


7, 8, 9

Law Offices of Beth S. Dorris
3226 Mandeville Canyon Road
Los Angeles, California 90049



September 27, 2016

Supplemental Comments on Paramount Pictures Project (“Project”)
CEQA No.: ENV-2011-2460-EIR (“EIR”)
Council Files 16-0876, 16-0876-S1, 16-0876-S2, 16-0876-S3, 16-0876-S4
Address: 5555 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, CA
Appeal on Behalf of Mary Ann Biewener (“Appeal”)

Dear Councilmembers:

These comments concern all entitlements proposed as part of the Project, including without limitation the Project’s proposed Tentative Tract (“TT”) and the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment, and zoning changes on which the TT relies.

Under Government Code section 66474.61, “the advisory agency ... shall deny approval of a tentative map ... if it makes any of the following findings:

- (a) That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.
- (b) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with the applicable general and specific plans.

Here, there is no question that the TT is inconsistent with the existing General Plan and applicable Community Plans and zoning. That is the reason amendments and other changes to said plans and zoning are part of the Project. The TT approvals themselves recognize this inconsistency, by relying on hypothetical general, specific, and community plans different from those in effect at the time.¹

As we indicated in our first appeal, the Advisory Agency was not permitted to approve the TT based on the plans and zoning in effect at the time of its action. The proposed amendments and changes to said plans and zoning, on which its TT approval determination relied, will not be in place, if at all, unless later approved by the full City Council. The Planning Commission’s affirmation of the Advisory Agency’s approval was subject to the same limitation. (Gov. Code section 66474.61.)

Nor are such future theoretic Plan changes legitimate project conditions for a tentative tract map. One cannot presume that the applicant will subsequently obtain approval of General and Specific Plan amendments. *Woodland Hills Residents Assn., Inc. v. City Council of Los Angeles* (1975)

¹ We detailed various major inconsistencies between the Specific Plan and other Project entitlements with the pre-existing General Plan and associated community plans in prior comments. The plan inconsistencies not only invalidate the TT and Specific Plan, but the EIR’s land use analysis.

44 Cal.App.3d 825, 838 (absence of statutory finding required invalidation of the approval). The TT's approval by the Advisory Agency, and later affirmation by the Planning Commission, were premature. These actions involved impermissible prejudgment or, as characterized by the Supreme Court, "post hoc rationalization." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 394.) In essence, the Advisory Agency and Planning Commission have "the process exactly backward". (*Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay v. Board of Port Commissioners of the City of Oakland* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1371.)

For that matter, the proposed General Plan Amendment and associated Specific Plan cannot be validly adopted, even in the future. The Los Angeles City Charter and Municipal Code both prohibit General Plan amendments unless "the part or area involved has significant social, economic or physical identity. (LA Charter section 555; LAMC section 11.5.6 ("GPA Code Provisions").) The concept is to prevent spot zoning to reward and enrich individual owners with entitlements that normal zoning does not allow. Here, the proposed Project site is not limited to the Paramount studio main lot, but includes various other lots (and offsite billboards) nearby, some of which are zoned residential. Further, the TT and associated Specific Plan is designed to break up the Paramount main lot into little pieces, most of which could then be sold off for non-studio uses such as office, retail, and liquor consumption – that is, common uses not the least bit unique to this area. Indeed, even "studio" use is not unique to the Paramount main lot, but rather common to much of the surrounding industrial properties as well.

As an additional procedural concern, we note that the Applicant, the current landowner, initiated the General Plan Amendment. Yet a General Plan Amendment cannot be initiated by the applicant, but only on the formal request of the Council, the City Planning commission or the Director Planning itself, with a formal report thereon meeting specific GPA Code requirements. This makes the TT approval all the more speculative, premature and unsupported.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Regards,

Beth S. Dorris,
Law Offices of Beth S. Dorris



7, 8, 9
17, 18

TO: City Planning Commission / David Ambrose cpc@lacity.org,
 Julia.Duncan CD 4 julia.duncan@lacity.org,
 Ms. Chris Robertson CD13 chris.robertson@lacity.org

Re: **Paramount Pictures Master Plan**

Case No: TT-7151; CPC-2011-2459-GPA-ZC SP-SN-CA: CPC-2011-2461-DA
 CEQA No: ENV-2011-2460-EIR State Clearinghouse No. 2011101035

Re:

Date: July 13, 2016

Sent via E-mail

GWNC letter of Board Resolution

Dear Mr. Ambrose,

At the meeting of its Board on July 13, 2016, the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council adopted the following Motion by a 9-3 vote with 3 members abstaining:

“ The GWNC opposes the Paramount Pictures Master Plan, the Specific Plan, the Tentative Tract Map, Special Sign District and Final Environmental Impact Report.

The GWNC joins with surrounding neighborhood organizations in expressing great concern regarding the height of the 2 proposed office towers, the impact of additional traffic, the digital and electronic signs and supergraphics in particular.”

We thank you for your time and interest in the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council.

Regards,
(signed)

Philip Farha
Land Use Committee, Secretary
Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council

City Council 9/27/16
 AGENDA ITEMS 17 & 18 Case 16-0876 and 16-0876-S2
 “Items for which Public Hearings Have Not Been Held

City Council Case No: 16-0876, 16-0876-S1, 16-0876-S2, 16-0876-S3, 16-0876-S4
 Case No: TT-71751; CPC-2011-2459-GPA-ZC SP-SN-CA: CPC-2011-2462-DA
 CEQA No: ENV-2011-2460-EIR, State Clearinghouse No. 2011101035




Non-Theatrical 1978/1979

7, 8, 9, 17, 18

RECEIVED
SEP 27 2016
By MN

Paramount



57



RADIO
TURES INC



September 27, 2016

City Council
Los Angeles City Hall

Re: Paramount Pictures Master Plan project ; 5555 W. Melrose Avenue
CASE NO. ENV-2011-2460-EIR ; State ClearingHouse NO. 2011101035
CPC-2011-2459-GPA-ZC-SP-SN-CA

Agenda items: #7 and #18
16-0876-S2

Dear Councilmembers;

The Studios are an essential element of Los Angeles' culture and industry. The location of these "Dream Factories" in our community resulted in the major impact the Entertainment Industry had on Hollywood, Los Angeles, the Nation and the World.

Universal Studios Master Plan encompassed a multi-Million dollar restoration & preservation plan for the historic **Phantom of the Opera set**. We call upon Paramount Studios to extend the same epic effort toward the **RKO Globe**.

The "**Studio Globe**" atop its respective exterior Studio walls, form the Melrose Ave & Gower St. corner and critically provide the *public face* of the quintessential "Hollywood Studio"; a treasured daily reminder to the role Studios played in the growth and development of our City.

Just as the HOLLYWOOD SIGN evolved beyond its inception as a real estate advertisement; so too has the "Studio Globe" transcended beyond a corporate logo for RKO, into a world recognized, universal symbol for Hollywood and the Hollywood Studio era.

We implore the Councilmembers of the proud City of Los Angeles to encourage Paramount Studio to Go Beyond 'reasonably commercial effort' and publicly commit to fully recreate, rehabilitate and restore this nationally significant cultural icon as a community benefit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Richard Adkins".

Richard Adkins
President, Hollywood Heritage, Inc.