

**CENTRAL LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
200 North Spring Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, California, 90012-4801, (213) 978-1300  
[www.planning.lacity.org](http://www.planning.lacity.org)

**LETTER OF DETERMINATION**

MAILING DATE: JUN 02 2022

Case No. DIR-2020-3656-SPR-1A  
CEQA: ENV-2020-3657-CE  
Plan Area: Central City

Council District: 14 – de León

**Project Site:** 1130 South Hope Street

**Applicant:** Hope Street 1, LLC  
Representative: Dana A. Sayles, three6ixty

**Appellant No. 1:** Evo Homeowners Association c/o Luc Sasseville  
Representative: Sheri Bonstelle, Jeffer Mangels Butler Mitchell LLP

**Appellant No. 2:** Peter Toumasis, Luma Homeowners Association  
Representative: Sheri Bonstelle, Jeffer Mangels Butler Mitchell LLP

At its meeting of **May 10, 2022**, the Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission took the actions below in conjunction with the approval of the following Project:

A new 112 guest room hotel with 528 square feet of ground floor retail uses.

1. **Determined**, based on the whole of the administrative record, that the Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332 Article 19 (Class 32), and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies;
2. **Denied** the appeals and **sustained** the Planning Director's determination dated November 17, 2021;
3. **Approved with conditions** pursuant to Section 16.05 E of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, a Site Plan Review for a new 112 guest room hotel with 528 square feet of ground floor retail uses;
4. **Adopted** the attached Conditions of Approval; and
5. **Adopted** the attached Findings.

This vote proceeded as follows:

Moved: Lindgren  
Seconded: Kang  
Ayes: Gold, Lawrence  
Absent: DelGado

**Vote:** 4 – 0

*Etta Armstrong*

---

Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I  
Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission

Fiscal Impact Statement: There is no General Fund impact as administrative costs are recovered through fees.

**Effective Date/Appeals:** The decision of the Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission is final upon the mailing date of this letter, and it is not further appealable.

**Notice:** An appeal of the CEQA clearance for the Project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21151(c) is only available if the Determination of the non-elected decision-making body (e.g., ZA, AA, APC, CPC) **is not further appealable to a City appellate body** and the decision is final. The applicant is advised that any work undertaken while the CEQA clearance is on appeal is at his/her/its own risk and if the appeal is granted, it may result in (1) voiding and rescission of the CEQA clearance, the Determination, and any permits issued in reliance on the Determination and (2) the use by the City of any and all remedies to return the subject property to the condition it was in prior to issuance of the Determination.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Attachments: Conditions of Approval, Findings, Interim Appeal Filing Procedures

c: Heather Bleemers, Senior City Planner  
Eric Claros, City Planner



## DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

### APPEAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

#### Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission

**Date:** May 10, 2022  
**Time:** after 4:30 p.m.  
**Place:** Due to concerns over COVID-19, the Central APC meeting will be conducted entirely telephonically by Zoom [<https://zoom.us/>]. The meeting's telephone number and access code number will be provided no later than 72 hours before the meeting on the meeting agenda published at <https://planning.lacity.org/about/com-missions-boards-hearings> and/or by contacting [apccentral@lacity.org](mailto:apccentral@lacity.org)

**Public Hearing:** Required; March 8, 2022  
**Appeal Status:** Site Plan Review is appealable to Area Planning Commission  
**Expiration Date:** May 10, 2022  
**Multiple Approval:** No

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 1130 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, CA 90015

**PROPOSED PROJECT:** Site Plan Review for the construction, use, maintenance of a 112-guest room hotel with 528 square-feet of ground floor retail uses

**REQUESTED ACTION:**

1. **DETERMINE**, based on the whole of the administrative record, the Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332, Article 19 (Class 32), and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to the exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies; and
2. **DENY** the Appeal filed by the Evo Homeowners Association and the Luma Homeowners Association, and **SUSTAIN** the decision of the Director's Determination in approving Site Plan Review Case No. DIR-2021-3656-SPR for the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 12 guest room hotel with 528 square-feet of ground floor retail uses.
3. **ADOPT** the Director's Determination Conditions of Approval and Findings.

