



APPLICATIONS:

APPEAL APPLICATION

This application is to be used for any appeals authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) for discretionary actions administered by the Department of City Planning.

1. APPELLANT BODY/CASE INFORMATION

Appellant Body:

☐ Area Planning Commission ☐ City Planning Commission ☒ City Council ☐ Director of Planning

Regarding Case Number: VTT-74076-1A

Project Address: 1220 - 1226 South Bedford Street, Los Angeles, CA 90035

Final Date to Appeal: 11/29/2018

Type of Appeal: ☐ Appeal by Applicant/Owner
☒ Appeal by a person, other than the Applicant/Owner, claiming to be aggrieved
☐ Appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety

2. APPELLANT INFORMATION

Appellant's name (print): Beatrice Leighton

Company: N/A

Mailing Address: 1151 South Bedford Street

City: Los Angeles

State: CA

Zip: 90035

Telephone: (310) 658-4718

E-mail: 2007beatrice@gmail.com

- Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on behalf of another party, organization or company?

☒ Self

☐ Other: _____

- Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position?

☐ Yes

☒ No

3. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION

Representative/Agent name (if applicable): N/A

Company: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____

State: _____

Zip: _____

Telephone: _____

E-mail: _____

4. JUSTIFICATION/REASON FOR APPEAL

Is the entire decision, or only parts of it being appealed? ☒ Entire ☐ Part

Are specific conditions of approval being appealed? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, list the condition number(s) here: _____

Attach a separate sheet providing your reasons for the appeal. Your reason must state:

- The reason for the appeal
- Specifically the points at issue
- How you are aggrieved by the decision
- Why you believe the decision-maker erred or abused their discretion

5. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

I certify that the statements contained in this application are complete and true:

Appellant Signature: 

Date: 11/29/18

6. FILING REQUIREMENTS/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Eight (8) sets of the following documents are required for each appeal filed (1 original and 7 duplicates):
 - Appeal Application (form CP-7769)
 - Justification/Reason for Appeal
 - Copies of Original Determination Letter
- A Filing Fee must be paid at the time of filing the appeal per LAMC Section 19.01 B.
 - Original applicants must provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) (required to calculate their 85% appeal filing fee).
- All appeals require noticing per the applicable LAMC section(s). Original Applicants must provide noticing per the LAMC, pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of the receipt.
- Appellants filing an appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety per LAMC 12.26 K are considered Original Applicants and must provide noticing per LAMC 12.26 K.7, pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of receipt.
- A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an individual on behalf of self.
- Appeals of Density Bonus cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants (must have documentation).
- Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract (TT or VTT) by the Area or City Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of said Commission.
- A CEQA document can only be appealed if a non-elected decision-making body (ZA, APC, CPC, etc.) makes a determination for a project that is not further appealable. [CA Public Resources Code ' 21151 (c)].

This Section for City Planning Staff Use Only		
Base Fee: \$89.00	Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner): Savan Goldman	Date: 11/29/2018
Receipt No: 0301142083	Deemed Complete by (Project Planner):	Date:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Determination authority notified		<input type="checkbox"/> Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)

BEATRICE LEIGHTON
1151 S. Bedford St.
Los Angeles, CA 90035

TO: CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FROM: BEATRICE LEIGHTON

DATE: NOVEMBER 29, 2018

SUBJECT: APPEAL OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 2018 DETERMINATION OF THE CENTRAL LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION DENYING THE APPEAL OF APPELLANT BEATRICE LEIGHTON AND SUSTAINING THE DETERMINATION OF THE DEPUTY ADVISORY AGENCY'S APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED CONDOMINIUM PROJECT LOCATED AT 1220-1226 SOUTH BEDFORD ST., LOS ANGELES, CA 90035 (CASE NO: VTT-74076-1A)

1. EXECUTIVE STATEMENT – REASON FOR THE APPEAL

I am a longtime resident of the Pico-Robertson community, specifically of the area bounded by Pico Boulevard to the south, Olympic Boulevard to the north, Robertson Boulevard to the west and La Cienega Boulevard to the east. I reside well within a 500-foot radius of the five story, 20-unit condominium project proposed for 1220-1226 S. Bedford St., Los Angeles (Case No. VTT-74076-1A) (the "Proposed Project"). I constitute an aggrieved person in this matter, as discussed below, and have good standing to appeal the City's September 18, 2018 approval of the Proposed Project.

