



● **McQUISTON ASSOCIATES**

6212 Yucca St, Los Angeles, CA 90028-5223

(323) 464-6792 FAX same

consultants to technical management

March 18, 2016

CF 16-0033

ITEM ___ PLUM 3/22/16

S. Dickinson

**ADDITIONAL STATEMENT of J.H. McQUISTON on
PROPOSED AMENDMENT for TARGET STORE**

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Committee:

1. Streets in Los Angeles were laid-out below the Santa Monicas when Los Angeles was rural with a population below 1 million. **Streets today cannot accommodate the 4 million-plus in the City. Bus and other vehicles obstruct traffic flow and prevent emergency vehicles from safely-assisting people in desperate need.**

Major revision for acceptable mobility is mandatory or CEQA is still dis-served.

California Supreme Court long-ago pronounced on a case about a City's Plan and its necessity for mobility. In Walnut Creek, people tried to restrict a developer unless the developer alleviated traffic congestion. The Court per *Leshar Communications v City of Walnut Creek*, 52 Cal.3d 531 (In Bank)(S Ct 1990) said a Plan is the "Constitution" for the City and *may not be subverted by traffic-segment authority*. The segments must jibe.

Planning is repeating Walnut Creek's folly, by **not constructing its Plan** so it *harmonizes with specificity per State Government Code* for the City's **mandatory land use and transportation segments**.

For consistency, the City must amend the status of the following streets:

TO Boulevard I: Adams, Alameda, Alvarado, Beverly, Broadway, Crenshaw, Fairfax, Figueroa, Glendale, Highland, Hollywood, Jefferson, LaBrea, LaCienega, LosFeliz, MLK, Melrose, Olympic, Pico, Santa Monica, Sepulveda, Slauson, Sunset, Venice, Vermont, Vine-Rossmore, Washington, Western, Wilshire.

These must always have six traffic lanes. Bus lanes may not take traffic lanes away. Setbacks must allow for street widening to achieve the Plan. Parking must not take away traffic lanes.

The TARGET BUILDING INTERFERES WITH SUNSET's and WESTERN's WIDENING. It must be set back from both Western and Sunset, NOW. That is the *raison d'etre* for City Planning, and State Law.

2. Moreover, the City Charter was amended in 1999 because residents **did not want the City Planning Commission to decide how properties were allowed to be developed for local areas: They demanded Area Planning Commissions to decide local planning issues, and the Charter now requires it.**

THIS ISSUE WAS IMPROPERLY HEARD *ultra vires* IN THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION.

Respectfully submitted,

J. H. McQuiston

c: Interested parties