



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

PLUM 2/5/19 - Item 5 - File# 18-0412

1 message

The SEO Doctors <theseodoctors@gmail.com>
To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org

Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 7:59 PM

Hollywood Montecito gets another building.

It appears this project is about allowing a second building (Montecito II) to be constructed alongside the original. It will be 6 stories, in comparison to the 10-story original. I don't see a problem with this.

Korie Schmidt
(310)600-2278
TheSEODOctors@gmail.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Feb 5, 2019 PLUM Committee, Item #5, 18-0412-S1, from CD 13 City Historic Designation of the Montecito. CF 18-0412 Case Nos. CPC-2017-1503-DB-CU-SPR; AA-2017-1505-PMLA Environmental No. ENV-2017-1504-SCEA

njjonz@gmail.com <njjonz@gmail.com>

Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 10:58 PM

To: councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.smith@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

The correct decision is to REJECT the report from the Dept. of City Planning (DCP).

The Montecito was nominated by the highly-respected Art Deco Society of Los Angeles for local landmark designation. Their nomination included ALL parcels. The Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) unanimously approved their nomination.

However, CD 13 defied the standard protocols of the CHC and rejected their unanimous decision to include ALL parcels in the local landmark designation of the subject property. CD 13 supported local designation of only the 10-story structure, and excluded the other parcels.

The CHC said it was "unheard of" to not include ALL parcels that are already included in the National Register of Historic Places designation.

Furthermore, the Montecito parcels are located atop an ACTIVE earthquake fault line. This project must be denied based upon this FACT alone.

Contact the California State Geologist:

John G. Parrish, Ph.D.
Office of the State Geologist
California Geological Survey
801 K Street, MS 12-30
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-1825
Fax: (916) 445-5718
Email: cgshq@consrv.ca.gov

Sincerely,

Normajean Jonz
Stakeholder



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

The Montecito, CHC-2018-3233-HCM; ENV-2018-3234-CE; Council File 18-0412-S1

D. Stewart Farquhar <dstewartfarquhar@hotmail.com>

Tue, Feb 5, 2019 at 4:45 AM

To: "Sharon.Dickinson@LACity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, "Patrice.Lattimore@LACity.org" <Patrice.Lattimore@lacity.org>, "Clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org" <Clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>, "CityClerk@LACity.org" <CityClerk@lacity.org>

Cc: "mike.n.feuer@lacity.org" <mike.n.feuer@lacity.org>, "vince.bertoni@lacity.org" <vince.bertoni@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, "councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org" <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org" <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>, "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>, "councilmember.smith@lacity.org" <councilmember.smith@lacity.org>, "Craig.Bullock@LACity.org" <Craig.Bullock@lacity.org>, "Emma.Howard@LACity.org" <Emma.Howard@lacity.org>

Dear Ms Dickinson, Ms Lattimore and Ms Wolcott:

This is a re-submission of a timely emailed file of 2/4/19.

I was advised that the PDF file came through incomplete.

At the request of both Montecito and Neighborhood Residents, I am forwarding their letters to you as an attached PDF file.

Many are at risk seniors who either do not have internet access or who are unfamiliar with how to contact city government.

The suggest that that they be contacted if there any questions about the concerns they have raised.

In light of recent events, they have asked that their letters of support for **The Montecito Property** be reviewed by the Plum Committee before any final determination is made on this case.

They express deep concern that, as seniors, they are being ignored or at minimum marginalized as insignificant.

Please enter the attach PDF file of letters into the record for this case on their behalf.

Please ensure that Councilmember staff make these concerns available to the PLUM Committee members directly.

Thank You.

