

MASTER APPEAL FORM

City of Los Angeles – Department of City Planning

APPEAL TO THE: L.A. City Planning Commission
(DIRECTOR, AREA PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY COUNCIL)

REGARDING CASE #: CPC-2013-1953-ZC-CU-SPR & CEQA No. ENV-2013-1954-MND

PROJECT ADDRESS: 20700-20848 ½ Nordhoff Street

FINAL DATE TO APPEAL: May 06, 2014

- TYPE OF APPEAL:**
1. Appeal by Applicant
 2. Appeal by a person, other than the applicant, claiming to be aggrieved
 3. Appeal by applicant or aggrieved person from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety

APPELLANT INFORMATION – Please print clearly

Name: Timur Tecimur, Overton Moore Properties

- Are you filing for yourself or on behalf of another party, organization or company?

Self Other: _____

Address: 19300 S. Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

Gardena, CA Zip: 90248

Telephone: (310) 354-2460 E-mail: ttecimer@omprop.com

- Are you filing to support the original applicant's position?

Yes No

REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION

Name: Timur Tecimur, Overton Moore Properties

Address: 19300 S. Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

19300 S. Hamilton Ave., Suite 200 Zip: 90248

Telephone: 310-354-2460 E-mail: ttecimer@omprop.com

CPC 2013-1953(ZC)(EW)(SPR)(IA)

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

CPC 2013-1953



April 18, 2014

City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning
Figueroa Plaza
201 North Figueroa Street, 4th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Attachment to Master Appeal Form
City of Los Angeles Planning Commission
20700-20848 ½ Nordhoff Street
Case No. CPC-2013-1953-ZC-CU-SPR
CEQA No. ENV-2013-1954-MND

Attn: City of Los Angeles Planning Commission Appeal of Decision

The reason for Appeal

Overton Moore Properties (Appellant), as the applicant, formally submits the following comments and reasons for appealing the City Planning Commission (CPC) Determination findings, dated April 16, 2014 to the above referenced Chatsworth Commerce Center. As proposed and submitted to the CPC, this project will provide much needed construction and permanent jobs, an increase to the City tax base and the development of a vacant parcel with industrial buildings and supporting retail services to the surrounding business and manufacturing community. Throughout the entitlement process and in our public and community outreach, all feedback has shown enthusiastic support for the proposed project.

The focus of this appeal is only on the retail component of the project at Lot 1. We acknowledge the CPC's comments but also want to design and develop a project that will be a success and a benefit to the community.

19300 South Hamilton, Suite 200
Gardena, California 90248
Main 310 323 9100
Fax 310 608 7997
www.omprop.com

CPC 2013-1953 (ze)(cu)
(SPR)(IA)



Appeal conditions and Appellant response

Zone Change from MR2-1 and P1-1 to (T)(Q)M2-1

CPC reduced parking from (106) spaces to (75) spaces, ***Appellant is requesting (94) spaces or a reduction of 11%.***

CPC is requesting 80% shading at the parking areas and the Landscaping Ordinance requires 50% canopy coverage. ***Appellant is providing 55% and will also provide and plant (10) 24" box Live Oak trees within Council District 3. The additional trees on-site represents a 39% increase and the additional trees in the district represents a 75% increase.***

Why we believe the decision-maker erred

The proposed parking of 106 stalls provided a parking ratio of 5.6 stalls per 1,000 square feet leased. The CPC change to 75 stalls creates a parking ratio of 3.95 stalls per 1,000 square feet leased. Our reduced parking of 94 stalls will provide a parking ration of 4.95 stalls per 1,000 square feet leased. According to parking studies conducted by the Urban Land Institute (ULI), parking for retail centers similar to the subject should have a parking ratio of 4.5 to 5.0 stalls per 1,000 square feet leased. LADBS –Summary of Parking Regulations (Revised 03-06-2013) states that parking for our proposed uses should be closer to 118 stalls based upon the proposed uses, subject to ordinances and special districts. The proposed project is in and State enterprise Zone.

The reduced parking proposed by the CPC will create parking problems and limit the success of the retail tenants. Parking is a large concern to tenants occupying centers similar to the subject property and is a major determining factor in their site selection process. These tenants make employment opportunities and contribute valuable taxes enhancing the economic and quality of life in the community.

In addition since no parking is allowed on De Soto and Nordhoff and the project is 3.4 miles away from the Orange Line, most patrons will drive to the project. If no parking is available during business hours, the patrons will simply not return to the center. The Appellant also provided additional bike racks, 8.3%% above the code requirements in the event patrons will bike to the project.



The original site plan submitted to CPC did meet the Landscape Ordinance K and O, but the tree canopy coverage of shade cover represented 40%%. The CPC also requested that we have one tree finger for every four parking stalls. This requirement is not part of the landscape ordinance but we complied with their request. As a part of the Appeal, we also modified our landscape plans that meets and exceeds the requirements of the Ordinance as outlined in Guidelines K – Vehicular Use Areas, Item 1. (a). The Ordinance requires 50% shading and the Appellant has provided a revised plan showing 55% shading.

Appellant has also agreed to provide and plant (10) Live Oak trees to parks or areas within Council District 3 as directed by Councilmember Blumenfield or CPC. These added trees will provide and exceed the CPC requested shade cover of 80%.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to call me. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Overton Moore Properties

Timur Tecimer

Cc: C. Diaz, Office of Councilmember Bob Blumenfield



April 24, 2014

Mr. Theodore L. Irving, AICP
City Planner, Expediting Processing Section
Los Angeles Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street,
City Hall, Room 721
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: City of Los Angeles Planning Commission Appeal of Decision
Case No. CPC-2013-1953-ZC-CU-SPR
CEQA No. ENV-2013-1954-MND

Mr. Irving,

Pursuant the above referenced project we are respectfully submitting an Appeal of Decision with the following documents:

8 copies	Master Application Form (1 original, 7 copies)	dated 4/22/14
8 copies	Justification Letter (1 original, 7 copies)	dated 4/18/14
8 copies	Original Determination Letter	dated 4/16/14
1 copy	BTC Mailing Fees Receipt	dated 4/21/14
8 copies	Sheet L1.1 Conceptual Tree Plan	dated 3/12/14
8 copies	Sheet L2.1 Tree Shading Plan	dated 3/12/14

We look forward to the continued opportunity to work with Staff and the City of Los Angeles on this project. I am available for any questions or comments and can be reached at (310) 354-2477 or via e-mail at MJohnson@OMProp.com should you require any further information.

Sincerely,
Overton Moore Properties

Michael Johnson