

Daniel Freedman
Direct: 310-785-5391
DFF@JMBM.COM

1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067-4308
(310) 203-8080 (310) 203-0567 Fax
www.jmbm.com

October 2, 2018

VIA E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Hon. President Herb Wesson and
Hon. Councilmembers
Los Angeles City Council
200 N. Spring Street, Rm. 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attn: Brian Walters
E-Mail: brian.walters@lacity.org

Re: **Council File: 18-0330; Agenda Item 8**
1848 South Gramercy Place, Los Angeles
Case No(s). CHC-2018-3217-HCM; ENV-2018-3218-CE
Opposition to Proposed Cultural Historic Monument Designation(s)
Council Hearing Date: September 18, 2018

President Wesson and Honorable Members of the City Council:

Our office represents Janet and Akhilesh ("A.J.") Jha, the owners of 1848 S. Gramercy Place, Los Angeles, (the "Property"). We submit this letter in opposition to the City of Los Angeles's ("City") consideration of their Property as a potential Historic Cultural Monument ("HCM"), and to urge the City Council to adopt the Cultural Heritage Commission's ("Commission") *unanimous* recommendation against declaring the Property as an HCM. Attached as **Exhibit A** is the Commission's report on the nomination, concluding unequivocally that:

"[The Property] does not meet any of the three criteria in the Cultural Heritage Ordinance... [and is] ineligible for designation as an Historic Cultural Monument."
(See Commission Findings, Pg. 1.)

The Commission's recommendation in this instance is consistent with the findings and analysis of the City's Office of Historic Resources and a detailed Historic Resources Assessment prepared by Environmental Science Associates ("ESA"), both of which found that the Property was not qualified for HCM designation under any standard. These conclusions are also consistent with the City's findings in SurveyLA - its recently completed inventory of potentially historic resources - which did not identify the Property as a potential historic resource or a contributor to a potential historic district. In this case, therefore, there is a clear consensus among all experts that this Property is not a historic resources or HCM under any applicable standard.

Additionally, strict consistency with these findings is even more important in this instance, given that the owners are currently in the process of developing a multi-family project - *with dedicated affordable units* - for the Property. An HCM designation for this dilapidated single-family home would (i) undermine the proposed project, (ii) threaten the development of much needed affordable housing, (iii) violate the Housing Accountability Act, and (iii) leave the owner with a building that cannot be economically repaired or rehabilitated. The community realizes this as well as the inadequacy of this HCM nomination, and a review of the council file will show that nearly all of the letters submitted to the Council are in opposition to this nomination. A copy of the correspondence received by the City in opposition to this nomination are attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

For these reasons, and others as set forth by ESA and the City's Office of Historic Resources, the City Council should adopt the Commission's recommendation against the designation of this Property as an HCM. Considering the consensus between the Commission, staff, ESA, and those who advised the City in the preparation of SurveyLA, it is clear the Property does not qualify as an HCM and does not meet the criteria set forth in LAAC Section 22.171.7 for HCM designation. Moreover, given the Property's poor condition, designation of the building as an HCM would make it impossible for the owner to economically maintain the structure while also bringing it to code. We urge the City Council deny this nomination consistent with the Commission's recommendation. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D.F.F.', written in a cursive style.

DANIEL F. FREEDMAN of
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP

Enclosures

EXHIBIT A

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 532
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801

CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION

RICHARD BARRON
PRESIDENT

GAIL KENNARD
VICE PRESIDENT

PILAR BUELNA
DIANE KANNER
BARRY MILOFSKY

ROCKY WILES
COMMISSION OFFICE MANAGER
(213) 978-1300

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR
(213) 978-1271

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER
(213) 978-1272

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
(213) 978-1274

<http://planning.lacity.org>

July 12, 2018

Los Angeles City Council
c/o Office of City Clerk
City Hall, Room 395
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attention: PLUM Committee

Dear Honorable Members:

STOKES' ANGELUS VISTA TRACT RESIDENCE; 1848 SOUTH GRAMERCY PLACE; CHC-2018-3217-HCM; ENV-2018-3218-CE; COUNCIL FILE NO. 18-0330

On May 1, 2018, the City Council instructed the Department of City Planning to initiate Historic-Cultural Monument designation proceedings for the Stokes' Angelus Vista Tract Residence (CF-18-0330). On May 24, 2018, a subcommittee of the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) visited the property, as required by Section 22.171.8 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code (LAAC). On July 5, 2018, after at the completion of a public hearing on the matter, the Commission, determined that this property does not conform with the definition of a Monument pursuant to LAAC Section 22.171.7 by a vote of 5-0. Therefore, the request for designation as a Historic-Cultural Monument has been declined.

