

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTENTS OF THIS FILE

Submissions by the public in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures (ROPs), Rule 4.3, are distributed to the Commission and uploaded online. Please note that “compliance” means that the submission complies with deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) AND the number of copies. Please review the Commission ROPs to ensure that you meet the submission requirements. The ROPs can be accessed at <http://planning.lacity.org>, by selecting “Commissions & Hearings” and selecting the specific Commission.

All compliant submissions may be accessed as follows:

- **“Initial Submissions”**: Compliant submissions received no later than by end of day Monday of the week prior to the meeting, which are not integrated by reference or exhibit in the Staff Report, will be appended at the end of the Staff Report. The Staff Report is linked to the case number on the specific meeting agenda.
- **“Secondary Submissions”**: Submissions received after the Initial Submission deadline up to 48-hours prior to the Commission meeting are contained in this file and bookmarked by the case number.
- **“Day of Hearing Submissions”**: Submissions after the Secondary Submission deadline up to and including the day of the Commission meeting will be uploaded to this file within two business days after the Commission meeting.

Material which does not comply with the submission rules is not distributed to the Commission.

ENABLE BOOKMARS ONLINE:

**If you are using Explorer, you need will need to enable the Acrobat  toolbar to see the bookmarks on the left side of the screen.

If you are using Chrome, the bookmarks are on the upper right-side of the screen. If you do not want to use the bookmarks, simply scroll through the file.

If you have any questions, please contact the Commission Office at (213) 978-1300.

Adams-Normandie Neighborhood Association

1658 W 23rd Street
Los Angeles CA 90007

Marco Flores – President

email m_a_flores@yahoo.com

July 7, 2022

South Los Angeles Planning Commission
201 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

Via email

RE: Project Site: 1840 West Adams Boulevard
Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA
CEQA No.: ENV-2020-3308-CE
Zone: C2-1VL-O-CPIO

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

We represent the Adams-Normandie Neighborhood Association (ANNA) an adjacent neighborhood association to the West Adams Neighborhood Association (WANA), one of our many community partners. Like us they are dealing with the excessive amount of Tripalink properties that are being built in our neighborhoods. We are writing this letter in opposition to the proposed project at 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard which will consist of small lot divisions at ten units with ninety-six bedrooms. This will be the third Tripalink building in close proximity on Adams Boulevard between La Salle and Normandie Avenue.

The design and excessive room count is not compatible for the Charles Victor Hall Tract, a neighborhood that is historically known for its diverse architecture that consists of multi-generational family homes. This proposed project will affect the residents, business owners, and stakeholders. Currently Nick Metropolis Collectibles is a small business that is operating on the proposed lot. Greater Page Temple COGIC, a church that has been in the same location for over 100 years is located to the west on La Salle Ave. The proposed entrance alley way is between Greater Page Temple and Nick's business. Making this alley way the main entrance will increase traffic, pollution with the number of cars, and create safety concerns especially for those who use the alley as a safe form of walking. The church uses the parking lot throughout the week for day care drop-off & pick-up, mid-week and special events, and Sunday services. This alley way allows the church participants to safely enter and exit the property. The residents who reside on the 2600 block of Dalton (westside) will also be directly affected by this proposed building. Some residents are considering having solar panels installed to help with the environment and reduce their electricity bills. The height of these building will interfere with the sunlight especially since the properties face east and west. The residents who live next to the proposed lot are experiencing health challenges and depend on the peace and quiet. The increase in residents and traffic will affect their daily well-being.

We are aware that housing is a major concern in Los Angeles and our unhoused population has significantly increased over the past few years. The Tripalink properties are designed for a co-living community that does not provide affordable, low-income, or family housing. Again, this housing design is not compatible to the historic West Adams neighborhoods.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for further information. Thank you for your time regarding this important matter.

Thank you,



Marco Flores
President
Adams Normandie Neighborhood Association
[M_a_flores@yahoo.com](mailto:Ma_flores@yahoo.com)
323-497-1772



July 12, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission

201 North Figueroa Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

RE: Project Site: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard

Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA

CEQA NO.: ENV-2020-3308-CE

Zone: C2-1VL-O-CPIO

Dear Ms. Armstrong,

I am writing this letter to oppose the projected Tripalink project at 1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, 90018. The size and logistics of this building are not compatible for this location. The proposed structure will consist of *ninety-six bedrooms* designed primarily for USC students and single residents. This will bring an excessive amount of people, traffic, and parking issues that we are currently dealing with. Also, there are two existing Tripalink buildings on Adams Blvd (1729 W. Adams Blvd. and 1815 W. Adams Blvd).

This neighborhood is a family friendly environment that also promotes home ownership. We have been told there is a housing crisis, not a student housing crisis and while Tripalink offers housing to non-students their focus is student housing. Most importantly the Tripalink invasion is destroying the fabric of our historic neighborhood.

I respectfully request that this project is not approved. You can reach me at _____ for any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Luis Fernando Vicente Castillo = SC

July 1~~8~~, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission

201 North Figueroa Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

RE: Project Site: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard

Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA

CEQA NO.: ENV-2020-3308-CE

Zone: C2-IVL-O-CPIO


Dear Ms. Armstrong,

I am writing this letter to oppose the projected Tripalink project at 1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, 90018. The size and logistics of this building are not compatible for this location. The proposed structure will consist of *ninety-six bedrooms* designed primarily for USC students and single residents. This will bring an excessive amount of people, traffic, and parking issues that we are currently dealing with. Also, there are two existing Tripalink buildings on Adams Blvd (1729 W. Adams Blvd. and 1815 W. Adams Blvd).

This neighborhood is a family friendly environment that also promotes home ownership. We have been told there is a housing crisis, not a student housing crisis and while Tripalink offers housing to non-students their focus is student housing. Most importantly the Tripalink invasion is destroying the fabric of our historic neighborhood.