I intend for this statement of reasons to become part of the Proposed Project's administrative record. I also intend for this appeal to the City of Los Angeles City Council to fulfill all obligations that I may have to fully appeal the Proposed Project administratively, and, as a result, to fully exhaust my administrative remedies prior to a possible legal challenge.

Over the last four (4) years, a multitude of large, residential projects have been entitled or otherwise authorized by the City of Los Angeles (the "City") in my immediate neighborhood. These projects have been constantly under construction (or with construction expected shortly) and have caused widespread, significant adverse environmental effects in my neighborhood. I have identified with specificity for the purposes of this appeal several of these projects and have described some of the observed adverse impacts on the neighborhood that these projects have generated (See Exhibit A which is attached to this statement).¹

These multiple projects are all being developed and constructed during the same time period. As a result, both individually and collectively, these projects have created significant, negative impacts on our neighborhood, and have degraded the quality of life for me and my family, as well as for many of my neighbors. These are not speculative concerns,

¹ Please note that my evaluation of similar projects in my immediate neighborhood is ongoing. It is highly likely that additional, similar residential projects are also being developed and/or constructed in close proximity to the Proposed Project.

nor are they to be relegated to only “anecdotal evidence.” Rather, the comments and information I present below are based on my own personal observations, as well as conversations I have had with many neighbors. Accordingly, I am able to identify and confirm with specificity many of the adverse impacts to our quality of life that have already occurred over the last four years and will almost certainly continue to occur.

Also, once completed, the individual and cumulative effects of these residential projects are, by design, causing a significant increase in the density of people living in the neighborhood, without a commensurate increase in the capacity of the City's infrastructure to accommodate these additional residents. These projects are also, both individually and collectively, leading to a major reduction of affordable, rent-stabilized rental units in the neighborhood, while increasing the stock of unaffordable condominiums and apartments. While these results may be acceptable (or even desirable) to City officials, they undoubtedly create negative impact those living next to or near the projects. Accordingly, the City is obligated to carefully weigh the costs and benefits of these projects, which flows in part from a careful evaluation of their environmental impacts. By performing the appropriate level of environmental evaluation, the City allows nearby residents to understand the individual and collective impacts of these successive, similar projects, and provide them with a real opportunity to be heard.

Unfortunately, rather than carefully evaluating the environmental impacts of these multiple projects, it appears that the City has not performed any environmental evaluation or analysis whatsoever on any of the identified projects.² By granting each project an exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), the City has failed to adhere to its obligation under CEQA to provide decision-makers and the public generally with sufficient information by which to evaluate the environmental and related impacts of these projects' individual impacts, as well as their cumulative impacts, on the surrounding neighborhood. The reality is that the City is authorizing the wholesale redevelopment of our formerly quiet, relatively-affordable, studiously religious neighborhood without an even cursory evaluation of the potentially significant environmental impacts, as required by CEQA.³

As with all of the high-density, residential projects entitled and authorized by the City in our neighborhood, the 15-unit condominium project proposed for 1220-1226 S. Bedford St., Los Angeles (Case No. TT-74076-CN) (the “Project”) has also been granted an exemption from CEQA, as set forth in the September 18, 2018 Deputy Advisory Agency approval letter (the “City's Approval”). The City's Approval has been sustained by the Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission. I believe that the City's decision to grant the Project a CEQA

² The nearby projects identified in Exhibit A are the ones that I am currently aware of within an approximately 500-foot radius of the Proposed Project. This is not an exclusive list, and it is almost certain that one or more other similar projects will fall within the same general radius that have already been entitled by the City or are in the latter stages of the planning process. The City's Planning Dept. is uniquely positioned to confirm this fact and act upon it appropriately. If confirmed, then the existence of additional projects in the same vicinity only adds to the substance of our position, namely that the cumulative impacts of these multiple, successive projects of similar type need to be thoroughly evaluated by the City prior to granting any more project entitlements.