**Case No.:** DIR-2020-3656-SPR-A1  
**CEQA No.:** ENV-2020-3657-CE  
**Incidental Cases:** N/A  
**Related Cases:** None  
**Council No.:** 14- De Leon  
**Plan Area:** Central City  
**Plan Overlay:** None  
**Certified NC:** Central City  
**GPLU:** High Density Residential  
**Zone:** [Q]R5-4D-O  
**Applicant:** Hope Street 1, LLC  
**Representative:** Dana A. Sayles, three6ixty  
**Appellant:** Evo Homeowner Association and Luma Homeowner Association

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP

Director of Planning




---

Heather Bleemers, Senior City Planner



---

Eric Claros, City Planner



---

Jessica Jimenez, Planning Assistant

Telephone: (213) 978-1344

Email: [jessica.jimenez@lacity.org](mailto:jessica.jimenez@lacity.org)

*ADVICE TO PUBLIC: \*The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communications may be mailed to the Commission Secretariat, 200 North Spring Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, CA 90012 (Phone No. 213-978-1300). While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent to the week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agenda itemized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to this programs, services and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request not later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at (213) 978-1300.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Background</b>	<b>page 3</b>
<b>Appeal Points/Staff Responses</b>	<b>pages 4-9</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>page 9</b>
<b>Exhibits:</b>	
A – Appeal Application	
B – Letter of Determination	
C – Environmental Case No. ENV-2020-3657-CE	
C.1 – Notice of Exemption	
C.2 - Categorical Exemption Justification	

## APPEAL REPORT

### **BACKGROUND**

The Site Plan Review project, Case No. DIR-2020-3656-SPR, was approved on November 17, 2021 to allow the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 112 guest room hotel with 528 square-feet of ground floor retail uses. The proposed floor area is 46,741 square-feet, with a floor area ratio of 6:1. The ground floor features a lobby/reception area, along with other hotel amenities including a conference room, business center, vending machine room, trash and recycling, loading area, common restrooms, and an elevator lobby. The guest rooms are evenly distributed – 16 rooms per floor – across seven floors. The proposed hotel is allowed under the site’s zoning. The project is only seeking a Site Plan Review and is consistent with all underlying zoning regulations.

### **APPEAL ANALYSIS**

On November 17, 2021, the Director of Planning approved a Site Plan Review at 1130 South Hope Street for the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 112 guest room hotel with 528 square-feet of ground floor retail uses. On December 1, 2021, the Department of City Planning received two timely appeals of the entire decision of the Director’s Determination, by the Evo Homeowners Association and the Luma Homeowners Association represented by Sheri Bonstelle. The justification for the appeal consists of two separate letters from the each of the Homeowners Association.

### **APPEAL POINTS/STAFF RESPONSES**

The appeal submitted by both parties contend the project design fails to comply with provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Downtown Design Guide, and the South Park Business Improvement

District Development Values. The appeal letters also provided comments on noise, traffic, air quality, and Green House Gases (GHG) during the operation and construction of the hotel as well as security issues. A synopsis of the appeal points from both letters are addressed in the responses below.

**Appeal Point #1: The Appellant contends that the developer has not provided any traffic or parking study to evaluate the alley, driveway or queuing.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #1: The project's valet for off-site guest parking and ride-share drop offs will not impact surrounding buildings that share the public alley.**

Valet, Parking, Trash Services

The appellant contends the project's valet for off-site guest parking and ride-share drop offs will impact the shared public alley, affecting resident of the surrounding building and trash vendors that service the building. The project does not provide a ride-share drop off area at the public alley and rather provides a ride-share drop off area at the front of the hotel along Hope Street.

