ORIGINAL

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: CPC-2013-2551-MCUP-DB-SPR; ENV-2013-2552-EIR

Project Address: 8148-8182 W. Sunset Blvd, 1438-1486 Havenhurst Dr, 1435-1443 N Crescent Heights Blvd

Final Date to Appeal: 09/01/2016

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): Fix the City, Inc.

Company:

Mailing Address: 1557 Westwood Boulevard, #235

City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90024

Telephone: E-mail: Laura.lake@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): Beverly Grossman Palmer

Company: Strumwasser & Woocher LLP

Mailing Address: 10940 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2000

City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90024

Telephone: (310) 576-1233 E-mail: bpalmer@strumwooch.com

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
- 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: 09/01/2016

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: $106.80	Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner):	Date: $106.80
Receipt No: 0203347964	Deemed Complete by (Project Planner):	Date:
☐ Determination authority notified	☐ Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)	

Appeal documents 11 total pages BCV

STRUMWASSER & WOOCHER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
10940 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

TELEPHONE: (310) 576-1233
FACSIMILE: (310) 319-0156
WWW.STRUMWOOCH.COM

FREDRIC D. WOOCHER
MICHAEL J. STRUMWASSER
GREGORY G. LUKE †
BRYCE A. GEE
BEVERLY GROSSMAN PALMER
DALE LARSON
JENNA L. MIARA†‡

† Also admitted to practice in New York and Massachusetts
‡ Also admitted to practice in Illinois. Not yet admitted in California

FIX THE CITY APPEAL
CPC-2013-2551-MCUP-DB-SPR
ENV-2013-2552-EIR

JUSTIFICATION FOR APPEAL

I. Fix the City Is Aggrieved by the Decision to Approve the Project's Entitlements

Fix the City is aggrieved by the City Planning Commission's determination to approve the proposed project at 8150 Sunset Boulevard, including Site Plan Review and the Master Conditional Use Permit, because it will impact the quality of life and emergency services in the community, as well as set a precedent for the Hollywood Community Plan, which Fix the City successfully challenged in court. Fix the City continues to be concerned with the provision of adequate infrastructure to protect public safety and assure the quality of life for Angelenos.

II. Basis for Appeal

The project is located at the base of Laurel Canyon in an Extreme Fire Hazard District within the Hollywood Fault Zone. As approved, it represents a major threat to public safety for project occupants and the region.

The procedures to vacate a public street and the restrictions on construction in earthquake fault zones in the Alquist-Priolo Act are state laws. Violation of state law is a basis to deny a density bonus under SB 1818. A lawsuit against the City for denial of a density bonus would lack merit, as the City is well-justified in rejecting this project for its failure to comply with the Alquist-Priolo Act, the California Streets and Highways Code, and the California Environmental Quality Act. By denying the proposed project, the City will be taking a strong stand for public safety.

The defects of this project are so egregious that five different appeals have been filed, including by a neighboring city, West Hollywood. Fix the City requests that the City Council safeguard public safety by maintaining the CEQA mitigation measures of the 1988 Hollywood Community Plan (a FAR of 1:1), not vacating the heavily used street, preserving Lytton Bank, and complying fully with the Alquist-Priolo Act to provide a 50-foot exclusion zone from the project's property lines (Havenhurst, Sunset and Crescent Height). Unless a more thorough site study is conducted, as well as studies 50 feet out from the three property lines, the only structure that can exist within 50 feet of the property line is the Lytton Savings Building (if designated a Cultural Monument).

Fix the City also objects, on due process grounds, to its inability to appeal the CPC's award of a Density Bonus and Off-Menu Incentive to the proposed project. There is no legitimate reason that a member of the public who is affected by the approval of a project with increased density. Neighboring property owners are not the only individuals that are directly affected by these actions. Moreover, the letter of decision misleadingly states that "Off-Menu Housing Incentive is not further appealable by any party." At a minimum, the same parties who are authorized to appeal the density bonus should be entitled to appeal the Off-Menu Incentive. However, there appears to be no basis to deny a member of the public the ability to appeal a density bonus which appears to have been awarded *ultra vires.*

In addition to due process violations, Fix the City objects to the lack of transparency with admitted ex parte meetings between CPC Commissioners and the project applicant and its consultants. Transparency, as clearly stated in the Brown Act, requires that the public be present, be given notice, and that there are no backroom lobbying efforts by the applicant or the Mayor.