³ I also note that the City has not updated the Wilshire Community Plan, which covers the entirety of my immediate neighborhood, for more than 17 years. Thus, there is no overarching master development plan for the environmentally sound, sustainable development in this neighborhood, nor has the City yet conducted any environmental assessment pursuant to CEQA for the update to this Plan. Accordingly, haphazard, and often ill-advised development remains the order of the day in the Wilshire Community area specifically. Based on information available from the City's website, the City will not have an updated Community Plan formalized completed for at least several more years.

exemption constitutes a legal error and prejudicial abuse of discretion, as it continues the City's harmful policy of allowing a multitude of large, environmentally impactful residential projects to overwhelm a previously quiet, family-oriented and studiously religious neighborhood, without a shred of environmental assessment.

To the contrary, based on my personal observations as to the negative effects of the various residential projects in our neighborhood, I now present to the City Council substantial evidence that the Project will foreseeably cause significant negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, both in terms of its individual impacts during the construction and operational phases, as well as its cumulative impacts due to the ongoing development and construction of multiple similar projects in the immediate vicinity.

2. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On or about September 18, 2018, the Deputy Advisory Agency (the "DAA") issued the City's Approval, despite the fact that it had received comments from the public informing the City that the Proposed Project would result in significant negative impacts to the neighborhood. Specifically, the DAA was apprised that, based on my personal observations (not anecdotes or speculation) of the construction which is occurring at the 1220-1226 S. Bedford St. property (under the 2015 entitlement for an apartment building), as well as the construction of other similar residential projects in the immediate neighborhood, that the negative impacts from the Proposed Project include:

- Loud noise from construction starting early in the morning and continuing all day, six days per week. This noise is deafening at times and has literally forced me and my neighbors to leave our home for hours at a time. The noise frequently exceeds City Code limits on noise. Unfortunately, and despite complaints personally made to the City Department of Building and Safety, nothing has ever been done to control the dangerous and intolerable noise levels.
 - On numerous occasions (including as recently as earlier this week), I have clearly heard and been disturbed by noise from more than one construction project simultaneously.
- Significant increase in large truck and construction vehicles on our street as well as all of the residential streets on our neighborhood. This vastly increased truck traffic has resulted in a variety of negative consequences for me and our neighbors, including, increased noise, increased exhaust, increased vibration, increased traffic circulation problems, blocked parking spots.
 - I have personally witnessed negative cumulative impacts from multiple construction projects, whereby traffic blockages at or near one construction site compounds traffic flow and leads to truck blockages at or near the other construction sites;
- Traffic flow on our street and our neighborhood generally has suffered from these multiple projects occurring concurrently. This is caused by, among other things, an increase in truck traffic, street closures, blockages caused by construction vehicles, and large metal debris containers placed in the street effectively narrowing the street.
 - Again, I have personally witnessed vehicular traffic being adversely impacted in my neighborhood due to the construction activities of two or more projects cumulatively.

- Vibrations caused by construction activities and from trucks and other large vehicles frequently result in my residence shaking, which substantially interferes with my ability to utilize and enjoy my residence.
- Increased dust and particulate matter from construction activities has frequently led to the deposition of this material on my car and our home, as well as the vehicles and homes throughout the neighborhood;
- Numerous street closures on Bedford Street as well as other neighboring streets have occurred over the last four years, which has led to increased traffic blockages, as well as increased noise (due to the street construction, as well as from irate motorists honking due to closures as well as temporary street blockages due to large vehicles in the street, etc.). For example, during Fall 2016, S. Bedford Street at Pico Blvd. was blocked on a daily basis for a period of more than two months due to construction of the project at 1209-1215 S. Bedford St. (which apparently included major trenching by DWP and the installation of a traffic light system at Bedford and Pico by LA Dept. of Transportation). This work represented a major inconvenience to residents, which was compounded by the City's almost complete lack of communication to residents regarding the nature and duration of the work;
- Sidewalk closures at multiple locations in the neighborhood, some lasting as much as a full year. These sidewalk closures significantly harm residents at the public generally, as they essentially prevent the free movement of pedestrians in our neighborhood. I often take my 4-year-old daughter out for a walk, and we have routinely been prevented by the various construction projects in the neighborhood from safely walking with her due to sidewalk closures that go on for months or even years. I have personally witnessed elderly and disabled people who are literally put in danger because of these sidewalk closures that require them to cross the street at locations without crosswalks, etc., or who are forced to retreat and walk around the entire long block to go to their intended destination.
 - On several occasions over the last few years, I have personally witnessed multiple sidewalk closures within a block or less of each other. I have personally witnessed elderly people, mothers with small children and disabled persons having significant trouble navigating the gauntlet of broken/closed sidewalks in my immediate neighborhood.
 - Note: Currently, there are two sidewalk blockages on S. Bedford St. within less than a block of each other due to large construction projects.
- Frequent water service interruptions and shutdowns to entire blocks of residents in our neighborhood occur to service these private developers, without any warning being provided by the City. These shutdowns are at best highly inconvenient, and also cause damage to household piping and appliances;
- Substantial loss of street parking has occurred in an already very crowded neighborhood. From personal observation, I have seen our neighborhood become very difficult to park in, at least in part due to the multitude of construction projects. Each of these projects typically eliminate from 2-6 parking spaces for up to 2 years; with the observed cumulative effect that the neighborhood has increasingly suffered from a paucity of available street parking.
- Changing the character of the neighborhood without appropriate City design oversight, leading to the construction of oversized, box buildings with no desirable architectural or aesthetic features.

