at 3:50 PM

To: Planning APCCentral <apccentral@lacity.org>, Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

I've placed the attached memo into the Technical Modifications folder for today's meeting and will also bring 22 printed copies to distribute to the APC.



Adam Villani, City Planner
Department of City Planning
Major Projects Section
T: (213) 847-3688
221 N. Figueroa St., Room 1350
Los Angeles, CA 90012

 **ITEM 08 Appeal Response and Submission.pdf**
615K



Department of City Planning

City Hall, 200 N. Spring Street, Room 525, Los Angeles, CA 90012

May 28, 2019

TO: Central Area Planning Commission
FROM: Adam Villani, City Planner

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION REPORT FOR CASE NO. VTT-74201-SL-1A; 750-756 ½ North Edinburgh Avenue

The following are the Department of City Planning recommended actions for the Central Area Planning Commission to take on this case, as well as proposed revised Findings for the Zoning Administrator's determination dated April 17, 2019 for the original case, VTT-74201-SL, along with responses to the justifications presented in the attachment to the appeal of this case.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Deny** the appeal;
2. **Find** that the Central Area Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project, which includes the Draft EIR, No. ENV-2016-1367-EIR (SCH No. 2017011016), dated August 2018, and the Final EIR, dated January 4, 2019 (Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR), as well as the whole of the administrative record, and

CERTIFY the following:

- 1) The Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- 2) The Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR was presented to the Advisory Agency as a decision-making body of the lead agency; and
- 3) The Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the lead agency.

ADOPT the following:

- 1) The related and prepared Edinburgh Avenue SLS Environmental Findings dated April 17, 2019 and amended as presented in this memo dated May 28, 2019;

DENY the following:

- 1) The related and prepared Edinburgh Avenue SLS Statement of Overriding Considerations and
- 2) The Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared for the Edinburgh Avenue SLS EIR.
3. **Sustain** the decision of the Advisory Agency in **denying** Vesting Tentative Tract No. VTT-74201-SL and
4. **Adopt** the Advisory Agency's Subdivision Findings, dated April 17, 2019.

AMENDMENTS TO CEQA FINDINGS:

Findings of Fact (CEQA) VI.D (Population and Housing).d.ii, first paragraph, delete the following sentence:

~~Multiple expert reports have indicated that the buildings at the Project Site may not be feasible to rehabilitate and they are not currently in a habitable condition.~~

Findings of Fact (CEQA) IX.A (Summary of Findings) is modified as follows:

~~Based upon the following analysis, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15096(g)(2), that no feasible alternative or mitigation measure within its powers will substantially lessen any significant effect of the Project, reduce the significant, unavoidable impacts Project to a level that is less than significant, or avoid any significant impact that the Project will have on the environment. 15091(a)(3), the City cannot make findings that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Additionally, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093(b), the City cannot make a Statement of Overriding Considerations to support approval of the project.~~

Findings of Fact (CEQA) IX.C(b)(iii, iv) (Alternative 2 – Full Preservation Alternative-Findings, Rationale for Findings) are deleted and replaced with the following:

iii. Findings: The Full Preservation Alternative would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts on historical resources with implementation of preservation recommendations, and the resource would remain a designated LAHCM. The Full Preservation Alternative would have similar less than significant construction noise and construction vibration impacts (with mitigation) as the Project since off-site excavation of expansive soils would occur near off-site residences.

The Full Preservation Alternative would have reduced impacts related to air quality, operational noise and vibration, construction and operational traffic, and energy, compared to the Project due to reduced construction activity and smaller unit size. The Full Preservation Alternative would have similar impacts as the Project related to population and housing, since the number of units would remain the same, and similar

impacts as the Project regarding design feature hazards, since less traffic would be generated but sidewalk and roadway improvements would not occur.

iv. Rationale for Findings: The Full Preservation Alternative is presumed to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards, although it would require substantial reconstruction and rehabilitation, including the lifting of the buildings, which would require a lifting and bracing plan due to the poor condition of the structures. Furthermore, new mechanical, electrical, and plumbing could cause additional damage to the buildings, and a rehabilitation plan would be required. However, the Full Preservation Alternative would avoid the deterioration that would continue to occur under Alternative 1, No Project Alternative.

Furthermore, the Full Preservation Alternative would meet three of the six Project Objectives and potentially meet one other. It would meet the Project Objectives of providing a diversity of housing choices within the neighborhood, would provide housing with high quality architecture and landscape design, and would provide high quality housing to accommodate demand within a Transit Priority Area. The project would potentially meet the objective to develop an economically viable residential project. It would not meet the objective to redevelop the Project Site with residential buildings and a site design that is consistent with the existing and proposed Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation, although it would be consistent with the Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation. It would also not meet the objective to support sustainable design through development that would optimize site energy efficiency, water conservation, and runoff water quality, since it would not be built using modern green building standards, although renovation of an existing building rather than building a new one has environmental benefits because fewer new resources are required.