Sincerely,

Stewart

D. Stewart Farquhar

 **PLUM - Signed - Submitted 2-5-19.pdf**
4090K

02/02/2019

Clerk.PlumCommittee@LaCity.org

CityClerk@LACity.org

TO: PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

VIA EMAIL

RE: 2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, **CF 18-0412-S1**, from CD 13
City Historic Designation of the Montecito. **CF 18-0412**
Case Nos. **CPC-2017-1503-DB-CU-SPR; AA-2017-1505-PMLA**
Environmental No. **ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Honorable **PLUM** Committee Members:

I ask that you **REJECT** this inaccurate report from the Dept. of City Planning (DCP). It is incumbent on this PLUM to correct the previous PLUM decision on the Historical Designation of the Montecito Property 18-0412-S1. At this meeting it is time to introduce and pass an amendment to reflect the established National / State boundaries of this historic monument.

This is an opportunity for the City to mirror the National and State Designations that have been in effect for over a third of a century. The Montecito Property, a unique part of Hollywood History, is on many tour bus routes. To attach a carbuncle to a well-preserved historic building is borderline cultural heresy.

A simple review of the extant Public Record demonstrates that the whole property was honored by both California and Federal agencies. All the significant cultural contributions and property descriptions are clearly detailed on the State and Federal Nomination Form (See enclosed Nation Register Document).

Now is the time to vote to correct past mistakes. Given this committee's past legal concerns, a vote to continue with a referral to the Cultural Heritage Commission, whose job it is to correct exactly what is missing in this premature SCEA, is the more politically prudent decision. If you follow this course it will aid to restore your stewardship of the public trust.

Please don't make Los Angeles look any more foolish than some self-serving interests already have.

In this time of heightened scrutiny, a correct, informed decision benefits everyone.

Sincerely,



D. Stewart Farquhar

CC: Via Email
Mike Feuer
Vince Bertoni
Ken Bernstein
Lambert Geissinger
City News Service
Los Angeles PLUM Committee

D. S. Farquhar

Page 1 of 1

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: 2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412, from CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

At this time, you must **REJECT** the above case because it is incomplete. You should not make a decision based on poor information. That could cause you a lot of problems.

It's reasonable that you use the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) to do what it is supposed to do. You should not take on the unnecessary liability for what the CHC should have been tasked to do.

It seems that there's some direction you need to give the Department of City Planning (DCP) because the CHC should have been utilized in this matter and it was not. Who better than the CHC to give an informed definition of what the Historic property consists of?

Please **DELAY** your decision on this project until you've had the CHC give its opinion to you.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Larsen

Friends of the Montecito

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

At this time, you must **REJECT** the above case because it is incomplete. You should not make a decision based on poor information. That could cause you a lot of problems.

It's reasonable that you use the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) to do what it is supposed to do. You should not take on the unnecessary liability for what the CHC should have been tasked to do.

It seems that there's some direction you need to give the Department of City Planning (DCP) because the CHC should have been utilized in this matter and it was not. Who better than the CHC to give an informed definition of what the Historic property consists of?

Please **DELAY** your decision on this project until you've had the CHC give its opinion to you.

Sincerely,

Richard Havens

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 405

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: 2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412, from CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

I urge you to **REJECT** this case at the upcoming hearing. Based on what you have received, you lack sufficient facts to make a prudent decision. You must protect yourself and the City.

Instead, you need to grant a **CONTINUANCE** while you forward this case to the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC). You need to have these City-appointed experts clarify the garbled information from the Department of City Planning (DCP) on the definition of what constitutes the Historical property.

It is a matter of Public Record that the whole property was honored by both the Federal and State agencies since 1985. The facts are well-known that it's more than just the building that's designated. Unfortunately, a prior misguided PLUM decision several months ago could easily come back to bite you. That's why you need the CHC clarification.

Please do what's right for all concerned: grant a **CONTINUANCE** and **FORWARD** this case to CHC.

Sincerely,

Rochelle Lesinsky

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 102

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412, from CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

This case is incomplete. It should be **CONTINUED** so that you can have appropriate technical guidance that was missing from the Dept. of City Planning (DCP).

The issue is the proper definition of what is covered in the Historical Designation that's been in effect for a third of a century. DCP should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC.