The Commission vote was as follows:

Moved: Kennard
Seconded: Kanner
Ayes: Buelna, Milofsky
Abstained: Barron

Vote 5 – 0

Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I
Cultural Heritage Commission

Time for Council to Act: The Commission action is hereby transmitted to the City Council for consideration. Pursuant to Section 22.171.10(f) of the Los Angeles Administrative Code, the Council may approve or disapprove in whole or in part an application or initiation for a proposed designation of a Monument. The Council shall act in 90-days of the public hearing held before the Commission on the proposed designation. The City Council may unilaterally extend the 90-day time limit to act for a maximum of 15 days for good cause. With written consent of the owner, the time for the City Council to act may be extended by up to an additional 60 days. If the Council does not act on the application or initiation within this specified time limit, the application or initiation to designate a Monument shall be deemed to have been denied. The Council may override a Commission recommendation of denial of Council initiated designation by a minimum of 10-votes.

Attachment: Findings

STOKES' ANGELUS VISTA TRACT RESIDENCE

FINDINGS

(Adopted by the Cultural Heritage Commission on July 5, 2018)

The Stokes' Angelus Vista Tract Residence does not meet any of the three criteria of the Cultural Heritage Ordinance and therefore is ineligible for designation as an Historic-Cultural Monument.

CRITERIA

The criterion is the Cultural Heritage Ordinance which defines a historical or cultural monument as any site (including significant trees or other plant life located thereon) building or structure of particular historic or cultural significance to the City of Los Angeles if it meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. Is identified with important events of national, state, or local history or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, economic or social history of the nation, state, city or community;
2. Is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.

SUMMARY

The Stokes' Angelus Vista Tract Residence consists of a two-story single-family residence located on the east side of Gramercy Place between Washington Boulevard and 18th Street in the Arlington Heights neighborhood of Los Angeles. Built in 1907 by noted Los Angeles builder Naldo F. Stokes and his wife Minnie Stokes as part of the Angelus Vista Tract development, the residence exhibits qualities of Craftsman and Tudor Revival architectural styles. Over the years, a series of owners and renters occupied the residence, and currently it serves as a sober living facility.

Though promoted in 1902 as one of Los Angeles's elite residential neighborhoods, the Angelus Vista Tract was not an initial success, as most of the wealthy targeted by the developers were already living in grand houses in other new developments. Between 1908 and 1910 the city's population had more than doubled, leading to a building explosion. Most homes in Angelus Vista date from this period. Washington Boulevard, envisioned as the future grand boulevard from Los Angeles to the Pacific Ocean, played a key role in the development of the community. In September 1902 the Washington Boulevard rail line was extended through West Adams Heights, prompting developers to lay out residential tracts along the main thoroughfare to Santa Monica and the sea.

Irregular in plan, the subject property is of wood frame and concrete construction with wood shingle and stucco cladding. The steeply-pitched side-gabled roof has composition shingles, wide overhanging eaves, and exposed rafter tails. The primary, west-facing elevation features a large bay window on the lower level, a second story projecting front gable with decorative half-

timbering, and a small recessed balcony with lattice railing, also on the second floor. The entryway is off-centered and accessed via a protruding porch with a gabled roof and square columns. There is a porte-cochere of cross-truss construction attached to the south-facing elevation of the building and a one-story addition off the rear, east-facing elevation. Fenestration consists of double-hung wood windows, multi-lite wood fixed and casement windows, wood hopper windows, and aluminum windows. There is a small shed at the rear of the property. Interior features include wood floors, built-in wood benches, wood ceiling beams in the living room, a river rock fireplace surround, built-in china cabinets and bookcases, and reverse board and batten wainscoting.

Based on available permit records and visual observation during the Cultural Heritage Commission site inspection, there have been a number of alterations to the property over the years that include a 20-foot by 23-foot one-story rear addition in 1920, installation of a rear staircase in 1982, as well as kitchen and bathroom remodels, the enclosure of the porch on the primary elevation, re-stuccoing of the stucco cladding with course concrete plaster, replacement of some windows, addition of a porte-cochere, installation of partitions in many of the rooms, enclosure of the rear service porch, and a second-story addition to the 1920 rear addition, all at unknown dates.