The original project design included three levels of automated parking accessed from the rear alley. Although not required, the Applicant redesigned the project to remove on-site parking in favor of an off-site parking solution. Because parking will be off-site and the ride-share drop off area will be along Hope Street, there is no impact to the alley from hotel parking or ride-share.

Regarding trash and service vendors, the Project will be served just as other surrounding properties are served, from the alley. Although not required the applicant has voluntarily offered the following operational features to help reduce any perception of impact to the public alley:

- Install "Do Not Block Driveway" signs in accordance with the recommendations of a signage plan that will be prepared;
- Use the same trash vendor as the surrounding residential buildings to consolidate trash service and ensure efficient scheduling; and
- Install security cameras facing the public alley for security and compliance that will be monitored by the hotel's front desk.

Driveway and Traffic

As previously mentioned, a ride-share drop off area is not provided at the public alley, and a parking study is not required for this Project as there is no on-site parking for guests of the hotel. Two parking spaces for operations and building management are on-site and accessed from the alley, which mirrors the employee parking that the Evo and Luma residential buildings provide off the alley.

The Applicant prepared a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for the Project in 2021. The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) reviewed and approved the TIA, stating in its approval that "The assessment determined that the project would not have a significant transportation impact and further not have a significant Household or Work VMT impact. Thus, the TIA determined there would be no significant impacts per CEQA and LADOT transportation thresholds.

Furthermore, the TIA states "In light of the increasing populating of driver-for-hire transportation network companies (TNCs), LADOT requires an evaluation of passenger loading areas for development projects. It is not anticipated based on the project size and the project location that there would be any significant impacts from passenger loading at the project frontage. A curb-side loading zone is provided at the front of the project on Hope Street, as well as a loading zone at the north side of the building."

The project will provide 23 parking spaces, as required. Two spaces are provided on the ground floor and accessed from the alley for operations and building management. The remaining 21 spaces are provided off-site, located within 750 feet of the site at 1028 South Hope Street.

**Appeal Point #2: The appellants contend an 8-story blank wall will provide no visual interest for the Luma residents and will create an echo and significantly increase noise in the alley.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #2: The 8-story wall adjacent to the Luma residential tower is compatible with existing and future development on adjacent properties and neighboring properties and will not create noise impacts.**

Alley design

The 8-story wall adjacent to the Luma residential tower is compatible with existing and future development on adjacent properties and neighboring properties and will not create noise impacts. The referenced 8-story wall is the north façade of the building and is not “blank.” The façade is designed to maximize privacy and minimize openings on the property line. Furthermore, during a working session with both the Evo and Luma HOAs, on November 16, 2020, during a working session with the HOA’s the applicant inquired whether there was a desire to “articulate” the building with additional windows, balconies, or other features, and the response was a vocal “no.”

The façade is only articulated with varying materials and colors, with exception of one window stack at the elevator lobby to provide natural light and air into that public space on each floor. However, these varying materials and colors provide visual interest and ensure the wall is not a blank monotone.

The Appellants also assert that the wall will create an echo that significantly increases noise in the alley by reverberating noise from existing traffic, loading, and deliveries that occur in the alley. As detailed below, expert analysis in the record refutes this conjecture.

The Applicant conducted a detailed noise study, dated September 7, 2021 and prepared by Urban Crossroads, for the project that conclusively demonstrates there are no unmitigable operational noise impacts from the Project, and that the Project complies with the City’s Noise Ordinance.

Furthermore, as described in the noise analysis, if the wall facing the alley was flat it would at most result in a three decibel (3-dB) sound increase. A 3-dB change in environmental noise is commonly considered a barely perceivable change in the ambient noise level of a given location (California Department of Transportation, 2020). However, per project plans, the north façade of the building would not be a flat wall. Rather, the façade would include substantial articulation thus diffusing, or scattering, sound waves in multiple directions, resulting in less than a 3-dB sound increase. As such, any noise reflected off the façade of the proposed building would not result in a perceivable increase in noise levels and impacts would remain less than significant.