I ask you to do proper due diligence: **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED** as it goes before the CHC.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Law

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 704

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: 2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412, from CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

At this time you must **REJECT** the above case because it is incomplete. You should not make a decision based on such poor information.

Why are you being rushed into a decision on such a serious, complex case with only one full business day to review the file?

How could you consider approving something that will be a public health and safety issue both during and after proposed construction? How can you turn a blind eye to the permanent impairment of a National/ State Historic Designated property, honored for over a third of a century?

How can you let the Dept. of City Planning (DCP) substitute itself for the expertise of the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and its mandate in this case?

How can you let this project be built on top of two identified fault lines with no required setback?

Note: the new building 300 feet to the west, at Franklin and Highland, was required to be set back because of the same faults. Remember, this proposed construction is in a liquefaction zone.

The property is already denser than allowed. Yet DCP is ready to permit even more density for low income seniors, many with mobility issues and various health concerns, including PTSD.

This case is a can of worms. **REJECT** it. Or, return it to DCP to do the job it was supposed to do and didn't.

Sincerely,

Kevin Kelly

Montecito Apt 305

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from **CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

Do things the right way, please. This incomplete case should be **CONTINUED** so that you can have appropriate technical guidance that was missing from the Dept. of City Planning (DCP).

For example, look at the proper definition of what is covered in the Historical Designation that's been in effect since 1985. DCP should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC.

I ask you to do proper due diligence: **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED** as it goes before the CHC.

Sincerely,

Steve Sambol

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 402

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from **CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

This incomplete case should NOT be decided just yet. How could you, in good conscience ? It should be **CONTINUED** so that you can have appropriate technical guidance that was missing from the Dept. of City Planning (DCP).

A case in point is the issue of the proper definition of what is covered in the Historical Designation that's been in effect for a third of a century. DCP should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC.

I ask you to do proper due diligence: **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED** as it goes before the CHC.

Sincerely,

Emil Sztucinski

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 506

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: 2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412, from CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

At this time you must **REJECT** the above case because it is incomplete. You should not make a decision based on such poor information.

Why are you being rushed into a decision on such a serious, complex case with only one full business day to review the file?

How could you consider approving something that will be a public health and safety issue both during and after proposed construction? How can you turn a blind eye to the permanent impairment of a National/ State Historic Designated property, honored for over a third of a century?

How can you let the Dept. of City Planning (DCP) substitute itself for the expertise of the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and its mandate in this case?

How can you let this project be built on top of two identified fault lines with no required setback?

Note: the new building 300 feet to the west, at Franklin and Highland, was required to be set back because of the same faults. Remember, this proposed construction is in a liquefaction zone.

The property is already denser than allowed. Yet DCP is ready to permit even more density for low income seniors, many with mobility issues and various health concerns, including PTSD.

This case is a can of worms. **REJECT** it. Or, return it to DCP to do the job it was supposed to do and didn't.

Sincerely,

Kevin Kelly

Montecito Apt 305

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from **CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

This case should be **CONTINUED** because you are missing too much information. You have had only one full business day to look at the material. Your decision could affect Hollywood for centuries.

A big issue is the proper definition of what is covered in the Historical Designation that's been in effect for a third of a century. The Department of City Planning (DCP) should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC.

There are other issues that haven't been properly addressed: two earthquake fault lines running through the proposed construction; being in a liquefaction zone; the probability of de-stabilizing the 10-story building while excavating less than 15 ft. from its deep double basement ; endangering the health and safety of the 120 senior citizens trapped in the middle of a construction site, with two of their three building exits blocked , and no on-site parking for two years.

I ask you to **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED** as it goes before the CHC, and perhaps the Department of Senior/Low Income Housing.

Sincerely,

Inna Shvartsur

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 602

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from **CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

This case has a number of serious issues that have been swept under the rug. You should grant a **CONTINUANCE** so that you can get appropriate technical guidance. You and your staff also need more than one full business day to examine the 500 pages of material. In addition, you need to take seriously the lives of the people jeopardized by this ill-conceived project and consider their input.