I respectfully request that this project is not approved. You can reach me at _____ for any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Samuel A. Vicente Castillo


July 14, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission

201 North Figueroa Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

RE: Project Site: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard

Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA

CEQA NO.: ENV-2020-3308-CE

Zone: C2-1VL-O-CPIO

Dear Ms. Armstrong,

I am writing this letter to oppose the projected Tripalink project at 1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, 90018. The size and logistics of this building are not compatible for this location. The proposed structure will consist of *ninety-six bedrooms* designed primarily for USC students and single residents. This will bring an excessive amount of people, traffic, and parking issues that we are currently dealing with. Also, there are two existing Tripalink buildings on Adams Blvd (1729 W. Adams Blvd. and 1815 W. Adams Blvd).

This neighborhood is a family friendly environment that also promotes home ownership. We have been told there is a housing crisis, not a student housing crisis and while Tripalink offers housing to non-students their focus is student housing. Most importantly the Tripalink invasion is destroying the fabric of our historic neighborhood.

I respectfully request that this project is not approved. You can reach me at _____ for any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dora Lisseth castillo maldonado = SC

Elfego gomez = SC

Beatris Ramirez = SC

July 1st, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission

201 North Figueroa Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

RE: Project Site: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard

Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA

CEQA NO.: ENV-2020-3308-CE

Zone: C2-1VL-O-CPIO

Dear Ms. Armstrong,

I am writing this letter to oppose the projected Tripalink project at 1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, 90018. The size and logistics of this building are not compatible for this location. The proposed structure will consist of *ninety-six bedrooms* designed primarily for USC students and single residents. This will bring an excessive amount of people, traffic, and parking issues that we are currently dealing with. Also, there are two existing Tripalink buildings on Adams Blvd (1729 W. Adams Blvd. and 1815 W. Adams Blvd).

This neighborhood is a family friendly environment that also promotes home ownership. We have been told there is a housing crisis, not a student housing crisis and while Tripalink offers housing to non-students their focus is student housing. Most importantly the Tripalink invasion is destroying the fabric of our historic neighborhood.

I respectfully request that this project is not approved. You can reach me at _____ for any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Wahon Quany
2611 Dalton Ave Los Angeles
CA 90018

July 11, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission

201 North Figueroa Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

RE: Project Site: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard

Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA

CEQA NO.: ENV-2020-3308-CE

Zone: C2-IVL-O-CPIO

Dear Ms. Armstrong,

I am writing this letter to oppose the projected Tripalink project at 1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, 90018. The size and logistics of this building are not compatible for this location. The proposed structure will consist of *ninety-six bedrooms* designed primarily for USC students and single residents. This will bring an excessive amount of people, traffic, and parking issues that we are currently dealing with. Also, there are two existing Tripalink buildings on Adams Blvd (1729 W. Adams Blvd. and 1815 W. Adams Blvd).

This neighborhood is a family friendly environment that also promotes home ownership. We have been told there is a housing crisis, not a student housing crisis and while Tripalink offers housing to non-students their focus is student housing. Most importantly the Tripalink invasion is destroying the fabric of our historic neighborhood.

I respectfully request that this project is not approved. You can reach me at questions. Thank you for your consideration.

for any

Sincerely,




July 6, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission
201 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

Case No: VTT-83081-SL-HCA
Address: 1840 – 1848 West Adams Boulevard
CEQA: ENV-2020-3308-CE

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed re-development of the property at 1840 – 1848 West Adams Boulevard.

Nestled within the historical West Adams district is the Charles Victor Hall Tract. This community is recognized for its historic architectural styles and designated landmarks. For over 50 years, this area of the city has been decimated by the demolition of gated communities and beautiful mansions to build a freeway and to foster re-development and gentrification. Such city planning has divided the city socially, economically, and politically.

This area of the city has the lowest social and economic status in Los Angeles County. The project does not provide sufficient accommodations for low-income families; it does not provide sufficient parking which will add to the existing parking disparities; the towering structure threatens the privacy of homeowners in the immediate area, and it will increase traffic hazards and endangers pedestrian safety the main thoroughfare. The proposed project does not enhance the community. It is an albatross and a hinderance.

Affordable housing, safe spaces, increasing economic resources, maintaining stability, preserving the historical integrity of our neighborhoods should be the foremost consideration in redeveloping all areas of the city.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Cecelia Schumake, Resident
2646 South Dalton Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90018



Tanisha B. Thomas, President
Leah Griffith, Vice President
Cecilia Schumake, Secretary
Rita Bertrand, Treasurer

Post Office Box 180254
Los Angeles, CA 90018

July 11, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission
201 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

Case No: VTT-83081-SL-HCA
Address: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard
CEQA: ENV-2020-3308-CE

Dear Ms. Armstrong,

In addition to the points that were mentioned in our letter dated April 12, 2022 (attached) we would like to include the benefits of filming production within our neighborhood.

We are proud of the filming that has taken place in our neighborhood over the past decades. There has been a sense of pride when we share with others what project was filmed in our neighborhood and seeing the outcomes on screen and/or print. When you think about West Adams, location is a factor including the architecture and historical structures, specifically the Charles Victor Hall tract, which offers the aesthetic appearance that filming companies are looking for.

In recent years we have been fortunate to have popular mainstream programs filmed in our neighborhood with consistency. 'This Is Us' filmed in our neighborhood for the duration of their programming from 2016-2022. 'Snowfall' another popular show that is still on the air has also filmed in our neighborhood, in addition to independent projects, magazine, and various video shoots. Our firm belief is that the Tripalink buildings with their proposed architectural styles, size, and quantity of rooms will deter companies from wanting to film in our neighborhood. The housing that Tripalink offers is very different from the current makeup of this neighborhood and has the potential to shift the tone if their structures continue to be erected. We partner with community organizations and rely on filming proceeds to help us support activities and projects within and outside of our tract.