**Appeal Point #3: The Appellants contend that the City should consider alleged shade/shadow impacts on the neighboring open spaces and pool area at the Evo and Luma buildings.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #3: A shade/shadow analysis, while not required, demonstrates the Project will not add to existing shade/shadow patterns.**

The project is located in downtown Los Angeles in a transit priority area, and by law is exempt from considering shade and shadow issues. However, the applicant did conduct a shade and shadow study,

which demonstrates that the Project does not have any more impacts on the pool and open space decks on the adjacent buildings than their own buildings currently shade those areas without the project. Thus, the project does not have any impact that does not already exist today.

**Appeal Point #4: The Appellants contend the project will cause noise on the open rooftop and ground level valet areas that will be audible from the multiple adjacent residences across the 20 foot alley and that the Noise Study does not properly evaluate the operation and construction of the hotel and adjacent residents.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #4: The rooftop and ground level valet areas will not cause noise impacts to adjacent residences across the alley, and the applicant has agreed to limit rooftop hours. The Noise Study properly evaluates the operation and construction of the hotel and adjacent residents.**

#### Noise

The applicant voluntarily agreed to restrict rooftop operating hours to the same as the adjacent buildings (Elleven, Luma, Evo). While there is no evidence that any rooftop use would cause noise impacts, the project's noise study analyzed these restricted hours and thus the operational noise analysis is more conservative than what is required by CEQA.

The Noise analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads identified four nearby receiver locations, all noise-sensitive residential uses (1133 South Hope Street, 1111 South Grand Avenue, 1155 South Grand, 1200 South Hope Street) and analyzed potential noise impacts at these locations based on noise-generating uses at the project including roof-top mechanical equipment and rooftop amenities. As discussed in the noise analysis, the project would not result in a significant noise impact during daytime or nighttime at the receiver locations and impacts would be less than significant.

The Appellants also assert the Letter of Determination does not provide limits on the hours of operation, including rooftop hours, and that there will not be sufficient hotel staff to monitor the sound. The City of Los Angeles does not regulate hours of operation as part of a stand-alone Site Plan Review application. Although not required, the applicant has agreed to reduce hours of operation. The rooftop will adhere to the same hours of operation as the surrounding residential building's (Evo, Elleven, and Luma buildings) rooftop hours, which close at 11:00p.m. Sunday through Thursday at until 12:00 a.m. Friday through Saturday. Hotel staff will be on-site to monitor and address noise.

#### Operation and Construction Noise

The Appellants assert the noise study prepared by Urban Crossroads does not evaluate impact of the operation and construction of the hotel on adjacent residents. As stated above, the Noise analysis identified four nearby receiver locations, all noise-sensitive residential uses (1133 South Hope Street, 1111 South Grand Avenue, 1155 South Grand Avenue, 1200 South Hope Street) and analyzed potential noise impacts at these locations based on noise-generating uses at the project including roof-top mechanical equipment and rooftop amenities. As discussed in the noise analysis, the project would not result in significant noise impacts during the daytime or nighttime at the receiver locations and impacts would be less than significant.

The construction management plan prepared includes construction equipment and complies with the City's set construction hours.



**Appeal Point #5: The Appellants contend the project does not comply with a setback.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #5: The project complies with zoning regulations, including all setbacks.**

Setbacks

The appellants assert the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) requires an 11-foot side yard and the Downtown Design Guide (“DDG”) requires a 40-foot setback from an interior property line if the adjacent property may be developed, and that the adjacent property south lot may be developed as it is owned by the EVO Homeowners Association.

As identified in Ordinance No 179,067, effective September 23, 2007, and summarized in ZI No. 2385-all yard requirements were eliminated by the Greater Downtown Housing Incentive Area program for all projects. There are no yards applicable to projects in Downtown Los Angeles. The project complies with yards required by the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

Appellants refer to page 35 of the Downtown Design Guide (figure 6-2), which provides scenarios and recommendations for spacing between towers. This does not apply to the project because tower is defined as over 150 feet, and the project is 106 feet. Furthermore, the Downtown Design Guide is a guide and not a zoning document and the project is not required to provide any setbacks for a project of this height. As such, the project complies with yard and setback requirements.