The Department of City Planning (DCP) has demonstrated a bad habit of taking too much authority where it shouldn't and producing too few results in actual areas of its responsibilities. For example, the issue of the proper definition of what is covered in an Historical Designation that's been in effect for a third of a century. DCP should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC. It is not the job of DCP to claim that authority.

On the other hand, it seems reasonable that DCP should be looking out of the health and safety of those who would be forced to live in the middle of a construction site for a prolonged period of two plus years. We have looked and can't find that concern. We also haven't found genuine concern for the Historical richness of the Montecito and its protection for future generations to enjoy.

I ask you to **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED**

Sincerely,

Dennis Luna

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 808

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from **CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

How can you expect to vote on this complex, life-altering, project when you and your staff have had the 500 page package and maybe 200 pages of letters AGAINST the project just one full business day?

This case cries out for a CONTINUANCE. Let me give you an example of the damage done by trying to ram this project through, which the Dept. of City Planning (DCP) seems intent on doing.

Take the issue of the proper definition of what is covered in the Historical Designation that's been in effect for a third of a century. DCP should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC.

Why should City laws set up to protect our historical resources be abandoned or silently killed?

There are a host of problems with this poorly -conceived project. Take your pick: earthquake fault lines purposely placed under human habitation, seniors denied a safe and healthy living environment, overcrowding on a small plot of land, creation of hazardous conditions in the neighborhood, etc.

I ask you to do proper due diligence: **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED** as it goes before the CHC and, perhaps, get a review from the California Office of Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA).

Sincerely,

Audrey Forgach

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 106

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from **CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

It would be prudent of you, in the atmosphere surrounding City Hall, that you grant a **CONTINUANCE** of this project's PLUM Hearing. Otherwise, you may be suspected of railroading the project for friends.

This project actually deserves to be REJECTED. It does not achieve "affordable housing", because the small plot, already brimming with residents, presents a difficult terrain, 2 earthquake faults, a liquefaction zone, and a National /State Historic Designation for the entire property. It costs more money, time, and effort than it's worth to "fix" such unsuitable property for over-development.

"Mitigation", a term frequently used by the Dept. of City Planning (DCP), is far more complicated than DCP indicates. Further, some things can't be mitigated, although DCP's motto seems to be: "wishing will make it so". It doesn't work.

Keep in mind, the elderly residents, about 120 of them, would be trapped for 2 years in the middle of an active construction site. Not adjacent to the site, but right in the middle of it. There'd be no parking for 2 years. Two of the building's three exists would be blocked.

The project would become a neighborhood "problem"—especially for the adjacent Senior Center and Pre-school. Even the iconic Hollywood Bowl would be affected because of bus traffic blockage.

Too many corners have been cut. Look at the issue of the proper definition of what's covered in the Historical Designation that's been in effect for a third of a century. DCP should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC.

We demand that you do proper due diligence: **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED** as it goes before the CHC.

David Kearse

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 205

Hollywood, CA 90028

PLUM Committee, Los Angeles City Council

Clerk.PlumCommittee@lacity.org

VIA EMAIL -- February 4, 2019

RE: **2/5/19 PLUM, Item #5, CF 18-0412**, from **CD 13 – ENV-2017-1504-SCEA**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

This incomplete case should be **CONTINUED** so that you can have appropriate technical guidance that was missing from the Dept. of City Planning (DCP).

An example is the proper definition of what is covered in the Historical Designation that's been in effect for a third of a century. DCP should have gone through the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and did not. You need to **REJECT** this proposal until you get the complete information from the source that is supposed to supply it: the CHC.

I ask you to do proper due diligence: **REJECT** this project as it is before you, materially incomplete, and have it **CONTINUED** as it goes before the CHC.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Fuller

6650 Franklin Ave, Apt. 708

Hollywood, CA 90028