The subject property was identified as eligible for historic designation under the local designation program as a Contributor to an identified historic district in the June 21, 1996 Historic Resources Final Report for the South Central Los Angeles District Plan Area prepared by Richard Starzak of Myra L. Frank & Associates, Incorporated. However, it was found to be ineligible for listing individually on the National Register of Historic Places in a 1987 Section 106 review survey and was also not identified as eligible individually or as part of a historic district for listing under the national, state, or local designation programs in the recent citywide historic resources survey, SurveyLA. Within the same neighborhood as the subject property, SurveyLA did identify a potential Angelus Vista Historic District, an important representative of a residential suburb with a significant concentration of Craftsman and Period Revival dwellings exhibiting quality of craftsmanship and distinctive features, and an excellent example of early 20th century streetcar suburbanization. The subject property was not included within the district boundary.

DISCUSSION

The Stokes' Angelus Vista Tract Residence does not meet the criteria for designation under the Cultural Heritage Ordinance. The preparer argues that the property is eligible under two criteria of the Ordinance: that it "is identified with important events of national, state, or local history or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, economic or social history of the nation, state, city or community" for its association with the early development of the Angelus Vista Tract and a California Supreme Court case involving restrictive use covenants, *Werner v. Graham*, and that it "embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age" as an unique example of Craftsman-style architecture and an exemplary work of noted builder Naldo F. Stokes.

The subject property is not associated with any significant historical events and does not exemplify any contributions to history. Even though the subject property does date from the early period of the neighborhood's development, it no longer retains sufficient integrity to individually convey its significance. The cumulative alterations, particularly on the primary, east-facing elevation, have substantially impacted the original design intent, materials, feeling, and association with the development of the Angelus Vista Tract. Further, the court case cited by the preparer may have had some impact on the development of Washington Boulevard as a commercial corridor; however, while the owner of the house was one of the named defendants, the case does not appear to have any direct association with the subject property.

Although the subject property retains original elements such as wood windows, decorative half-timbering, wide over-hanging eaves, exposed rafter tails, and built-in furniture typical of the style, staff does not find it to be a distinctive or outstanding example of Craftsman-style architecture. As noted above, the house has experienced a number of alterations, particularly to the primary façade, that compromise the integrity and original design of the house; therefore it is not a distinguished example of the style. More intact and exemplary Craftsman-style single-family residences that are already designated include the Kissam House, 2160 West 20th Street (1907, HCM #761), Perrine House, 2229 South Gramercy Place (1908, HCM #6662), and the Edward Alexander Kelley Hackett House, 1317 South Westlake Avenue (1910, HCM #719).

The property is also not a notable example of a master designer, builder, or architect. While Naldo Stokes built at least 50 single-family residences across Los Angeles, some of which were collaborations with master architect Frank M. Tyler, he is not recognized as a master builder or architect. The majority of Stokes' body of work consists of speculative ventures for himself and his wife.

The subject property was not identified by the citywide historic resources survey, SurveyLA, as eligible for designation under the national, state, or local designation programs and staff finds that it does not appear to rise to the level of historic significance to be individually eligible for designation as a Los Angeles City Historic-Cultural Monument.

BACKGROUND

On May 1, 2018, the Los Angeles City Council, acting upon a motion introduced by Councilmember Herb Wesson, initiated consideration of the subject property as a potential Historic-Cultural Monument. On May 24, 2018, a subcommittee of the Cultural Heritage Commission consisting of Commissioners Barron and Kennard visited the property, accompanied by staff from the Office of Historic Resources.

EXHIBIT B

Deny 1848 Gramercy Place Historical Nomination

Avis Bates <avisbates@yahoo.com>

Sep 29, 2018 9:24 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Commissioners and City Staff,

I previously gave my objection to 1848 S Gramercy Place being considered for historic designation. The Cultural Heritage Commission received an email from me on June 25th, 2018 noting that there are several other occurrences of this same style home in very close proximity, meaning we don't have to save every single old building in this neighborhood based on age alone. My letter also mentions the exclusionary economic practices of this area at the time of construction. "Preserving this property in this fashion is preserving the idea that rich neighbors can still exclude people they feel are beneath them, or different than them, just because they have an emotional reaction."

Nothing on the interior, exterior, nor experience wise has happened at this home to warrant historic preservation.

Please deny this puzzling nomination.