Portions of Findings of Fact (CEQA) IX.E (Environmentally Superior Alternative) are modified as follows:

~~Alternative 2 would not meet current LAMC parking requirements, and therefore parking impacts would be greater compared to the Project. However, of the six Project Objectives, Alternative 2 would only partially meet three, and not meet two objectives. Alternative 2 would only partially meet the Project Objectives of providing housing with high quality architecture and landscape design, providing high quality housing to accommodate demand within a Transit Priority Area, and providing sustainable design through development. Under Alternative 2, the housing units would be rehabilitated rather than newly constructed to meet modern residential design standards, although Alternative 2 would include new landscaping and would provide housing within a Transit Priority Area. Although Alternative 2 would be subject to less intensive energy conservation and green building design standards, overall the construction and operation of this Alternative would require less energy consumption than the Project. Alternative 2 would not meet the Project Objective of redeveloping the Project Site with residential buildings and a site design that is consistent with the existing and proposed HCP and underlying zoning because no new housing would be provided. Alternative 2 would not meet the Project Objective of developing an economically viable residential Project, based on the Market Analysis (provided in Appendix H of the Draft EIR).~~

Furthermore, the Full Preservation Alternative would meet three of the six Project Objectives and potentially meet one more. It would meet the Project Objectives of providing a diversity of housing choices within the neighborhood, would provide housing with high quality architecture and landscape design, and would provide high quality housing to accommodate demand within a Transit Priority Area. It would potentially meet the objective to develop an economically viable residential project. It would not meet the objective to redevelop the Project Site with residential buildings and a site design that is consistent with the existing and proposed Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation, although it would be consistent with the Hollywood Community Plan and underlying zoning designation. It would also not meet the objective to support sustainable design through development that would optimize site energy efficiency, water conservation, and runoff water quality, since it would not be built using modern green building standards, although renovation of an existing building rather than building a new one has environmental benefits because fewer new resources are required.

Findings of Fact (CEQA) X.F (CEQA Considerations) paragraph (h) is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:

h. As the City has not approved the project, no Mitigation Monitoring Program is adopted.

APPEAL RESPONSE:

The following are responses to the justifications presented in the attachment to the appeal for this case:

1. The certification of the EIR indicates that the City of Los Angeles, acting as the Lead Agency for this project, meets the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15090(a), that is, that the final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the final EIR was presented to the decision-making body (the Advisory Agency) of the lead agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR, and that the final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgement and analysis. As the City was unable to make the findings necessary for a Statement of Overriding Considerations (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093), no Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted, the project was denied, and no mitigation monitoring plan was adopted.
2. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. The findings are now internally consistent with the decision to deny the project.
3. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15092(b), a public agency shall not decide to approve a project with significant environmental impacts unless it determines that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in Section 15093. It is within the lead agency's discretion to determine whether the benefits of a project outweigh its significant impacts.

Additionally, while the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. Full preservation of the site would achieve three of the six Project Objectives outlined in the EIR, and potentially one other, and, most importantly, would avoid the significant environmental effect of the demolition of the historic resource on the site, City of Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument (LAHCM) No. 1105.

4. It is within the City's discretion to determine what constitutes consistency with the General Plan. In the project's case, the demolition of a designated Historic Cultural Monument is clearly contrary to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, specifically its Cultural and Historical policy on page II-9 to "continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities."

Additionally, while the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. Full preservation of the site would achieve three of the six Project Objectives outlined in the EIR, and potentially one other, and, most importantly, would avoid the demolition of the historic resource on the site, City of Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument (LAHCM) No. 1105.

5. While the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. Policies that encourage the creation of housing do not require that the City approve all housing development projects, especially since in this case the total number of dwelling units would not change.
6. The denial of this project does not violate the Housing Accountability Act because it has a specific, adverse impact, the demolition of Historic Cultural Monument No. 1105, which would violate the objective policy in the Conservation Element of the General Plan on page II-9 to "continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities." Furthermore, Section 65589.5(e) of the Government Code notes that the Housing Accountability Act does not relieve the City from making the findings required pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code or otherwise complying with CEQA. Since the City cannot make the findings necessary for a Statement of Overriding Considerations to approve the project, it cannot approve the project, and the Housing Accountability Act does not override this.
7. While the project would create larger units than currently exist on the site, the number of dwelling units, eight (8), would be identical to the existing number of dwelling units on the site. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. The City's obligation to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation do not require that the City approve all housing development projects, especially since in this case the total number of dwelling units would not change, and the findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations cannot be made.

8. With the modifications presented to the CEQA findings on May 28, 2019 incorporated, the findings no longer indicate that there is no feasible preservation alternative, and that Alternative 2 is a potentially economically viable preservation alternative. Since an economically viable alternative to the project exists, the denial does not constitute a taking of private property without just compensation.
9. All procedural requirements for the evaluation and denial of the project have been met. The City is under no obligation to approve a project presented to it for a discretionary entitlement, and all findings have been made to support the City's determination. Furthermore, the Applicant/Appellant does not state in what way they claim the Applicant's due process rights have been violated.
10. No examples are given for what constitutes a "similarly situated small lot subdivision." Indeed, every development project is unique, and in this case there is a designated Historic Cultural Monument on the site that would be demolished by the project, and an economically feasible preservation alternative. The City's decision does not constitute a violation of equal protection.

Please consider these amendments to the Findings and responses to the justifications of the appeal of this project in your consideration of the appeal, VTT-74201-SL-1A.

Thank you,



Adam Villani, City Planner
Department of City Planning, Major Projects Section