3. CITY FAILURE TO EVALUATE THE PROJECT'S CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH NUMEROUS NEARBY PROJECTS UNDER DEVELOPMENT VIOLATES CEQA AND CONSTITUTES ABUSE OF DISCRETION

CEQA is codified at California Public Resources Code §21000 et seq. Section 21084 of the Public Resources Code requires that the State of California provide a list of classes of projects which have been determined generally not to have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, are exempt from the provisions of CEQA.

The so-called CEQA Guidelines (found at Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, §15300 et seq. - the "Guidelines"), in fact, have the force of mandatory regulation. The Guidelines set forth a number of specific classes of projects that are generally exempt from CEQA. For the Proposed Project, as with other projects in our neighborhood, the City's Approval relies exemption set forth in § 15332. Section 15332 allows for an "In-fill development project" to be determined to be exempt from CEQA, as long as: a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations, (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses, (c) The project site has no value, as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species, (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality, and (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

While the City's Approval attempts to make these findings to support the Proposed Project, its analysis is completely conclusory and without any substantive facts or analysis. In particular, it is beyond dispute that the City has failed to make the finding required by § 15332(d), which requires that approval of the Proposed Project by the City "would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality." My personal observations, which I have incorporated in this appeal, constitute substantial evidence that there have been, and continue to be, significant negative impacts from a multitude of similar, successive projects in the vicinity (see Exhibit A). My direct observation are uncontroverted by anything set forth in the administrative record of the Proposed Project, including in the City's Approval. To the contrary, by its very nature, the City's choice to apply a categorical exemption to this case means that it did not perform any tangible environmental assessment of the Proposed Project's impacts.

Further, the City Approval fails to address adequately the inapplicability of the exception to an application of a CEQA categorical exemption as set forth in § 15300.2(d). Specifically, this provision states that a CEQA exemption based on in-fill development (or any other categorical exemption) is "inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant." Rather, the City Approval merely states that the Proposed Project "would not create a significant cumulative impact on the environment nor are any unusual circumstances anticipated, given that the project will be required to adhere to all applicable building codes and regulated construction methods."

First, this self-serving statement by the City is entirely conclusory and is not backed up or supported by any facts or evidence. To the contrary, I have personally witnessed the impacts of multiple construction projects in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project, and have set forth facts herein that provide substantial evidence of significant adverse impacts from these projects, both individually and cumulatively.

Even assuming for argument's sake that these various projects all completely adhered to "applicable building codes and regulated construction methods," the City's argument is

legally irrelevant as full compliance with law does not obviate the need under CEQA to assess cumulative environmental impacts, if there is substantial evidence that significant impacts may result. To the contrary, CEQA can require the evaluation of cumulative impacts even when the projects being assessed all operate within fully legal parameters.