Thank you,

Avis Bates
1672 North Western Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90027

RE:1848 S. Gramercy Place

Javi M <javi.m31@yahoo.com>

Sep 29, 2018 10:05 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear PLUM Commissioners,

I attended the CHC Hearing regarding the nomination of 1848 S Gramercy Place as a property worthy of Historic-Cultural Monument Status. I was happy with unanimous vote to deny it as I had sent is a letter opposed to the nomination. Imagine my surprise to learn that the case is now being heard by PLUM. Didn't the commissioners who are in charge of preservation denying it means anything?

In my letter to the CHC, one of the reasons I gave to deny this nomination was it feels like an attempt by already wealthy neighbors to preserve properties they can't control to get enough homes locally to qualify as an HPOZ and increase their home values. Just one guy's opinion.

Please continue to deny. Thank you.

Javier Mulero

1022 North Vista Street

West Hollywood CA 90069

Please Deny Council File: 18-0330

Ruthle Myers <myer0159@gmail.com>

Sep 29, 2018 9:33 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear PLUM Staff,

I am writing in opposition to the HCM for 1848 Gramercy Place. I considered the report, reviewed the site, and looked up the property, went out to speak against and sent a letter to the Cultural Heritage Commission. I was very happy when they unanimously decided against deeming this location historic. I hope that you will do the same.

The nomination appears to be made at the request of neighborhood residents. These residents did not appreciate the aesthetic of the building until progress was initiated. At that point, the building was being considered despite SurveyLA already rejecting this building.

The building itself is insignificant, run down, and nothing more than an opportunity to do something relevant. Whatever the plan for the site is, I will be excited to see LA embrace progress and move forward as this building has been deteriorating it seems for decades. I don't like this word, but it's ugly.

When I looked it up, on Yelp it appeared as a sober living facility. I called the number and hung up after it asked me for insurance information. There was nothing else I saw online except for the price of the house on various real estate sites.

I did not come across anything historically significant for this project and encourage you to reject this nomination.

Respectfully,

Ruth Myers
(952) 200-0944

Dear Council Members:

My wife (Janet Jha) and I (Akhilesh Jha) are the owners of the property 1848 S Gramercy Place, Los Angeles, CA. This property is in front of the council as Item 18-0330 for designation as a Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM). Let us present to you the facts gathered so far as to why this property does not qualify to be an HCM:

1. **Department of Parks and Recreation (1987)** – “None of these properties (including 1848 S Gramercy Place) would be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places as examples of Architecture”
2. **SurveyLA Assessment (2012)** – “This was not a property that was found eligible either as a contributor to the nearby historic district or individually eligible for designation.”
3. **CRA/LA Assessment** – “Nothing in record suggesting that it is a historically important property”.
4. **United Neighborhoods (2018)** – Did not support the Historic-Cultural Monument Nomination.
5. **LA Office of Historic Resources (2018)** – “The Stokes’ Angelus Vista Tract Residence does not meet any of the three criteria of the Cultural Heritage Ordinance and therefore is ineligible for designation as a Historic-Cultural Monument.”
6. **Environmental Science Associates (2018)** – “There is no evidence that suggests the subject property was significant to the development of the Angelus Vista Tract, the subject property lacks architectural merit as an excellent example of the Tudor Revival style and a notable work of builder Naldo Stokes. The subject property also has not yielded, and is not likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. In addition, the subject property lacks integrity of design, materials, workmanship and feeling due to alterations.”
7. **Cultural Heritage Commission (2018)** - “Determined that this property does not conform with the definition of a Monument pursuant to LAAC Section 22.171.7 by a vote of 5-0.”
8. **Statements from Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) Hearing:**
 - a. **Gail Kennard, Commissioner** – “If we designate this property, I am not sure this is the best way to tell that [legal] story if that [Werner v. Graham] is the crux of the nomination. I do not see really any other criteria into which this would fit. Because I do not think it is particularly a great specimen of Tudor-Revival type. It does not meet any of the other criteria in terms of architecture. So, you are left with the criteria on broad social economic impact. At the end of the day, I just do not see that it tells that story well enough to rise to the level of a monument.”
 - b. **Barry Milofsky, Commissioner** – “I also agree with Commissioner Kennard that a single-family house of this specific type adjacent to a three-story brick building and a liquor store across the street is not enough to tell a story of the legal case [Werner v. Graham] that has been cited here.”
 - c. **Diane Kanner, Commissioner** – “Designating this house because it represents a land-use precedence [Werner v. Graham], does anybody get excited about that? I don’t. If this were a

human story of segregation or something like that, I might get a little excited. As far as broader Los Angeles implications, I do not see it.”