We are concerned residents, business owners, and stakeholders who want to ensure our neighborhood remains an affordable, safe, and family friendly environment for everyone while preserving its historical integrity. I am available by phone and/or a meeting (virtual or in person) if needed to further discuss this

matter. I can be reached at Tanishat@wana-la.org or (213) 308-2852. Thank you for taking the time to review our letters.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tanisha B. Thomas". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "T" and a cursive "Thomas".

Tanisha B. Thomas
President
West Adams Neighborhood Association



Tanisha B. Thomas, President
Leah Griffith, Vice President
Cecilia Schumake, Secretary
Rita Bertrand, Treasurer

Post Office Box 180254
Los Angeles, CA 90018

April 12, 2022

Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Case No: VTT-83081-SL-HCA
Address: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard
CEQA: ENV-2020-3308-CE

Dear Mr. Ibarra:

The West Adams Neighborhood Association (WANA), the Greater Page Temple Church of God in Christ (GPT), and many residents of the Historic Charles Victor Hall Tract oppose the development of the property known as 1840 – 1848 W. Adams Boulevard as planned for the following reasons:

- I. The design and over dense development will result in health and safety problems, parking congestion, and have a negative effect on the historic residential neighborhood adjacent (officially recognized in the CPIO of the South Community Plan), on the adjacent historic Greater Page Temple, and on the Los Angeles City designated scenic highway, Adams Boulevard (designated by the City in its Mobility Plan.)
 - A. The concern is not only regarding the proposed development to be located at 1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd., but the cumulative effects of having multiple high-density barrack style co-living developments within a ¼ mile radius. These developments have already and will continue to increase traffic, create more trash/refuse, and increase noise in the area. Another area of concern is the amount of parking spaces, which is already limited in our neighborhood. We were informed in 2021 that Tripalink would provide sufficient parking spaces for their residents. During the public hearing on January 12, 2022, it was stated that Tripalink is only responsible for providing a certain amount of parking spaces due to the location of the building on Adams Boulevard which is a main thoroughfare. We are estimating that parking will only be provided for half of the residents and that will cause further strain on this already sensitive issue, Exhibit A. The other Tripalink buildings within this radius are located at:
 1. 1729 W. Adams Blvd. (Adams and Normandie) Exhibit B-1
 2. 1815 W. Adams Blvd. (Adams and Dalton) Exhibit B-2
 3. 2642 S. Brighton Ave. (Brighton between Adams and 27th) Exhibit B-3

B. Activities at the Greater Page Temple Church of God in Christ, a contributing historic structure to the CPIO as noted in the Normandie 5 Survey, will be affected adversely due to increased traffic through the alleyway that will provide the main vehicle access to the proposed development, Exhibit A-4 and A-5. The activities affected include:

1. Daily daycare drop-off and pick-up occurs in the alley.
2. Midweek events in which parking is accessed through the alley.
3. Special events held in the parking lot/ or in which parking is accessed through the alley.
4. Sunday services in which parking is accessed through the alley.

C. The community has health concerns because the number of bedrooms filled by tenants at the existing Tripalink structures and other increased density, oversized apartment and/or co-living structures has created access issues at the only full-service grocery store in the area, Ralphs #294 located at 2600 S. Vermont Ave. The amount of traffic in the parking lot and the amount of people in the store at any given time has become a detriment to grocery shopping for the older and disabled residents of our community and is a nuisance to all residents in the community, Exhibits B-6 and B-7.

1. Tripalink has stated that they provide a shuttle to Ralphs for residents to use, but that is not a guarantee that all, or even a large percentage of Tripalink residents take advantage of the shuttle service.

II. The proposed tract map is not consistent with the South Community Plan which places a high value on infill development being consistent with the community character. The size, scale, excessive room count (96) is contrary to the goals of the South Community Plan. Additionally, the project fails to meet the goals of the small lot subdivision which was intended to promote affordable homeownership.

A. The main purpose/function of Tripalink developments, as described on their LinkedIn business description, is co-housing for students and young working adults who do not intend to rent for extended periods of time. Tripalink advertises their developments as such on their own website and on college/university websites. The renters who do/will occupy units in the Charles Victor Hall Tract do not have the same investment in the community as homeowners and long-term renters do, Attachment I and Exhibit B-8, from homeowner Trevor Williams.

B. While it was mentioned at the last public hearing held on January 12, 2022, that the units located at the development would be available for purchase, this was communicated in response to public objection to the co-living dormitory style of the buildings that will provide 96 bedrooms on the small lot. With the recent increase in interest rates and with the Federal Reserve intent to raise interest rates again in 2022, and with none of the units designated as affordable, this development does not contribute to providing affordable or moderately affordable housing in the Charles Victor Hall Tract as defined by local affordability levels.

1. No interior floorplan or design plan was provided at the public hearing to substantiate that the proposed units would be appropriate to be purchased by families rather than to be rented as co-living dormitories.

2. The public is repeatedly told by government leaders and through the media that California has a shortage of housing, and especially affordable housing. The Tripalink Corporation doesn't build traditional single family, multiple family, or affordable housing to satisfy the city's Housing Element, yet Tripalink is being granted the most permits to develop dormitory style housing in the South Los Angeles area.
- C. The intent of infill development within the South Community Plan is to provide opportunities for families to purchase housing that is compatible with the historic community character and sold at an affordable price.
 - D. Residential housing in the Charles Victor Hall Tract characteristically has ample front yards, backyards, and space between the adjacent structures as is mentioned in the Normandie 5 Historic Survey of the Charles Victor Hall Tract. This development, as of the last public hearing held on January 12, 2022, still did not adhere to required setbacks. It is too large for the lot, especially when compared to other residential structures in the neighborhood.
- III. The South Community Plan recognizes that this area includes neighborhoods that are "unique and historically significant in character" and thus includes provisions specifically to address compatibility of new development with the existing neighborhood character.
 - A. Community members are aware that infill development is not meant to mimic or replicate Historic architectural styles, however, the plans and elevations that were presented at the public hearing on January 12, 2022, revealed a modern structure that had undergone small adjustments (in color palette and roof pitch) to make the modern design of the building less-than-minimally compatible with the existing neighborhood structures. The level of compatibility does not match the intent of the South Community Plan.
 1. The Charles Victor Hall Tract consists of Craftsman, Victorian and Spanish/Mediterranean Revival style residential dwellings. There is little to no meaningful reference to any of these styles of architecture in the plans that were presented at the public hearing.
 2. The style does reflect the established modern, boxy style of already existing Tripalink structures that are recognizable as a "brand" by college students in the USC area.
- IV. The design is not compatible with design guidelines standards for the Community Plan nor is it compatible with the City's Small Lot Subdivision Design Guidelines.
 - A. The site is not suitable for this barrack like type of development nor is the proposed density suitable.
 - B. The project fails to meet the goals of the small lot subdivision which was intended to promote affordable homeownership.
 - C. The project fails to meet the aesthetic requirements of a city designated scenic highway, Adams Boulevard, nor does it conform to the established setbacks of Adams Boulevard.

