



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: ENV-2019-930-CE

Project Address: 738 S. Normandie Ave.

Final Date to Appeal: 01/21/2020

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): Carolyn Zanelli

Company: _____

Mailing Address: 745 S. Normandie Ave. Apt. 601

City: Los Angeles

State: CA

Zip: 90005

Telephone: (310) 990-1628

E-mail: carolynzanelli@gmail.com

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

☐ Self

☒ Other: Save our Normandie Mariposa Historic District

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

3. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION

Representative/Agent name (if applicable): _____

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

CEQA

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
- How you are aggrieved by the decision
- Specifically the points at issue
- 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: 01-20-2020

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	Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner): Sarahi Ortega	Date: 1/21/19
Receipt No: 010-814-2532	Deemed Complete by (Project Planner):	Date:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Determination authority notified		<input type="checkbox"/> Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)

January 20, 2020

Carolyn Zanelli, Save our Normandie Mariposa Historic District
745 S. Normandie Ave., Apt. 601
Los Angeles, CA 90005

Los Angeles City Council
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, Ca 90012

Re: CEQA appeal of Case No. ENV-2019-930-CE; 738 S. Normandie Ave.

The 1994 Historical Assessment of the Normandie-Mariposa Historical Apartment District states: *"The overall design plan of these two streets displays a uniformity of mass while allowing a unique composition for each individual building. The building designs range stylistically from Art Deco to Classical Revival. As a district they maintain similar height, width and density, which help create a natural and clearly evident boundary."*

The proposed 80-foot-tall development approved by the Director of Planning conflicts with this uniformity and threatens the historical significance of the entire district. The proposed development features a faux historic facade that mixes bad architecture with brick veneer. The design is overall contemporary, ignoring the architectural consistency of surrounding buildings whose key contributing elements of window design, fire escapes, turrets and detailing displays a cohesion and symmetry which the proposed development will destroy.

As noted in the project's Historical Resource Assessment Report, *"the contributing buildings vary in size but are generally consistent in scale, massing, and setbacks..."* The proposed 7-story, 80-foot-tall project counters this consistency.

CEQA Guidelines provide that no project can be found categorically exempt where substantial evidence supports a fair argument that (1) the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would be significant (Guidelines § 15300.2(b)), or (2) the project may cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (Guidelines § 15300.2(f).) Here, the project would result in a radical architectural deviation from the consistency of a historic resource: the Normandie-Mariposa Historical Apartment District. In addition, the failure of the City to examine the potential mitigation of these environmental impacts violated the relevant zoning regulations.

Section 21084.1 of CEQA provides that "A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." CEQA Guidelines explicitly recognizes the importance of historical resources by providing that "A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource." (Guidelines, § 15300.2(f).)



Photo of 715 S. Normandie Ave. (former residence of Ronald Reagan).



Photo of Project block, showing uniformity of architecture of the District.



Rendering of the proposed project, showing its contemporary windows, modern balconies, and overwhelming height that are inconsistent with the character defining features of the District.

As noted by the 1994 Historical Assessment of the Normandie-Mariposa Historical Apartment District, "The cohesion of these blocks emerges from the fact that most of the buildings were constructed in a four-year period beginning in 1924." The design of the proposed project in no manner reflects this time period, instead, as stated in the developer's application materials, offering a modern building that "will be differentiated from the old by its contemporary design, including large floor-to-ceiling windows."

As noted in the developer's report, "the project site is flanked to the north, south, and east by district contributors." These buildings range in height from 3 to five stories, not the 7 stories proposed by the developer, topped by another level for the protruding elevator shaft and rooftop amenities. At 80 feet, the contemporary project establishes precedent that other developers will follow in the Normandie-Mariposa Historical Apartment District.

Viewed in isolation, the construction of one badly designed apartment building may not appear important. But, through the blind application of Class 32 exemptions to similarly contemporary structures, the cumulative impacts begin to take on a weightier significance. At what point does the wholesale disregard of a species of architecture emblematic of the City of Los Angeles give rise to a level of significance?



Photo showing buildings located adjacent to the project site.

The proposed project would permanently alter a significant historic resource. As noted, Public Resource Code Section 21084.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states: "A

project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." The design of the project will therefore cause substantial environmental damage.

For the foregoing reasons, we request that the City Council recognize the importance of retaining Koreatown's significant cultural and architectural history by reversing the project's approvals. To do so will preserve one of the many key architectural and cultural treasures that make Los Angeles such a unique and special place to live.