**Appeal Point #6: The Appellants assert that the Project does not comply with the Downtown Design Guidelines requirement to minimize neighbor impacts, and that mechanical equipment and lighting must be located away from residential uses.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #6: The Project complies with Downtown Design Guidelines requirement to minimize neighbor impact, including the location of its mechanical equipment and lighting.**

Downtown Design Guide

Page 52 states that major mechanical systems, penthouses, and lighting should be designed to limit adverse impacts. The DDG states:

- “Mechanical equipment shall be either screened from the public” or “integrated with the architectural design of the building”
- Further, mechanical equipment “should not be placed on balconies or other private or common open space areas”
- Ventilation requirement “shall be located and designed away from the street and to minimize adverse effects on pedestrian comforts along the sidewalk”

The project complies with the Downtown Design Guidelines and locates mechanical equipment and lighting away from surrounding residential uses. The subject building ventilates vertically, not towards the neighboring residential buildings.

The Appellants also assert that the Project does not comply with a requirement for a series of open spaces publicly accessible at the street level and does not have sufficient hotel drop-off waiting area on Hope Street. Appellants misunderstand the application of the DDG to the Project.

The open space section of the DDG states, “*Determinations of open space and floor area should be implemented in a manner that maximizes opportunities for resident and public-serving open space, such as on rooftops, balconies, and building cutout areas, **taking into account limitations on developable space that constrain many downtown development projects.***” As confirmed by Department of City Planning Staff and the Director of Planning in approving the Site Plan Review, there is no open space required for the Project as a hotel project, and this provision for public-serving open space is not applicable because it is not feasible as the Project frontage is only 50 feet wide and significantly constrained as a parcel under 10,000 square feet.

**Appeal Point #7: The Appellants assert that the projects traffic, noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas analysis will create an environmental impact.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #7: The project’s traffic, noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas analysis provide substantial evidence that the project will not create any environmental impacts.**

The Appellants assert that the Project did not provide parking and traffic studies. The Applicant prepared a Traffic Impact Study (TIA) in 2021, which LADOT subsequently reviewed and approved on February 23, 2021. See a detailed response to this point address above under item 1.b.

The Appellants also assert that the Project’s air quality and greenhouse gas studies are flawed and require revisions. The Air Quality Analysis conducted by Urban Crossroads was conducted using CEQA significance criteria and SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. The Air Quality Analysis identified four nearby receiver locations, all noise-sensitive residential uses (1133 South Hope Street, 1111 South Grand Avenue, 1155 South Grand Avenue, 1200 South Hope Street) and analyzed potential air quality impacts at the nearest sensitive receptor, consistent with SCAQMD methodology. As discussed in detail in the Air Quality Analysis, the Project would not result in significant air quality impacts during operation or construction, and no mitigation is warranted. The comment does not include further information on how the analysis is flawed and is representative of the Appellants’ general unsubstantiated claims.

Furthermore, Appellants claim that the Project did not provide a study of the public alley. LADOT does not require a study of the public alley and parking is satisfied by off-site parking.

**Appeal Point #8: The Appellants contend that alcohol and restaurants should be prohibited.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #8: The City cannot restrict a restaurant or alcohol service as part of a Site Plan Review.**

A future alcohol service would require a separate approval. A prior case for the property filed under Case No. ZA-2012-385-VCU-ZV-ZAA-TDR included a rooftop and bar, which was part of an appeal by the same Appellants, and thus the current project was specifically designed without any food or beverage outlets to minimize conflicts from those uses with adjacent neighbors.

**Appeal Point #9: The Appellants claim that Planning Director erred or abused their discretion.**

**Staff Response to Appeal Point #9: The Planning Director did not err or abuse their discretion.**

The project meets the Conditions of a Class 32 Exemption for CEQA, as outlined in the Exemption findings prepared for the project which include:

- 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.