Fix the City incorporates by reference the points raised by all other appellants.

a. Approval of Site Plan Review Was Abuse of Discretion

The Project Is Not In Conformance with the Purpose, Intent, and Provisions of the General Plan and Hollywood Community Plan

The density requested for the site is *inconsistent* with the site's designation in the Hollywood Community Plan. The Hollywood Community Plan specifies that, in areas like the project site that are located outside of the Redevelopment Area, a designation of Neighborhood Oriented Commercial would be limited to a FAR of 1:1. This limitation was imposed in recognition of the impacts of the increased area development permitted in the Hollywood Community Plan, in order to *limit* the impact of new commercial development in the area. By permitting a FAR of 3:1, the proposed project calls for a level of development far greater than that permitted by the General Plan.

Critically, the site's zoning is C4-1**D, with a FAR of 1:1**. This D Limitation was included as a mitigation measure in the certified Environmental Impact Report for the 1988 Hollywood Community Plan (See Ordinance 164,714) in order to account for the impacts on infrastructure and traffic from the expansion permitted in the 1973 plan. Even in the most recent HCP update, the D Limitation remained in place, restricting the FAR to 1:1. There has been no disclosure of the attempt to remove the D Limitation as required by LAMC 17.15 D.

The site is ineligible for increased FAR to 3:1 as an incentive or otherwise, without a legislative process to change the site's zoning that include findings that the infrastructure and traffic have improved since 1988 and the mitigation is therefore no longer required.

The municipal code explains the purpose of a D limitation (see LAMC12.32 G 4):

> "[P]rovisions may be made in an ordinance establishing or changing any Height District that a building or structure may be built to a specific maximum height or floor area ratio less than that ordinarily permitted in the particular Height District classification . . . .These limitations shall be known as D Development limitations."
>
> In order to impose a D limitation, Council must find that the limitation is necessary:
>
> "(1) to protect the best interests of and assure a development more compatible with the surrounding property or neighborhood, and
>
> (2) to secure an appropriate development in harmony with the objectives of the General Plan, or
>
> (3) to prevent or mitigate potentially adverse environmental effects of the Height District establishment or change."

The site here has a D limitation that specifically limits the FAR to 1:1. Ordinance 164,714, enacted as part of the adoption of the Hollywood Community Plan, provided the following D Limitation applicable to the subject property: "The total floor area of all buildings on a lot shall not exceed one (1) times the buildable area of the lot."

The City's density bonus law does not allow for the City to ignore the express restrictions imposed as a CEQA mitigation measure (the D limitation). Municipal code section 12.22 A 25 (f)(4) explains that a 3:1 floor area ratio is available as an incentive for commercially zoned properties "in Height District 1 (including 1VL, 1L, and 1XL)," and the project is located within 1,500 feet of a transit stop. The project site is not within any of those Height Districts and it is not within 1500 feet of a transit stop.

On-menu incentives were designed to be objective, over-the-counter incentives with specific standards. Because the project is not within 1,500 feet of a transit stop, the developer is seeking an "off menu" incentive to get this same incentive that it does not qualify for.[1] However, the project is also not in Height District 1, 1VL, 1L or 1XL. Those districts all have an applicable FAR of 1.5:1 (see LAMC 12.21.1 A 1.), and thus the 3:1 FAR is effectively a doubling of the density.

This site is zoned Height District 1**D** , and the permanent D limitation on the site imposes a 1:1 FAR limit in order to mitigate the specific, adverse impacts of denser development in the area. Granting 3:1 FAR for this site represents a tripling, not doubling of FAR.

---

[1] "Off menu" incentives, per the code, are meant to be incentives that are not included on the list of "menu" incentives, which the 3:1 FAR already is. Fix the City objects to this use of the "off menu" incentive.

In order for this site to legally house a project with a 3:1 FAR, the project must obtain a height district change and remove the D limitation, which has not been done or applied for.