- V. The continued overdevelopment in the area by Tripalink is placing the success of one corporation ahead of the needs of local, longtime community members and often violates City of Los Angeles requirements for demolition and development.
- A. Many of the existing housing stock in the Charles Victor Hall Tract is already multi-family including homes that are shared by roommates.
- B. Mom and Pop Landlords in the area rely on the rental income from Accessory Dwelling Units and rented rooms in their homes. Tripalink is threatening their ability to make a profit on their rentals, Attachment II from homeowner Sergio Robles.
- C. Tripalink developments on the main transportation corridors surrounding the Charles Victor Hall Tract (Adams Blvd., Western Blvd., Jefferson Blvd., Normandie Ave.) displace local businesses that local residents rely on and enjoy patronizing in exchange for a multi-resident dwelling model that has no benefit to the surrounding community, Attachment III and Exhibit B-9 from business owner, Nick Metropolis.
1. The proposed project by Tripalink is an example of the pattern of urban planning historically damaging communities of color while eradicating their very existence. Examples of such damage to communities of color in the area are listed below:
- a. In the early 1960s, the beautiful mansions of Sugar Hill and Berkeley Square were demolished to construct the Santa Monica Freeway (10.)
- b. Prior to the construction of the 10 Freeway through West Adams, the Harbor Freeway (110) was built, and succeeded in dividing the city economically.
- c. The Pacific Electric Red Car system heavily relied upon by local residents (as is evidenced in the Normandie 5 Historic Survey) was dismantled.
- D. Tripalink has a track record of demolishing properties illegally before demolition permits have been applied for or issued.
- E. Tripalink doesn't consider adaptive reuse or mixed-use development that would result in less environmental impact and loss of existing businesses within the community.

We are concerned residents, business owners, and stakeholders who want to ensure our neighborhood remains an affordable, safe, and family friendly environment for everyone while preserving its historical integrity. I am available by phone and/or a meeting (virtual or in person) if needed to further discuss this matter. I can be reached at Tanishat@wana-la.org or (213) 308-2852. Thank you for taking the time to review our appeal.

Respectfully yours,



Tanisha B. Thomas
President
West Adams Neighborhood Association



Planning APC South LA <apcsouthla@lacity.org>

Case No: VTT-83081-SL-HCA/1840-1848 West Adams Blvd2 messages

Virginia Kuhn <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>

Mon, Jul 11, 2022 at 7:50 PM

Reply-To: viriniakuhn@gmail.com

To: apcsouthla@lacity.org

South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission,

South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission:

I strongly urge denial of exemption from CEQA Guidelines for the proposed construction on [1840 West Adams Boulevard](#) since it does not meet the requirements for a categorical exemption. The design is not compatible with the City's Small Lot Subdivision Design Guidelines. The design is not compatible with the design guideline standards for the Community Plan. The project fails to meet the goals of the small lot subdivision which was intended to promote affordable homeownership.

A massive 96-bedroom development on this site will impact the character of this residential neighborhood regarding aesthetics, parking, traffic congestion, and health of the residents. The site is not suitable for this barrack like type of development nor is the proposed density suitable. It will have a negative effect on the historic residential neighborhood adjacent (officially recognized in the CPIO of the South Community Plan), on the adjacent historic Greater Page Temple, and on the scenic highway Adams Boulevard (designated by the City in its Mobility Plan.)

The proposed tract map is not consistent with the South Community Plan which places a high value on infill development being consistent with the community character. The excessive room count alone of 96 is excessive in regard to both size and scale and contrary to the goals of the South Community Plan.

The Community Plan recognizes that this area includes neighborhoods that are "unique and historically significant in character" and thus includes provisions specifically to address compatibility of new development with the existing neighborhood character.

This project does not provide family housing or affordable housing that would meet the goals of the City's Housing Element.

The very fact that this development does not qualify for an exemption from CEQA guidelines should be enough for its denial. Such guidelines were put in place for important reasons to ensure that neighborhoods aren't wrecked for mere profits. I strongly urge a no vote.

Virginia Kuhn

viriniakuhn@gmail.com

2907 Dalton Ave
[Los Angeles, California 90018](#)

Brená Robinson <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Reply-To: sfrowe.brena@gmail.com
To: apcsouthla@lacity.org

Mon, Jul 11, 2022 at 8:32 PM

South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission,

South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission:

I strongly urge denial of exemption from CEQA Guidelines for the proposed construction on [1840 West Adams Boulevard](#) since the project fails to meet the goals of the small lot subdivision which was intended to promote affordable homeownership.

This project does not provide family housing or affordable housing that would meet the goals of the City's Housing Element.

I strongly urge a no vote.