- d. *Lambert Giessinger, Architect, Office of Historic Resources* – “There has been some dilapidated property that has been restored. Once you restore this property, is it a great Tudor house around in 10-mile radius - No”
- e. *Ken Bernstein, Principal City Planner, Office of Historic Resources* – “I want to set the records straight factually on one item. A couple of speakers asserted that this property was not surveyed by SurveyLA. And that is inaccurate. SurveyLA did not record every property in the city that was surveyed. However, it did evaluate every property in the city. If we had actually done recordation of every property, we would have been at this for the next 40 years with 880,000 properties city-wide. Every property was evaluated. And because it was asserted in writing, we did go back and checked with our SurveyLA team, led by Janet Hansen. What was being referred to with respect to industrial properties, we did go back to properties that were zone industrial, which were deferred to a later phase of the survey because we were completing our city-wide industrial historic context statement. We know that this is not an industrial property. This has been a residential property. The survey team did go back and resurveyed all properties that had a zoning designation of industrial at a later phase including the residential properties within those zones. So, that was done here. And again, this was not a property that was found eligible either as a contributor to the nearby historic district or individually eligible for designation.”

9. Surroundings

North side: Apartment building
South side: Liquor Store
East side: Single-family house
West side: Apartment building

10. Usage

Current Use – Single family house on a commercial zone (CM-1).

Proposed Use – TOC Tier II Affordable Housing of 20 units including 2 units for Extremely Low-Income Residents.



Therefore, I urge you to deny the HCM designation for this property. Thank you!

Respectfully,

Janet & Akhilesh Jha

Owners, 1848 S Gramercy Place, Los Angeles, CA 90019

(310) 995-4859, akhilesh.jha@gmail.com

Dear Commissioners, Council Members, and City Staff:

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the 1848 S Gramercy PI Historic Nomination. I am in strong opposition to this nomination because of my ability to see and the lack of historic content that has taken place at the site.

Please take a look at the photos below:



It is not my intent to come across as elitist, and I don't believe saying this place is lacking architectural character does that. These photos show the amount of attention this home has received prior to it being considered for a new development site. All of a sudden, we must preserve this property because of what? Age? If that is the precedent being set, our city's problems will continue to get worse.

Please let me know if there are other merits to this project I am missing. As it stands, this building is borderline embarrassing but preserving it is a mistake.

Thank you for your consideration and service to Los Angeles

V. Weathersby
1672 North Western Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90027

To the Council President and Cultural Heritage Commission:

I am writing in opposition to the HCM for 1848 Gramercy Place. I considered the report, reviewed the site, and looked up the property.

The nomination appears to be made at the request of neighborhood residents. These residents did not appreciate the aesthetic of the building until progress was initiated. At that point the building was being considered despite SurveyLA already rejecting this building.

The building itself is insignificant, run down, and nothing more than an opportunity to do something relevant. Whatever the plan for the site is, I will be excited to see LA embrace progress and move forward as this building has been deteriorating it seems for decades. I don't like this word, but it's ugly.

When I looked it up, on Yelp it appeared as a sober living facility. I called the number and hung up after it asked me for insurance information. There was nothing else I saw online except for the price of the house on various real estate sites.

I did not come across anything historically significant for this project and encourage you to reject this nomination.

Respectfully,

Ruth Myers
(952) 200-0944

Dear Council Members and Cultural Heritage Commissioners,

The intent of this email is to oppose the historic nomination of 1848 Gramercy Place - Council File: 18-0330.

I understand the purpose of this commission is not to weigh in on the future plans of a site, but to consider the item at hand and judge its historic merits. The nomination of this property, however, was not done with the history in mind but the opportunity it presented by nominating it. That opportunity was to block development and future housing.

There were years of opportunities to preserve this site, but until the plans came for the new development, the neighborhood had no interest in this property. If a one story organic grocer or trendy restaurant was proposed, would the nomination have occurred? The history of tomorrow will be decided by the decisions we make today, and the needs of our city are far greater than the discomfort brought by change for a handful of residents.

If this building is truly historic, I hope something exceptional will be done with the structure. The current narrative of weaponizing HCM nominations will be an unfortunate chapter in the future history books of Los Angeles.

Thank You,

Peggy Sears
900 N Orange Grove Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90046
(607)684-8348

To Whom It May Concern -

I've witnessed first hand how HCM designations are wielded as tools to block future development all across Los Angeles. I've already spoken at a PLUM hearing on this topic regarding another site in Los Angeles and here I am, spending more time speaking to this issue on yet another site, slated for development. I believe that the HCM Designation in question at 1848 Gramercy is yet another example of how the HCM designation has been weaponized by NIMBYs to block development. And I urge you to abandon this consideration swiftly and unapologetically.