The project also does not conform to a number of policies in the Hollywood Community Plan. These include the preservation of existing low density neighborhoods, to encourage development consistent with the ability of the circulation system to support increased traffic, and to "[p]rovide a standard of land use intensity and population density which will be compatible with street capacity, public service facilities and utilities, and topography and in coordination with development in the remainder of the City." By permitting massively increased density (tripling the FAR) and 234 or 188 feet in height, the proposed project is inconsistent with these objectives of the Hollywood Community Plan. It dwarfs its neighbors.

In other respects, too, the proposed project is inconsistent with the General Plan. The Housing Element designates the City-owned property at 8118 Sunset for affordable housing. Developing a "plaza" on this site will eliminate the site as a potential location for affordable housing constructed by the City. Finally, the maps included in the Mobility Plan (MP 2035) include the full right turn lane on Crescent Heights and 15 foot sidewalks, which are no longer part of the project plan for which site plan review is requested. The project plan therefore conflicts with MP 2035. The project also does not adhere to the City's Street Design Standards because it vacates a portion of a heavily-used public street, and introduces commercial traffic on a narrow, local, residential street.

The Project Does Not Consist of an Appropriate or Compatible Arrangement of Buildings and Structures

The project places high rise development that is *admittedly* significantly taller than any of the surrounding developments onto a site that is adjacent to low-rise, and often historic structures. The project is 13 stories higher than the adjacent buildings. The record is full of testimony of neighboring residents that the scale of the building is inappropriate. Using Havenhurst, a local, narrow street, for loading and driveway access is not compatible with neighboring residential properties. The proposed loading dock for the commercial grocery and restaurant deliveries is located across from a sensitive use, a home for seniors. This kind of site plan does not satisfy legal requirements for appropriate or compatible arrangement of buildings and structures.

The project does not conform to LAMC 17.05 because it violates the "vehicular access rights," or "the right of easement for access of owners or occupants of abutting lands to a public way other than as pedestrians." By removing the turn lane on Crescent Heights, the City will be vacating the street and abandoning the public easement, and creating a traffic challenge as well.

The project does not comply with LAMC 12.37 A, which requires "adequate right-turn ingress to and egress from the highway," because it closes the right turn lane limiting right turns from Sunset Boulevard onto Crescent Heights.

The arrangement of uses on the shared foundation (it is one building with one basement/garage with commercial and residential uses above-ground) the site also does not comply with the Alquist-Priolo Act.

Fault zone mapping has recently demonstrated that the Hollywood fault runs in extremely close proximity to the site. The November 2014 California Geologic Survey map of the earthquake fault zones in the Hollywood Quadrangle places the fault zone directly under the proposed project site. To the best of the public's knowledge, the applicant has only done boring to search for evidence of faulting under the southwest corner and north east corners of the site. (see Figure 2, "Borehole Location Map," Golder and Associates, March 25, 2014).

It is unknown whether there is an active fault directly under the proposed project, nor whether the fault or traces of the fault may be located under Sunset Boulevard just feet from the site's border. Because no geologic study whatsoever has been conducted under Sunset Boulevard, the City requires the presumption that the fault exists in this area. Yet the City has failed to prohibit construction for human occupancy within 50 feet of the presumed fault. The applicant has proposed to shift the residential towers 50 feet further from the potential fault, but the entire structure is prohibited by State law within 50 feet of the fault and may not be placed over the trace of the fault. It is not only the residential components which are of concern under Alquist-Priolo, but *any structure for human occupancy.*

The Applicant's consultant has incorrectly stated that the City's requirement is for structures used for ***habitation***, not structures used for human ***occupancy*** as the law provides. The risk to future human occupants of the structures at the site is a basis to deny the proposed project until complete analysis demonstrates that the site is not within 50 feet of an active fault or fault trace.