Brená Robinson
sfrowe.brena@gmail.com
2946 S Hobart Blvd
[Los Angeles , California 90018](#)

SECONDARY SUBMISSIONS

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS



Planning APC South LA <apcsouthla@lacity.org>

Public Comment on Agenda Item 6

1 message

andrea rojas <asrojas25@gmail.com>
To: apcsouthla@lacity.org

Tue, Jul 19, 2022 at 1:05 PM

Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA-1A

Dear Ms. Armstrong

My name is Andrea Rojas and I am a constituent of this area. I support the appeal -- This project is missing using the small lot subdivision program. The small lot subdivision program was not intended to allow developers to have an effect on what is the traditional setting and configuration of parcels in South LA. It was meant to allow homeownership and opportunity for people to buy into what is a pathway to improving their assets and upward mobility. Tripalink is building an enormous project to continue to profit from USC students because USC is failing to provide on campus housing. Tripalink units are not intended for the working class community - they are specifically reserved for USC students.

Thank you,
Andrea

--

Best,

Andrea Rojas, MSc
asrojas25@gmail.com

Daniel Freedman
dff@jmbm.com

1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067-4308
(310) 203-8080 (310) 203-0567 Fax
www.jmbm.com

Ref: 82152-0003

July 14, 2022

BY EMAIL ONLY

President Bates and Hon. Members of the
South Los Angeles Area Planning
Commission
Department of City Planning
City of Los Angeles
200 North Spring Street, Room 272
Los Angeles, CA 90012
E-Mail: apcsouthla@lacity.org

Re: **Project Address:** 1840 – 1848 West Adams Boulevard
Case No(s): VTT-83081-SL-HCA-1A; ENV-2020-3308-CE
Hearing Date: July 19, 2022;
Agenda Item: 6
Letter of Support for Staff Recommendation to Deny Appeal

Dear Hon. Members of the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission:

On behalf of the applicant, we submit this letter in support of the Department of City Planning's (the "Department") approval of the above referenced ten-unit small-lot subdivision project (the "Project"), and to echo the Department's finding that the appeal is not supported by substantial evidence. As explained in the Department's staff report, the Project was properly approved consistent with all relevant objective and non-objective City requirements and criteria. We therefore join the Department in requesting that the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission (the "APC") deny the appeal so that our client may proceed forward forward with helping the City achieve its sweeping and legally mandated housing goals.

We also submit into the record our prior correspondence to the Department for this case. (See **Exhibit A** and **Exhibit B**.)

A. The APC no longer has jurisdiction over the appeal as it was deemed denied two months ago.¹

When it processes residential subdivisions, the City must comply with strict timelines of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (“LAMC”) and the Subdivision Map Act. There are consequences for failing to comply. Under LAMC Section 17.06(A)(3), the APC “shall hear [an] appeal within 30 days after it is filed.” If the APC does not act timely, the appeal is denied as a matter of law: “If ... the “Appeal Board fails to act [within the specified time period], the appeal shall be deemed denied...”. A similar rule exists in the Subdivision Map Act. *See* Government Code §66452.5(c)(1). Assuming that the April 15, 2022 appeal was timely filed, the APC needed to act on it no later than May 15, 2022. That deadline expired two months ago. Having failed to act timely, the appeal has been deemed denied by operation of law.² Notice of this result was provided to both the City and the appellant in our June 3, 2022, letter attached as **Exhibit A**. We thus demand that the appeal be dismissed immediately.

B. The appeal fails to establish a basis on which the City can deny the Project at this stage.

What’s more, the appeal fails to state any basis for which this housing development project may be disapproved. In response to California’s ongoing housing crisis, the California legislature has enacted strict laws that limit a local agency’s authority to deny a housing development project that complies with objective general plan, zoning, subdivision, and design standards. Here, the Advisory Agency’s approval of the Project establishes that the Project meets all the City’s objective standards, and nothing contained in the appeal undermines this finding.

Further, Government Code § 65589.5(j)(2) states that a project is deemed consistent, compliant and in conformity with applicable plans, programs, policies, ordinances, standards, requirements, or similar provisions, unless the City provides the applicant notice to the contrary within 30 days of the Project application being deemed complete. The City gave the applicant no such notice here. The Project is thus deemed consistent with all City standards, regulations, and policies as a matter of law.

In these circumstances, the City must approve the Project unless it finds, based on a preponderance of the evidence, that:

¹ As the Project approval was final by operation law several months ago, we participate in this hearing under protest and with a full reservation of right to object to any further action on this basis. (*See* **Exhibit A** and **Exhibit B**)

² Because subdivisions are regulated by state law, the City’s local COVID tolling order has no effect on the time limitations provided for the processing of subdivisions. *Building Indus. Legal Defense Found. v Superior Court* (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 1410 (court found interim ordinance that suspended for 10½ months formal processing of development application invalid).

- The Project would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, *and*
- There are no feasible methods available to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid those impacts other than denying the Project. Government Code § 65589.5(j)(1)-(2).

The evidence before the APC cannot sustain these findings. A “specific, adverse impact” is not just any old impact: “a specific, adverse impact” is one this is “significant,” “quantifiable,” “direct,” and “unavoidable” and it must be based on “objective,” “identified,” “written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions” in effect when the Project application was deemed complete. The Legislature has found that the conditions that would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health and safety are rare and arise infrequently. Government Code § 65589.5(a)(3). There is no evidence that this Project will have a specific, adverse impact on public health or safety under these exacting standards.

In short, the appeal has already been deemed denied. And even if not, given the evidence before the APC, the appeal must be denied and the Project approved. Any other action would subject the City to significant liabilities.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Freedman', with a stylized, cursive script.