This practice of weaponizing HCM's is shameful because it undermines the integrity of the HCM designation and contributes to the larger housing crisis, thereby preventing Angelenos from creating our own meaningful history in this city. In this case, 1848 Gramercy wasn't motioned for designation until the land was purchased by a developer. The single family home, built in the early 1900's, hasn't been deemed culturally or architecturally significant by Survey LA and still, here we are debating this.

The small and vocal NIMBY contingent has become strategic in their attempts to stunt growth in Los Angeles, and we should not fall for this trap. An HCM would stymie the potential for this valuable lot, impacting Angelenos for generations to come.

Do not grant the HCM designation for 1848 Gramercy Place.

Thank you,
Chelsea

Dear Council Member Herb Wesson and the Staffs:

Does Los Angeles have a rich history worthy of preservation? Of course, but on what grounds are we deciding the merit of said nomination? Reviewing the increasing staff reports for these types of nominations I am becoming increasingly concerned. I am concerned from 2 perspectives:

- 1) As a housing advocate and
- 2) Someone who appreciates history

If we perennially approve projects simply based on the age of a building, we are diluting true historical relevancy as most of these nominations are simply a tool to block new development. Does the neighborhood truly value this property, or are they actually opposed to new development and see an opportunity with the HCM. I will let you decide on your own but it appears very clear to me.

The 1848 S Gramercy Pl property is a great example. It had been dismissed as an HCM until the demolition permit was filed. This property has been heavily modified and overlooked for years. It is not significant, it is an eye sore and I hope you dismiss this nomination, Council File: 18-0330.

Thank you

Katie Sears
900 N Orange Grove Ave. #2
Los Angeles, CA 90046
(607)684-8348

June 25th 2018

1848 S. Gramercy Pl Los Angeles CA 90019

Dear members of Los Angeles Historical Committee,

I am going to suggest against the consideration of this property as a historical property.

Let me begin by offering some magnitude to a decision of considering a property such as this to be historic. We live in the most populous metro in California, 2nd largest metros in the USA, our local economy would rank in the top 20 worldwide. We have a growing population in California, it fuels a demand for housing, naturally by not building more units we have a housing crisis in LA. This property at 1848 South Gramercy Pl. can provide 20 times more housing units than its current use.

This property was built as a single-family home, all neighboring properties have multi-unit housing and commercial properties, it has become out of character with the neighborhood (Zoning is CM-1, neighboring properties are zoned R3, R4 & C2). Entering 1848 South Gramercy Pl. you will see an old house with many modifications, replacements and additions, it has lost many of its original characteristics.

There will be a few reports provided with the history of this property and there hasn't been any significant event related to this property.

This property is in Tier 2 of the Transit Oriented Communities Program passed in September 2016 with Measure JJJ. The TOC program incentivizes developers to build more affordable housing, this property will house 10% for affordable housing. By considering this property historic you will be obstructing the development of the necessary housing our city desperately needs.

In conclusion, the consideration of this property as historic should be rejected, it doesn't qualify as having the character, history or value for historic designation.

Gabriel Getter
Real Estate Broker
15 year resident in Los Angeles

To Whom It May Concern:

Can you please explain to me what is so significant about 1848 S. Gramercy Place? I am beyond confused that a seemingly mediocre building would warrant a HCM designation. An HCM should tell a story of our city, speak to our shared values, or enshrine the legacy of a contributor. What is worth saving about this building? I supposed this could all fall into a matter of opinion, but there must be some explanation.

I often look to trusted community leaders and organizations to offer perspective in moments like this, but as I understand it, Survey LA - an agency entrusted with this scope of designations - did not make this motion. If this building hasn't landed on their radar, why is it on anyone else's radar? I ask this, with all due respect, because I truly don't know and despite all of my research, I can't figure it out.

Does my home warrant designation? I suppose we could make the case for any home to be designated HCM -- but that seems a bit dangerous. HCM's effectively ward off future influence and change to that specific area, and who am I to say what this city will need 10, 20, 30 years from now? This is why Survey LA's work is important, and done so scrupulously. All this to say -- I think we should really consider (perhaps, more carefully) what is being motioned for HCM and why.

Respectfully,

Harlan Allen

(949) 702-5372

Dear Council Members and Cultural Heritage Commissioners:

I am writing this letter in regards to the HCM nomination at 1848 S Gramercy Pl, Council File: 18-0330.