There has not been an adequate fault study performed, and the record before the City contains inadequate information to support the conclusion that this site is physically suitable for the proposed development. The findings do not even mention that the property is located in the Hollywood fault zone. Moreover, the findings erroneously state that that the project complies with required fault zone setbacks for "habitable structures." This is an incorrect statement regarding the required setbacks: all structures for human occupancy, not just for habitation, must be setback from any potential fault. The Alquist-Priolo Act imposes a duty on the City not to approve development or division of land without a proper assessment of the presence of fault within the Earthquake Fault zone. Site plan review should be denied until such a geologic study is complete and it is known whether a fault runs beneath the proposed development or within fifty feet from the property line.

The site plan also fails to appropriately require the preservation of the Lytton Saving/Chase Bank building. The Cultural Heritage Commission on August 4th agreed to consider the Lytton Savings/Chase Bank building as a Historic-Cultural Monument. The Los Angeles Conservancy calls the bank building "a significant example of postwar-era bank design in Los Angeles," and notes that it is one of the earliest remaining examples of such architecture in the City. The failure of the current "Alternative 9" proposal to preserve the bank building

does not demonstrate an appropriate arrangement of buildings or structures because it permits the *demolition* of a potential cultural monument. This monument could remain even though it is 50 feet within the 50-foot exclusion zone. It is exempt from Alquist-Priolo limitations. East of the bank must be left as open space.

The Project Does Not Minimize Impacts on Neighboring Properties

The proposed project does not minimize impacts: it creates new and unmitigable impacts, as recognized in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. First, by removing portions of the public street in order to create the "plaza," the project vacates a street without following the requirements of the California Streets and Highways Code. The project proposes the entire removal of a turn-lane of traffic on N. Crescent Heights Boulevard between the project's parcels and the City-owned parcel at 8118 Sunset Boulevard. The public has an easement over this street for vehicular access. Moreover, all private property owners owning property created in the subdivision on which this portion of Crescent Heights appears have a private easement in the street that is created by the recording of the 1905 subdivision map. It is not reasonably disputed that removing this portion of Crescent Heights from vehicular use in order to create a plaza will eliminate the ability of vehicles to use this portion of the roadway.

The closure of the street unlawfully abandons the city's vehicular easement. The property will revert to the Applicant. The suggestion that DOT have a $2 million bond to reopen the street in the future ignores the fact that the easement will be extinguished over time. The closure as approved is a de facto vacation without due process. Furthermore, private easements require compensation, otherwise the city will be condemning the property right of vehicular easement owners without compensation. There are about 1,100 parcels with this private easement right within the 1905 Crescent Heights Tract. Many are in West Hollywood. While the City has argued that it is concerned that it will be sued for denial of the density bonus, it must be equally concerned that it is opening itself up to a massive legal challenge by property owners who value their vehicular easement to a road referenced in their deeds and in the Mobility Element of the City of Los Angeles.

State law establishes a number of mandatory procedures prior to the vacation of a public street, none of which have been followed here. The City Engineer is required to make a finding that the roadway is "unnecessary for present or prospective public use." (Streets and Highways Code, § 8324, subd. (b).) And of course, the public is notified of the request, hearings are held, and a determination is made. Not one of those steps has been taken here; instead, Planning staff deny that removing the lane of the street and turning it into a plaza has any effect on the street. Planning staff contend that the issue can be resolved with an encroachment permit or "B permit." None of those permits would appropriately apply to the removal of the lane of traffic that is part of the proposed project. There are two separate actions proposed: one is a street vacation and the other is a so-called intersection "improvement" to round off the eastern tip of the traffic island triangle (8118 Sunset Boulevard). *A "B Permit" would suffice for the intersection improvement, but it cannot be substituted for the process required as part of a street vacation.*

The City owns the land at 8118 Sunset Boulevard. The proposed project will allow that land to be occupied by a private developer, ostensibly for the purpose of creating a public plaza. Indeed, the applicant relies upon the "public" space created by its use of City-owned land to satisfy its open space requirements under the municipal code. The use of the City's land is an improper gift to the developer. The City has procedures for the disposition of surplus lands and should utilize those processes if it intends to dispose of public property. The proposed project should not be approved because the project improperly relies upon City-owned land to satisfy open space requirements.

b. The Project Does Not Satisfy Requirements for a Conditional Use Permit

The Project Will Not Enhance the Built Environment

As set forth above, for numerous reasons the project does not enhance the built environment, and the service of alcohol does not in any way improve the built improvement.