Also, the reality is that City enforcement of these projects has been extremely weak and uneven. I have personally called City inspectors on multiple occasions regarding a variety of illegal and non-compliant activities undertaken by developers in the neighborhood (particularly relating to the ghastly project constructed at 1209-1215 S. Bedford St.). It was only after receiving our complaints that the City inspectors actually went out to the site and actively enforced the Code. I have no confidence, based on the City's performance in the neighborhood, that the Proposed Project will in actuality be constructed in a manner that fully complies with applicable standards (in particular related to noise, dust, vibration, safety, traffic, etc.).

I contend that the City is in possession of substantial evidence that there is a high probability that the Proposed Project's cumulative impacts is significant, when evaluated in light of other projects of the same basic type (all multi-unit residential) in the same place (the neighborhood bounded by Pico the South, Olympic to the North, Robertson to the East and La Cienega to the West), over time. The evidence that I am presenting in my appeal generates a "fair argument" that the City must require, at a minimum, that the Proposed Project be fully evaluated pursuant to CEQA. To do otherwise constitutes legal error and prejudicial abuse of discretion, and will subject the City to judicial scrutiny and reversal.

4. APPELLANT HAS BEEN AGGRIEVED AND REMEDY REQUESTED

I have been aggrieved personally in light of the numerous negative impacts caused by the multitude of large residential construction projects that have been allowed to go forward by the City, without any environmental assessment and analysis as required by CEQA. My quality of life has been degraded due to the City's inadequate assessment and oversight of these projects. Allowing the Proposed Project to obtain its requested entitlement, without requiring substantive CEQA compliance, will compound and exacerbate these many negative quality of life impacts.

I request that the City Council remand this matter back to the Deputy Advisory Agency, in order that the Project undergo environmental assessment, particularly in regard to its cumulative impacts, as required by CEQA. By this appeal, I intend to exhaust my administrative remedies pursuant to the City's appeal procedures, and reserve my right to timely seek judicial scrutiny of the City's decision making in this matter, pursuant to applicable state law.

EXHIBIT A

TABLE 1

SUCCESSIVE, SIMILAR MULTI-UNIT APARTMENT OR CONDO PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED OR UNDER CONSTRUCTION WITHIN A COUPLE OF BLOCKS OF EACH OTHER OVER THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS

NOTE: THIS REPRESENTS A NON-EXCLUSIVE LIST OF RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS IN THE IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORHOOD.

ADDRESS	ENTITLEMENT	APPROVAL DATE	STATUS (OBSERVED IMPACTS TO NEIGHBORHOOD)
1220-1226 S. SHENANDOAH ST.	DIRECTOR'S DETERMINATION FOR DENSITY BONUS ON-THE-MENU FILING TO DEVELOP A 21 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT	NOVEMBER 2015 (APARTMENT BUILDING)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• MULTIPLE TENANTS FORCED OUT OF FORMERLY RESTABILIZED, AFFORDABLE UNITS• CONSTRUCTION ONGOING FOR APARTMENT BUILDING ENTITLED IN 2015• OBSERVED NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO NEIGHBORHOOD DURING CONSTRUCTION PHASE INCLUDE:• SUSTAINED LOUD NOISE FOR 6 DAYS PER WEEK FOR A PERIOD MORE THAN 2 YEARS,• SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN TRUCK TRAFFIC, REGULAR IDLING TRUCKS CAUSING SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN AIR POLLUTION,• VIBRATION FROM ACTIVE CONSTRUCTION SHAKING NEARBY RESIDENCES AND CAUSING DUST TO MIGRATE OFFSITE• NUMEROUS BLOCKAGES TO TRAFFIC DIRECTLY OBSERVED DUE TO ONGOING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES CAUSING TRAFFIC TO SIGNIFICANTLY BACK UP,