DANIEL FREEDMAN of
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP

DF:df

cc: Albizel Del Valle, Deputy District Director, Council District 8
Michelle Singh, Senior City Planner, Department of City Planning.
Sergio Ibarra, City Planner, Department of City Planning
Rafael Fontes, Planning Assistant, Department of City Planning

EXHIBIT A

Benjamin M. Reznik
bmr@jmbm.com

1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067-4308
(310) 203-8080 (310) 203-0567 Fax
www.jmbm.com

June 3, 2022

BY CERTIFIED MAIL

Sergio Ibarra
Deputy Advisory Agency
City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring St. Suite 750
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Notice of Denial of Appeal, LAMC 17.06(A) and Gov. Code Sec. 66452.5
Project Address: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard, City of Los Angeles
Case No. VTT-83081-SL-HCA

Dear Mr. Ibarra:

On or about April 5, 2022, the Advisory Agency for the City of Los Angeles ("City") issued the above referenced Advisory Agency Determination for a 10-unit small lot subdivision proposed for 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard.¹ An appeal was filed on April 15, 2022. Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code § 17.06 and Government Code § 66452.5, the Appeals Board was required to act on the appeal within thirty (30) days after it was filed. If the Appeals Board fails to act within the specified time limits, an appeal is considered deemed denied. We write to advise the Advisory Agency that the Appeals Board was required to hear this appeal by May 15, 2022, but failed to do so. **Having failed to hear or take action on the appeal by this date, the appeal is deemed denied.** Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,



BENJAMIN M. REZNIK of
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP

cc: Appellant Tanisha Thomas, West Adams Neighborhood Assoc., P.O. Box 180254, LA 90018

¹ We reserve the right to challenge the legality of this second determination, which was issued erroneously after the appeal period on the original February 2, 2022, determination had already passed without the filing of an appeal.

EXHIBIT B

Benjamin M. Reznik
BMR@jmbm.com

1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067-4308
(310) 203-8080 (310) 203-0567 Fax
www.jmbm.com

April 29, 2022

VIA E-MAIL

Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP
Director of City Planning
Advisory Agency
200 N. Spring Street, Room 525
Los Angeles, CA 90012
T: (213) 978-1271
vince.bertoni@lacity.org

Sergio Ibarra
Deputy Advisory Agency
200 N. Spring Street, Room 525
Los Angeles, CA 90012
T: (213) 473-9985
sergio.ibarra@lacity.org

Rafael Fontes
Planning Assistant
Los Angeles City Planning
200 N. Spring St., Room 721
Los Angeles, CA 90012
T: (213) 978-1189
rafael.fontes@lacity.org

Holly L. Wolcott
City Clerk
200 N. Spring St., Room 360
Los Angeles, CA 90012
CityClerk@lacity.org

Mike Feuer
Los Angeles City Attorney
City Hall East, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012
T: (213) 978-8100
mike.n.feuer@lacity.org

Re: 1840 –1848 West Adams Boulevard (Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA)

Dear Recipients,

Our office represents Tripalink Real Estate, LLC (“Tripalink”) in connection with its small lot single family subdivision project located at 1840-1848 W. Adams Boulevard (the “Project”). This letter concerns the City’s unlawful *reissuance* of its Letter of Determination memorializing the Advisory Agency’s decision on the Project.

On November 10, 2021, the City of Los Angeles’ (“City”) Advisory Agency approved Tentative Tract No. 83081-SL-HCA for the Project and determined that the Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). The City’s Advisory Agency issued a written Letter of Determination memorializing the decision, which identified the “Decision Date” as February 24, 2022, and the “Appeal End Date” as March 7, 2022 (the “Original LOD”).

Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the Original LOD. The Original LOD further notified interested parties that any appeal “must be filed within 10 calendar days from the decision date as noted in this letter.” These instructions were consistent with Section 17.06.A.2 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (“LAMC”) requiring any appeal from a tentative map decision to be filed “within ten days of mailing of the written decision of the Advisory Agency.” The Original LOD also correctly informed interested parties that its issuance triggered the limitations period to seek judicial review pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6.

On March 10, 2022, Tripalink emailed the assigned planner, Rafael Fontes, to confirm that no appeals had been filed by the Appeal End Date. Having received no response, Tripalink emailed Mr. Fontes again on March 14, 2022, and March 15, 2022, to confirm there were no pending appeals. Finally, on March 21, 2022, Mr. Fontes responded that the City “received reports of mailing delays with respect to the LOD for this project, but we’re not sure how they can be corroborated.” Regardless, Mr. Fontes assured Tripalink that the City “*met [its] LAMC mandated mailing and included interested parties*[.]” which includes “immediate neighbors, the NC [neighborhood council], etc.” Mr. Fontes also attached the mailing list to demonstrate the City’s compliance with its noticing requirements.

That same day, Tripalink responded that it had not heard of any mailing delays and in fact received confirmation from members of the community that they received timely notice. Accordingly, Tripalink notified Mr. Fontes that it would be moving forward with the subdivision pre-conditions as the Project was approved and no appeals had been filed by the deadline of March 7, 2022. Having received no objection from the City, Tripalink proceeded.

Inexplicably, Mr. Fontes emailed Tripalink *twenty days later*, on April 10, 2022, stating that he was instructed “to reissue t[he] LOD in order to meet [the City’s] notification requirements.” Neither Mr. Fontes nor any other City representative sent Tripalink any evidence indicating that the City’s notice of the Original LOD was in some way defective. To the contrary (as noted earlier), Mr. Fontes confirmed that the City had in fact complied with the LAMC’s notice requirements. Attached as Exhibit B are Tripalink’s email correspondences with Mr. Fontes. As it turns out, *one month after the appeal period expired*, the City purported to “reissu[e] the determination letter for the proposed project to ensure noticing requirements [we]re met” (the “Reissued LOD”). Attached as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of the Reissued LOD.

The City’s sloppiness did not stop there. The Reissued LOD is itself replete with inconsistencies, stating at the top “Decision Date: April 5, 2022; Appeal End Date: April 15, 2022,” but in the substance of the letter that “[t]he new issuance date of the determination letter is April 4, 2022 and the new appeal period is April 14, 2022.” Based upon the City’s purported extension of the appeal period to April 14th or 15th, an appeal was filed on April 13, 2022—i.e., 37 days after the fixed appeal deadline.