The Project's Location, Height, and Operations and Other Features Will Not be Compatible With And Will Adversely Affect the Surrounding Neighborhood And the Public Health, Welfare and Safety

The proposed project seeks to service alcoholic beverages in admittedly over-concentrated census tract with admittedly higher crime rates than the Citywide average. There are sensitive users nearby, including the Nichiren Soshu Myohoji Temple that is about 90 feet from the site. The findings do not disclose this proximity. In fact, the LOD states that this Buddhist Temple is between 600 and 1000 feet from the site. This is incorrect and shows that staff did not accurately represent the distance in their recommendation to CPC, which adopted the staff report in their Letter of Determination. While alcohol service may be standard at restaurants, that does not mean that the proposed project has to include alcohol serving restaurants in this area that is already saturated with such uses, particularly where the sale and consumption of alcohol will intrude into the worship at the Temple, and the residents within 100 feet, who will be subjected to noise, drunken behavior, increased crime, etc, according to substantial evidence in the record.

c. The Certification of the EIR Failed to Satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act

The Environmental Impact Report for the project does not satisfy the mandates of CEQA. For both procedural and substantive deficiencies, the EIR does not adequately inform the public or decision makers about the impacts of the proposed project.

The EIR Must be Recirculated

The recent Errata to the EIR disclosed a significant, unmitigable impact that was not disclosed in the Draft EIR or the Recirculated Draft EIR. The Draft EIR noted a "potential" impact to traffic at the unsignalized intersection of Fountain and Havenhurst due to project-

generated traffic, but asserted that a mitigation measure requiring the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection would mitigate that impact. The DEIR therefore concluded that there would be no significant impacts to traffic. In the Errata, which was released just days before the City Planning Commission hearing, the City acknowledged that it had no control whether a traffic signal could be installed at that location, because the intersection is entirely within the jurisdiction of the City of West Hollywood. The Errata added to the EIRs list of significant and unavoidable impacts the fact that there would be a significant and unavoidable impact to traffic if the City of West Hollywood did not chose to install a traffic signal at Fountain and Havenhurst. In addition, failure to install the signal would have an adverse impact on emergency response times, as acknowledged in the project's EIR.

Recirculation of an EIR is required when, *inter alia*, new information discloses that a new significant impact would result from the project. The traffic impacts were not properly disclosed in the Draft EIR (hence the need for the Errata). Worse, the EIR relies on several other instances upon the traffic light mitigation measure (TR-1) to mitigate the impacts of the project, including public services such as fire, emergency medical response, and police. The CPC determination on the VTT likewise relies upon mitigation measure TR-1 to mitigate these impacts. The reliance upon a mitigation that is entirely out of the control of the City or the applicant in the Draft EIR, and the Errata's partial but incomplete resolution of this issue require recirculation of the EIR for the public to evaluate and comment upon the project's impacts connected with the Fountain/Havenhurst signal.

It is also not apparent that moving the driveways from Sunset to Havenhurst studied the impacts to a narrow, quiet, residential street, which straddles the border between West Hollywood and Los Angeles. Introducing commercial deliveries to a residential street is incompatible with the peaceful enjoyment of the homes adjacent to the project.

The Land Use Impacts of the Proposed Project Are Not Adequately Disclosed

The EIR contends that the approval of the project will not have an adverse impact on land use. This conclusion is based on the assumption that the project's entitlements will be approved. The disclosure is inadequate.

The EIR states that the threshold of significance for a potentially significant land use impact is "if it substantially conflicts with the adopted Community Plan or with relevant environmental policies in the General Plan or other regional and local plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect." By failing to discuss the D Limitation imposed on the site in 1989 in connection with the adoption of the Hollywood Community Plan, the EIR fails to disclose an environmental policy applicable to the site that was adopted to mitigate the impacts of the adoption of the Hollywood Community Plan itself. By failing to disclose and discuss the inconsistency, the EIR does not meet the disclosure mandates of CEQA. Moreover, as set forth above, there are other General Plan policies with which the project is inconsistent, so the determination that the project will not have a significant impact on land use is not adequately supported.

