

**MASTER APPEAL FORM**

Text

City of Los Angeles – Department of City Planning

APPEAL TO THE: City Council  
(DIRECTOR, AREA PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY COUNCIL)

REGARDING CASE #: ~~DIR-2014-668-SPP-SPPA-2A~~ CEQA ENV - 2014.887.mnd

PROJECT ADDRESS: 12833-12835 West Ventura Blvd., 4218-4230 Coldwater Canyon

FINAL DATE TO APPEAL: N/A

- 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: Andrea Sher

- Are you filing for yourself or on behalf of another party, organization or company?  
 Self       Other: Many SC Stakeholders Against Landing Project

Address: 4019 Goodland Ave.

Studio City, CA      Zip: 91604

Telephone: 818-763-3634      E-mail: ma.sher27@gmail.com

- Are you filing to support the original applicant's position?  
 Yes       No

**REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

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.



Justification of Appeal to the City Council

RE:DIR-2014-886-SPP-SPPA-2A

12833-12835 West Ventura Blvd./4218-4230 North Coldwater Canyon Ave.

Per the zoning code and Ventura Blvd Specific Plan this project needs to provide 702 parking spaces. The developer's application included a request to reduce the parking to only 446 spaces. The project claims to have utilized a "Shared Parking Study" to demonstrate that only 440 parking spaces would be necessary for its operations. A Shared Parking application utilizes the code required parking for each of the uses within the proposed project, but demonstrates that based on the different hourly parking demands for each of the uses, the project can operate with less than the code required parking. However, that is not what this developer did. Instead, he discarded the city code parking requirements for the gym use and restaurants and substituted Urban Land Institute parking data. In other words, he utilized parking numbers much lower than the city's zoning code and the Ventura Blvd Specific Plan require. Such a drastic parking reduction of 262 parking spaces, equivalent to a 37% reduction, is not a "by right" entitlement but rather a "discretionary" entitlement - meaning the city has the right to reject it. Further, deviating from zoning code standards requires one to file for a variance and deviating from the Specific Plan standards requires one to file for a Specific Plan Exception. Neither was done in this case. The so-called "Shared Parking Study" was nothing but a sham because it was used by the developer as a way to side step the need to have filed for a parking variance and specific plan exception. In fact, the Shared Parking Study showed that the major uses (Equinox gym and restaurants) have the same peak hour demand for parking, which means these uses cannot "share" parking spaces. Quite the contrary, these uses compete for parking spaces at the same time of day. So how did this developer show that he only needs 440 parking spaces in lieu of the code required 702 parking spaces? By ignoring the code and the Ventura Blvd. Specific Plan and substituting a much lower set of parking requirements. The developer justifies using these lower parking requirements based on surveys conducted at other gyms and concluding that the city parking requirements for gym and restaurants is too high. In other words, this developer is arguing that the city's parking requirements are wrong. The city cannot ignore its own zoning code and should have required Sportsmen's Landing to file for a zoning variance and a specific plan exception. This would have necessitated a full public hearing prior to approval. Moreover, even if this developer were to provide a legitimate Shared Parking Study, (i.e. one based on peak hour demand of various different uses rather than simply substituting a parking requirement substantially lower than the code or specific plan) the decision as to whether to approve a parking reduction is discretionary with the city. It is not a "by right" development.

Furthermore we the stakeholders are very concerned about the lack of parking and the over flow spilling into our neighborhoods, the impact on the additional traffic as well as the environmental issues especially with a water shortage. How do you justify building a gym, 20 stores and restaurants that will require a great deal of showers, bathrooms and restaurant facilities?

We are requesting the City Council to overturn the Planning Commission's approval of the MND and require the Developer to complete a full EIR consistent with the requirements of CEQA.