The City’s conduct was unlawful, unauthorized, and extrajurisdictional. Principally, nothing in the LAMC authorizes the City to extend the clearly established 10-day appeal period.

LAMC § 17.06.A.2 (Any appeal must be filed “within ten days of the mailing of the written decision of the Advisory Agency.”) Nevertheless, the City purported to *quadruple* the appeal period by extending it *thirty-nine days* (from March 7 to April 15, 2022). The City thus defeated the very purpose of a short appeal period to provide applicants with decision finality before investing substantial time and money into their projects. As the City lacked authority to extend the appeal deadline, the Reissued LOD is null and void.

Relatedly, the Advisory Agency purported to reissue the decision *after* the appeal period had already expired. By that point, the Advisory Agency lacked jurisdiction to make any further decisions on the Project. For this reason as well, the Reissued LOD is of no force and effect.

Finally, even if the City had authority and jurisdiction to extend the appeal period—which it certainly did not—the City’s alleged bases for reissuing the determination are nonsense. The Reissued LOD states that, “[i]n compliance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 19.00, the Department of City Planning is reissuing the determination letter for the proposed project to ensure noticing requirements are met.” First, Section 19.00 of the LAMC has nothing to do with the City’s noticing requirements. Instead, LAMC § 19.00 sets forth the City’s procedures for: (1) handling errors discovered in an *application* or an *appeal* (as opposed to a letter of determination); and (2) how appeal periods are calculated when the deadline falls on a weekend or a holiday. LAMC § 19.00 simply does not grant the City any authority to extend appeal periods.

Second, the City did not purport to reissue the determination because of some kind of discovered error. Mr. Fontes had already confirmed that the City “met [its] LAMC mandated mailing and included interested parties.” Further, the City neither made any allegation in the Reissued LOD that it provided defective notice nor did it circulate any supporting evidence to establish any error. Instead, the City states only that it was reissuing the determination “to ensure noticing requirements are met.” Again, nothing in the LAMC or otherwise authorizes the City to extend appeal periods (and for no apparent reason at all for that matter).

In light of the foregoing, we respectfully request that the City rescind the unauthorized Reissued LOD as it must, deny the appeal as untimely, and cancel any public hearing scheduled for the untimely appeal. Should the City uphold the Reissued LOD and hear the appeal, Tripalink will be forced to pursue all legal remedies available to it.

Sincerely,



BENJAMIN M. REZNIK for
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP

· N · U · P · C · A ·

NORTH UNIVERSITY PARK COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

July 18, 2022

South Area Planning Commission

Via e mail

RE: VTT-83081-SL-HCA, ENV-2020-3308-CE

Honorable Commissioners

NUPCA was founded four decades ago with the specific mission and purposes of building community and protecting both historic resources and the character of the community in the University Park neighborhoods. Along with efforts to establish the University Park HPOZ, NUPCA successfully advocated for the establishment of the North University Park Specific Plan and DRB, and for the creation of the two designated National Register Historic Districts (the Menlo Avenue West 29th Street District and the North University Park District). We are commenting on the tract map request because it has significant impacts to historic Adams Boulevard.

The City is considering approving this Project upon a Class 32 categorical exemption to environmental review under CEQA. This categorical exemption is inappropriate because the Project is inconsistent with the applicable City plans; would result in traffic impacts due to a severe parking shortage; and would have adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding residential community. The use of a categorical exemption is also unsupportable because the Project may have aesthetic and cultural resource impacts on the historic Charles Victor Hall tract and the adjacent Greater Paige Temple. And most significantly, the project would have negative impacts on Adams Boulevard, a city designated scenic highway.

I submitted materials to the record and incorporate these materials by reference from an earlier case that has application here RE: ZA-2018-2453-CU-DB-SPR-1A, DIR-2020-4338-RDP-1A, ENV-2018-2454-CE as it relates to impacts to Adams Boulevard and its significance. In that case, there was misinformation circulated that because it wasn't a state scenic highway, no impacts should be considered. The developer alleged there was no such thing as environmental concern or impacts on a city scenic highway.

As stated in the City's adopted Mobility Plan:

2.16 Scenic Highways: Ensure that future modifications to any scenic highway do not impact the unique identity or characteristic of that scenic highway. Scenic Highways include many of the

City's iconic streets. Preservation and enhancement of these streets and their scenic resources need to be preserved per the Scenic Highways Guidelines in Appendix B of this Plan.

These referenced materials in the record document existing historic resources on Adams Boulevard. Please accept this documentation for the administrative record to ensure that as decision makers you are cognizant of the importance of Adams Boulevard as a scenic highway. This can guide the decision-making process for this tract map public hearing.

The Project is contrary to the requirements for a Scenic Highway:

In addition to failing to meet the requirements of the South Community Plan, the site is on Adams Boulevard which is a City designated scenic highway. The project as proposed is also inconsistent with the goals established by its Scenic Highway designation. (see the Mobility/Transportation Element of the General Plan). Scenic Highways, according to the Mobility/Transportation Element, "include many of the City's iconic streets. Preservation and enhancement of these streets and their scenic resources need to be preserved." Adams Boulevard between Figueroa and Crenshaw is a designated Scenic Highway.

The Project as proposed not only ignores this fact, but provides no Adams Boulevard setback and green. Adams Boulevard offers a development pattern with generous landscaped front yards with buildings set back anywhere from 15 feet to more dramatic deep setbacks in some cases (and, yes, there are exceptions.)

This Project should respect the pattern of development AND the Scenic Highway designation and point its face toward Adams Boulevard.