I am opposed to this nomination for a handful of reasons. The most obvious is due to the condition of the property. This building is run down, modified, and offering little to no value as it currently stands.

If this dilapidated building were to be preserved, what would the future plan with it be? Just to hold onto something that is subject for demolition, or would it be converted into a museum, an adaptively reused building, or something else? We have an opportunity with the land this building sits on, but the wood structure itself is getting in the way.

Please deny this nomination and help improve our cities infrastructure, aesthetic, and ability to achieve progress. Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Collins
900 N Orange Grove Ave. #2
Los Angeles, CA 90046
(781) 999-0977

To Whom It May Concern -

We are in the midst of an unprecedented effort to address the decades-long housing affordability crisis in Los Angeles. This means, we are actively seeking to build new homes - and every corner of the city is called to do its part. This call-to-action has peaked the activity of the "Not-In-My-Backyard (NIMBY)" folks. The HCM designation at 1848 Gramercy sadly speaks to another pitiful attempt by this contingent to block much-needed housing. The property isn't worth saving by Survey LA's standards -- and it didn't occur to any of the neighborhood to bother saving it, until it was slated for development. Suspicious? Absolutely. This strategy of nominating buildings for HCM has been mobilized at a growing rate, and we must not be fooled. We have a moral obligation to press-on in our pursuit of lifting LA out of the depths of this housing crisis.

This is not a battle between single family homes and apartment buildings - we need homes of all types in Los Angeles. And yet, we are woefully under-supplied with apartments, condos, and mixed use spaces that provide economic value to neighborhoods, and create greater access for the diversity of people living throughout Los Angeles. Do not let 1848 Gramercy be a victory for the NIMBY movement. Please deny this HCM and help bring new, much-needed homes to LA. '

Thank you for your consideration and service to Los Angeles.

Claudia Baticela
8360 Clinton Ave
W. Hollywood 90046

To: Council President Herb Wesson, CHC, and City Staff
Regarding: Council File: 18-0330 1848 S Gramercy

The property at 1848 S Gramercy is not a historic property, unless age alone qualify it. Nothing historic has yet to occur. It is just another older building in Los Angeles that doesn't need to be preserved when there are several examples of this type of building in this very small geographic area.

A person actually had to be rich to move into the Angelus Vista neighborhood when it was originally planned, with homeowners required to spend at least \$2,000.00 in home construction costs to live here. This was clearly an attempt to keep out the influx of "others". Preserving this property in this fashion is preserving the idea that rich neighbors can still exclude people they feel are beneath them, or different than them, just because they have an emotional reaction.

Please deny this ridiculous nomination, reject impulse, and side with actual history.

Thank You,

Avis Bates
1672 North Western Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Deny 1848 S Gramercy as a Historic Monument Please

Daniel Collins <dcinweho@gmail.com>

Sep 27, 2018 2:13 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear PLUM Commissioners:

I am writing this letter in regards to the HCM nomination at 1848 S Gramercy Pl, Council File: 18-0330. I also spoke at the CHC hearing against this nomination. I believe the CHC was unanimously against it and yet here we are at PLUM. How is that even possible? Seems like a waste of city resources.

1848 S Gramercy is run down and so heavily modified since its original construction that I fail to see the value as it stands. We would have an opportunity for housing and even potentially economic growth if we replaced it with something better. And to be clear almost anything would be better than that property as it stands.

Please deny this nomination and help improve our cities infrastructure, aesthetic, and ability to achieve progress. Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Collins

900 N Orange Grove Ave. #2

Los Angeles, CA 90046

Please Decline the Historic Nomination of 1848 S Gramercy

harlan allen <beembosoo@gmail.com>

Sep 27, 2018 7:14 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Please Decline the Historic Nomination of 1848 S Gramercy

To Whom It May Concern:

I wrote a letter in June to The Cultural Heritage Commission giving my disapproval of 1848 S Gramercy as a historic place. I also attended the CHC hearing and spoke giving my disapproval. As I said then "I am beyond confused that a seemingly mediocre building would warrant an HCM designation. An HCM should tell a story of our city, speak to our shared values, or enshrine the legacy of a contributor. What is worth saving about this building?" I stand by those words.

I pass by this property often and I continue to think how much better served the neighborhood would be by replacing it with something new. SurveyLA passed over this property in their initial review of the city and I think they were right to do so. And clearly, The Cultural Heritage Commission voting unanimously to deny the nomination should have stopped this from even going to PLUM.