The Geologic Impacts are Not Adequately Documented

The project has not complied with the Alquist-Priolo Act requirements for projects located within mapped earthquake fault zones. The FEIR insists that, despite the most recent maps, "The Project Site is not located within the Hollywood Fault earthquake fault zone." As discussed above, there has been no study of faulting just off site or in many areas on the site. The City specifically requested a study fifty feet from the site's boundary, but the applicant did not produce such a study and explained that it could not "unequivocally" determine that the fault is not present within fifty feet of the site. The EIR's conclusion that there will be no seismic impacts from the construction of the project is not based on substantial evidence.

Impacts to Public Service Are Not Adequately Discussed or Acknowledged

Both the Draft and Final EIRs ignore the clear statements from the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) that the construction of the project could have a significant impact on fire and emergency medical services. The LAFD's initial response to requests for an assessment of its service capacity in the area was that fire service to the proposed project would be "inadequate." After the Draft EIR — stating no impact to fire services — was circulated, the Final EIR presented further response from the LAFD as an effort to justify the Draft EIR's conclusion of no significant impact to fire services. The LAFD's second letter specifies a number of design features that must be incorporated into the project in order to prevent a significant impact to emergency response. However, that letter does not state that there is not likely to be significant impact to fire services from the construction of the project. Indeed, the letter states: "The development of this project, along with other approved and planned projects in the immediate area, may result in the need for the following: (1) Increased staffing for existing facilities; (2) Additional fire protection facilities; (3) Relocation of present fire protection facilities." These comments track almost precisely the City's threshold of significance for impacts to fire services. Yet the Final EIR blithely concludes that the project will have no impact on fire services.

This conclusion is even less tenable due to the Final EIR's reliance on mitigation measure TR-1, which, as discussed above, is outside of the control of the City or applicant. The EIR does not adequately disclose the potential impacts to fire services from the development of this and related projects. The EIR likewise relies upon the ability to mitigate traffic impacts to conclude that police response access to the site will be adequate. These determinations must be revisited and the public and decision makers must be properly informed about the impacts to public services.

Finally, there has been no analysis of the need to relocate water mains which run under Sunset Boulevard, adjacent to the fault line.

Office: Van Nuys
Applicant Copy
Application Invoice No: 31830

City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

Scan this QR Code® with a barcode reading app on your Smartphone. Bookmark page for future reference.

City Planning Request

NOTICE: The staff of the Planning Department will analyze your request and accord the same full and impartial consideration to your application, regardless of whether or not you obtain the services of anyone to represent you.

This filing fee is required by Chapter 1, Article 9, L.A.M.C.

Applicant: FIX THE CITY, INC. - LAKE, LAURA
Representative: STRUMWASSER & WOOCHER LLP - PALMER, BEVERLY (B:310-5761233)
Project Address: 1435 1/2 N CRESCENT HEIGHTS BLVD, 90046

NOTES:

CPC-2013-2551-CUB-DB-SPR-1A			
Item	Fee	%	Charged Fee
Appeal by Aggrieved Parties Other than the Original Applicant *	$89.00	100%	$89.00
		Case Total	$89.00

Item	Charged Fee
*Fees Subject to Surcharges	$89.00
Fees Not Subject to Surcharges	$0.00
Plan & Land Use Fees Total	$89.00
Expediting Fee	$0.00
OSS Surcharge (2%)	$1.78
Development Surcharge (6%)	$5.34
Operating Surcharge (7%)	$6.23
General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (5%)	$4.45
Grand Total	$106.80
Total Invoice	$106.80
Total Overpayment Amount	$0.00
Total Paid(this amount must equal the sum of all checks)	$106.80

Council District: 5
Plan Area: Hollywood
Processed by HENRY, THOMAS on 09/01/2016

Signature: _____

LA DBS
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY

LA Department of Building and Safety
VN LAUR 203086700 9/1/2016 12:49:12 PM

PLAN & LAND USE $106.80

Sub Total: $106.80

Receipt #: 0203347964