- The proposed development occurs within City limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
- The Project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species.
- Approval of the Project would not result in significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
- The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

The Exemption findings explain that the Exception to a Class 32 Categorical Exemption do not apply to the Project.

The case file includes comprehensive environmental documentation and extensive technical analysis to support the determination by the Director of Planning. These reports included but are not limited to, a Traffic Assessment dated September 2020 prepared by KOA, a Traffic Impact Study dated August 2021 prepared by KOA, and a Technical Memorandum dated February 8, 2021 prepared by KOA and subsequently reviewed by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation on February 23, 2021. In addition, the applicant provided a detailed Noise Impact Analysis dated September 7, 2021, an Air Quality Impact Analysis dated August 20, 2021, and a Green House Gas Analysis dated August 20, 2021, all prepared by Urban Crossroads. A Geotechnical engineering report investigation dated December 23, 2019, prepared by Rybak Geotechnical was submitted and reviewed. A Certificate of Compliance for Methane Test Data was conducted by Engineer Don Terras on January 31, 2021. Furthermore, the applicant provided a memo dated October 19, 2021 and prepared by Carlin Environmental Consulting confirming they had conducted methane testing requirements per LADBS code and deemed the site to be in the Methane Zone with level II design measures needed and plans have been submitted to LADBS for review and oversight.

## **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the Appellant has not demonstrated how the Director's Determination erred or abused its discretion in approving DIR-2020-3656-SPR and has not provided any substantial evidence to dispute the findings of the Categorical Exemption. The Categorical Exemption is comprehensive and has been completed in full compliance with CEQA. As demonstrated by the responses to the appeal points, there are no new impacts or substantial increases in previously identified impacts that would result from the comments raised herein. The Director's Determination included correct findings of approval consistent with the provisions of CEQA. Therefore, in consideration of all the facts, Planning staff recommends that the appeal be denied, the decision of the Director's Determination be sustained, and it be determined that based on the whole of the administrative record, the Project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332 (Class 32) and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to the Exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies.



# COVID-19 UPDATE

## Interim Appeal Filing Procedures

Fall 2020

Consistent with Mayor Eric Garcetti's "Safer At Home" directives to help slow the spread of COVID-19, City Planning has implemented new procedures for the filing of appeals for non-applicants that eliminate or minimize in-person interaction.

---

### OPTION 1: Online Appeal Portal

([planning.lacity.org/development-services/appeal-application-online](http://planning.lacity.org/development-services/appeal-application-online))

Entitlement and CEQA appeals can be submitted online and payment can be made by credit card or e-check. The online appeal portal allows appellants to fill out and submit the appeal application directly to the Development Services Center (DSC). Once the appeal is accepted, the portal allows for appellants to submit a credit card payment, enabling the appeal and payment to be submitted entirely electronically. A 2.7% credit card processing service fee will be charged - there is no charge for paying online by e-check. Appeals should be filed early to ensure DSC staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow Appellants time to submit payment. On the final day to file an appeal, the application must be submitted and paid for by 4:30PM (PT). Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30PM (PT) on the next succeeding working day. Building and Safety appeals (LAMC Section 12.26K) can only be filed using Option 2 below.

---

### OPTION 2: Drop off at DSC

An appellant may continue to submit an appeal application and payment at any of the three Development Services Center (DSC) locations. City Planning established drop off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop.

#### **Metro DSC**

(213) 482-7077  
201 N. Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

#### **Van Nuys DSC**

(818) 374-5050  
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard  
Van Nuys, CA 91401

#### **West Los Angeles DSC**

(310) 231-2901  
1828 Sawtelle Boulevard  
West Los Angeles, CA 90025

City Planning staff will follow up with the Appellant via email and/or phone to:

- Confirm that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions
- Provide a receipt for payment