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIDEWALK BROKEN AND EFFECTIVELY CLOSED FOR MUCH OF THE DAY, • LOSS OF SEVERAL STREET PARKING SPOTS FOR HAS CONTRIBUTED TO A SHORTAGE OF STREET PARKING FOR RESIDENTS AND GUESTS • CUMULATIVE IMPACTS DIRECTLY OBSERVED FROM THIS AND OTHER SIMILAR PROJECTS IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD, INCLUDING EXCACERBATING NOISE AND TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN NEIGHBORHOOD.
1209-1215 S. BEDFORD ST.	<p>VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 21 UNIT CONDOMINIUM W/ DENSITY BONUS</p> <p>(NOTE: APPARENTLY SWITCHED TO AN APARTMENT BUILDING POST-APPROVAL)</p>	<p>MAY 2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MODERATE INCOME TENANTS KICKED OUT OF FORMERLY RENT STABILIZED, AFFORDABLE UNITS ON 2 ADJACENT PARCELS IN EARLY 2014; • PROJECT TOK MORE THAN 2 YEARS TO BUILD WITH ALMOST CONSTANT NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON NEIGHBORS; • UGLY 5-STORY, GREY BOX STRUCTURE TOWERS OVER NEIGHBORHOOD (MOSTLY 2-STORY BUILDINGS); • ADVERSE IMPACTS TO NEIGHBORHOOD WERE ENORMOUS AND CONSTANT, INCLUDING, SUSTAINED LOUD NOISE FOR UP TO 12 HOURS PER DAY, 6 DAYS PER WEEK FOR MORE THAN 2 YEARS, • A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN TRUCK TRAFFIC, REGULAR IDLING TRUCKS CAUSING SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN AIR POLLUTION,

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VIBRATIONS SHAKING NEARBY RESIDENCES, • DUST REGULARLY OBSERVED TO HAVE MIGRATED OFFSITE • NUMEROUS AND LONG LASTING STREET AND SIDEWALK CLOSURES FOR MANY MONTHS ON END, • CONSTRUCTION WORKERS LOITERING IN FRONT OF RESIDENCES, • REGULAR WATER SERVICE INTERRUPTIONS, • LOSS OF PARKING SPOTS ON STREET FOR 2+ YEARS, • LARGE DEBRIS BIN PLACED ON STREET FOR 18 MONTHS CAUSING TRAFFIC FLOW PROBLEMS DAILY; • CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OBSERVED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER SIMILAR PROJECTS IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD, INCLUDING EXCERBATING NOISE AND TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN NEIGHBORHOOD.
1064-1070 S. BEDFORD ST.	<p>NOTE: NATURE OF ENTITLEMENT UNCLEAR – NO INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON ZIMAS</p> <p>CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION</p>	<p>UNCERTAIN</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FORMER TENANTS HAVE BEEN KICKED OUT OF FORMERLY RENT STABILIZED, AFFORDABLE UNITS ON TWO ADJACENT PARCELS. • LARGE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT UNDERWAY SINCE FALL 2016 ON TWO ADJACENT LOTS. • CURRENTLY DEMOLITION AND EXCAVATION HAS BEEN COMPLETED – SITE UNDERWENT ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, WITH SOIL VAPOR EXTRACTION VESSELS OBSERVED TO BE IN PLACE AT SITE AND

				<p>DISCHARGE TO ADJACENT STORMWATER DRAIN OBSERVED;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIGNIFICANT DISRUPTION TO NEIGHBORHOOD ALREADY EXPERIENCED, INCLUDING STREET BLOCKAGES, MAJOR INCREASE IN LARGE TRUCK TRAFFIC ON ALREADY CROWDED, NARROW RESIDENTIAL STREETS. • OBSERVED NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO NEIGHBORHOOD INCLUDE, SUSTAINED LOUD NOISE 6 DAYS PER WEEK FOR MORE THAN 2 YEARS, • A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN TRUCK TRAFFIC, • REGULAR IDLING TRUCKS CAUSING SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN AIR POLLUTION, • VIBRATIONS SHAKING NEARBY RESIDENCES, • DUST AND DEBRIS OBSERVED TO REGULARLY MIGRATE OFFSITE • NUMEROUS AND LONG LASTING STREET AND SIDEWALK CLOSURES, • CONSTRUCTION WORKERS LOITERING IN FRONT OF RESIDENCES, • REGULAR WATER SERVICE INTERRUPTIONS, • LOSS OF PARKING SPOTS ON STREET LEADING TO SEVERE SHORTAGE OF PARKING FOR RESIDENTS AND GUESTS • POOR CONSTRUCTION HOUSEKEEPING PRACTICES HAVE BEEN OBSERVED AT THIS SITE, INCLUDING LEAVING GATE WIDE OPEN OVER THE WEEKEND, WITH A LARGE PIT ACCESSIBLE TO ANYONE – POSED A
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>POTENTIAL HAZARD TO CHILDREN!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OBSERVED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER SIMILAR PROJECTS IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD, INCLUDING EXCACERBATING NOISE AND TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN NEIGHBORHOOD.
<p>1128 S. SHENANDOAH ST.</p>	<p>NEW 6-UNIT CONDO PROJECT WITHIN 4-STORY BUILDING</p>	<p>FEBRUARY 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FORMER TENANTS HAVE BEEN KICKED OUT OF FORMERLY RENT STABILIZED, AFFORDABLE UNITS; • CONSTRUCTION PROJECT UNDERWAY – SIGNIFICANT, DAILY NOISE DIRECTLY OBSERVED AND EXPERIENCED • SIGNIFICANT DISRUPTION TO NEIGHBORHOOD ALREADY EXPERIENCED, • STREET BLOCKAGES DUE TO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY, • MAJOR INCREASE IN LARGE TRUCK TRAFFIC ON ALREADY CROWDED, NARROW RESIDENTIAL STREETS. • SUSTAINED LOUD NOISE 6 DAYS PER WEEK FOR MORE THAN 2 YEARS, A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN TRUCK TRAFFIC, • REGULAR IDLING TRUCKS CAUSING SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN AIR POLLUTION, • VIBRATIONS SHAKING NEARBY RESIDENCES, • DUST AND DEBRIS DIRECTLY OBSERVED TO REGULARLY MIGRATE OFFSITE