Please keep declining this and other fake historic nominations.

Respectfully,
Harlan Allen
(949) 702-5372

Please deny

Peggy and Kevin Sears <pegkevsears@gmail.com>

Sep 27, 2018 8:37 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Plum Commissioners,

This is a follow up to the letter I sent in June to the Cultural Heritage Commission. I've again looked over the nomination of 1848 S Gramercy as a Historic Cultural Monument and I have to say I agree with the unanimous decision of the Cultural Heritage Commission to deny it as such. I agree with the commission put in charge of what stays and what goes in Los Angeles and they say it goes!

This nomination if approved would just continue as a terrible waste of very valuable Los Angeles real estate and is a very deliberate attempt to halt development during our historic housing crisis. This nomination if approved would also set a dangerous precedent where SurveyLA and LA's Cultural Heritage Commission agree that this property isn't historic yet it still continues to get pushed along at city hall. By who and why? What is the end game when the owner wants it demolished and both of the major pro historic preservation entities in Los Angeles both agree it isn't worth saving?

Please continue to deny this property as historic.

Thank you,

Thank You,

Peggy Sears
900 N Orange Grove Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90046
(607)684-8348
Sent from my iPad

1848 Gramercy Please Deny

Kate Ye <kateyeyyyy@gmail.com>

Sep 28, 2018 12:38 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

To the PLUM Commissioners:

I do not feel the property at 1848 S Gramercy, Council File: 18-0330 has any significant cultural or historic value. This feels like a deliberate attempt to block development by a NIMBY centric neighborhood that has enough resources and entitlement to tell their neighbors what to do and how to live. This is a dangerous way to plan a city.

The median price for the Angelus Vista District home is now \$1.7 million dollars according to redfin.com. If we continue to allow affluent neighborhoods to halt development we will never build our way out of the historic housing crisis currently plaguing Los Angeles. Each neighborhood needs to take responsibility to help their neighbors put a roof over their head and should be less concerned with what a neighbor decides to do with their own property. We have enough old homes, we don't have enough places to live. Thank you for your consideration.

Kate Ye

1000 Hancock Ave

West Hollywood, CA 90069

1848 Gramercy Please Deny

Kate Ye <kateyeyyyy@gmail.com>

Sep 28, 2018 12:38 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

To the PLUM Commissioners:

I do not feel the property at 1848 S Gramercy, Council File: 18-0330 has any significant cultural or historic value. This feels like a deliberate attempt to block development by a NIMBY centric neighborhood that has enough resources and entitlement to tell their neighbors what to do and how to live. This is a dangerous way to plan a city.

The median price for the Angelus Vista District home is now \$1.7 million dollars according to redfin.com. If we continue to allow affluent neighborhoods to halt development we will never build our way out of the historic housing crisis currently plaguing Los Angeles. Each neighborhood needs to take responsibility to help their neighbors put a roof over their head and should be less concerned with what a neighbor decides to do with their own property. We have enough old homes, we don't have enough places to live. Thank you for your consideration.

Kate Ye

1000 Hancock Ave

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Claudia Baticele <claudiabaticele@gmail.com>

Sep 28, 2018 1:26 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear PLUM Staff:

This is I believe my second letter giving my disapproval of the property at 1848 S Gramercy as a Historic-Cultural Monument. As stated in my letter to the Historic Preservation Commission I believe the nomination of 1848 S Gramercy is an attempt by "Not-In-My-Backyard (NIMBY)" folks to block housing. The property isn't worth saving by Survey LA's standards -- and it didn't occur to any of the neighborhood leaders to bother saving it until it was slated for development. I find that highly suspicious.

Do not let 1848 Gramercy be a victory for the NIMBY movement. Please deny this HCM and help bring new, much-needed homes to LA.

Thank you for your consideration and service to Los Angeles.

Claudia Baticele
8360 Clinton Ave
W. Hollywood 90046

V Weathersby <msladyvw@gmail.com>

Sep 28, 2018 4:49 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear PLUM Commissioners and Staff,

I am writing again in opposition of 1848 S Gramercy being turned into a historic site. We are in the middle of a historic housing crisis and to sum up my letter to the CHC in June of this year there is no historic merit to this very neglected property. It is an eyesore, borderline embarrassment to the neighborhood, and I do not believe that the age of construction should be the sole reason this property is blocked from being redeveloped. Doing so will ensure Los Angeles' current housing crisis keeps getting worse.

Thank you for your consideration and service to Los Angeles

V. Weathersby
1672 North Western Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90027