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STREET AND SIDEWALK CLOSURES, • LOSS OF PARKING SPOTS ON STREET LEADING TO SEVERE SHORTAGE OF STREET PARKING FOR RESIDENTS AND GUESTS • SIDEWALK IN FRONT OF THIS PROJECT OBSERVED TO BE CLOSED TO PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC FOR LONG PERIODS OF TIME • CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OBSERVED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER SIMILAR PROJECTS IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD, INCLUDING EXACERBATING NOISE AND TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN NEIGHBORHOOD.
1063 W. WOOSTER	NOTE: NATURE OF ENTITLEMENT UNCERTAIN– NO INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON ZIMAS	UNCERTAIN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FORMER TENANTS HAVE BEEN KICKED OUT OF FORMERLY RENT STABILIZED, AFFORDABLE UNITS; • CONSTRUCTION PROJECT UNDERWAY – SIGNIFICANT, DAILY NOISE DIRECTLY OBSERVED AND EXPERIENCED • SIGNIFICANT DISRUPTION TO NEIGHBORHOOD ALREADY EXPERIENCED, • STREET BLOCKAGES DUE TO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY, • MAJOR INCREASE IN LARGE TRUCK TRAFFIC ON ALREADY CROWDED, NARROW RESIDENTIAL STREETS. • SUSTAINED LOUD NOISE 6 DAYS PER WEEK FOR MORE THAN 2 YEARS, A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN TRUCK TRAFFIC, • REGULAR IDLING TRUCKS CAUSING SIGNIFICANT

			<p>INCREASE IN AIR POLLUTION,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VIBRATIONS SHAKING NEARBY RESIDENCES, • DUST AND DEBRIS DIRECTLY OBSERVED TO REGULARLY MIGRATE OFFSITE • STREET AND SIDEWALK CLOSURES, • LOSS OF PARKING SPOTS ON STREET LEADING TO SEVERE SHORTAGE OF STREET PARKING FOR RESIDENTS AND GUESTS • CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OBSERVED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER SIMILAR PROJECTS IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD, INCLUDING EXCACERBATING NOISE AND TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN NEIGHBORHOOD.
<p>1123-1129 SHENANDOAH ST.</p>	<p>15 UNIT CONDOMINIUM PROJECT - VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP</p>	<p>ENTITLEMENT GRANTED IN 2016</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CONSTRUCTION TO COMMENCE SOON • FORMER TENANTS HAVE BEEN KICKED OUT OF FORMERLY RENT STABILIZED, AFFORDABLE UNITS; • ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS TO NEIGHBORHOOD IS ANTICIPATED TO BE SIMILAR TO THOSE DIRECTLY OBSERVED AND DESSCRIBED ABOVE.