*2.16 Scenic Highways: Ensure that future modifications to any scenic highway do not impact the unique identity or characteristic of that scenic highway. Scenic Highways include many of the City's iconic streets. Preservation and enhancement of these streets and their scenic resources need to be preserved per the Scenic Highways Guidelines in Appendix B of this Plan.*¹

Jim Childs
North University Park Community Association
c/o 2326 Scarff Street, LA, CA 90007

¹ Mobility Plan 2035, An Element of the General Plan, adopted by City Council 9/7/2016

Ms. Tanisha B. Thomas
2637 ½ S Harvard Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90018
Cell #:213-308-2852/Email address:
tanishathomas@hotmail.com

July 19, 2022

RE: Address-1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd.
Case No: VTT-83081-SL-HCA

Good afternoon South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission and thank you for taking the time to hear our concerns regarding the proposed Tripalink project at 1840-1848 West Adams Blvd.

I am speaking to you as a resident of the Charles Victor Hall Tract and President of WANA. As you venture into our neighborhood you see many architectural designs ranging from Victorian mansions, various Revival styles and Craftsman bungalows. These various styles encourage people who are looking for a place to live, **to build a home**, not a house.

The current Tripalink buildings and proposed buildings do not promote or preserve the architectural or historical integrity of our neighborhood. Tripalink is violating the Fair Housing Act by creating these dwellings. Their target audience is designed to provide temporary housing to students and young professionals, not residents who are looking to plant roots and create generational wealth. The number of residents is too high of a number to place on Adams Blvd. This will add additional strain to our resources such as water, electricity, and gas usage along with the additional vehicles that will require parking to a neighborhood that is already struggling in this area. Overall, this poses an environmental strain. We respectfully ask that you carefully review all the documents that were submitted including submissions from NANDC and the West Adams Heritage Association.

As you make your final decisions regarding this proposal, I ask you to look past the economic benefits. How many more Tripalink buildings do we need in this area? Currently there are 2 Tripalink buildings within a very short walking distance from this proposed site. This doesn't include the other properties scattered within our beloved tract. **There are residents who have lived here for many years and now have multi-generational households and the family-oriented residents who are moving in and want to have that same opportunity.** You don't have to rely on history books or the internet to soak up the historical beauty and energy of West Adams, however if, Tripalink continues to take over this neighborhood this same beauty and energy will be destroyed on so many levels in the years to come.

Again, thank you for your time.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tanisha B. Thomas



Thryeris Mason
President

Julianne Burg
Vice President

Samantha Burg
Secretary

Julie Burg
Treasurer

Marco Flores
Area 1
Representative

Joel Vaca
Area 1
Representative

Steve Pepdjonovic
Area 2
Representative

Kevin McPherson
Area 2
Representative

Jean Frost
Area 3
Representative

Nicholas Creighton
Area 3
Representative

Jon Tieuel
At Large
Representative

Nina Womack
At Large
Representative

Cindy Gaete
At Large
Representative

Christopher Perez
USC Interest
Representative

Jim Childs
Business
Representative

November 10, 2020

Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street
LA, CA 90012
ATT: Sergio Ibarra (Sergio.Ibarra@lacity.org)

Via email

RE: 1840 1848 West Adams Boulevard, VTT-83081-SL-HCA, 10 unit small lot subdivision,

Rep: Nevis Capital LLC, Scott Yang

Dear Mr. Ibarra:

The Empowerment Congress North Area Neighborhood Development Council (NANDC) Board discussed the above referenced development proposal on November 5, 2020 at its General Board Meeting and at the Policy/Joint Board Committee meeting on October 27. By motion, the Board opposes the small lot subdivision and 10 unit development as currently proposed as it is incompatible with the community character due to its size, design, excessive room count, and overall architecture and failure to comply with established community plans.

The Policy Committee had extensive discussion with the developers' representative at its Policy Committee meeting on October 27. The ten units include 96 bedrooms and the counter per each of the units was not clearly explained. The design fails to meet any of the requirements of the CPIO and the South Community Plan. "The Plan contains policies that ensure that new construction and the rehabilitation of existing buildings is of high quality architectural, landscape and environmental design. Projects should contribute to reinforcing the distinctive and historical character of the corridors and the residential neighborhoods they serve."¹

The proposed project fails to reinforce the character of the Charles Victor Hall Tract in which the project is located, identified as a historic area by the Community

¹ South Community Plan, "Revitalize Corridors and Preserve Neighborhood Character," 3-6



Redevelopment Agency and in the South Community Plan as a character residential CPIO. The development also has serious impacts on traffic, parking and circulation.

The Policy Committee recommended that the Board reject the project as proposed (8-0-0) and the NANDC Board unanimously adopted the Policy Committee recommendation on November 5, 2020.

NANDC is a self-governed, self-directed and independent organization empowered by the Los Angeles City Charter. This charter offers neighborhood councils a role in the City's decision-making process. NANDC was certified by the City of Los Angeles on April 27, 2002 and was the 24th neighborhood council formed under the guidelines of the City Charter. We urge the Deputy Advisory Agency reject this proposal.

Sincerely,

Thryeris Mason, President

Cc: Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson.

Albizaal Del Valle CD8

Kristen Gorden CD8

NANDC Board

Scott Yang, Nevis Capital LLC

July 12, 2022

VIA EMAIL

South Los Angeles Planning Commission
201 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I

RE: Project Site: 1840-1848 West Adams Boulevard
Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA
CEQA NO.: ENV-2020-3308-CE
Zone: C2-1VL-O-CPIO

Dear Ms. Armstrong,

I am writing this letter to oppose the projected Tripalink project at 1840-1848 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, 90018. The size and logistics of this building are not compatible for this location. The proposed structure will consist of ***ninety-six bedrooms*** designed primarily for USC students and single residents. This will bring an excessive amount of people, traffic, and parking issues that we are currently dealing with. Also, there are two existing Tripalink buildings on Adams Blvd (1729 W. Adams Blvd. and 1815 W. Adams Blvd).

This neighborhood is a family friendly environment that also promotes home ownership. We have been told there is a housing crisis, not a student housing crisis and while Tripalink offers minimal housing to non-students, their focus is student housing. Most importantly the Tripalink invasion is destroying the fabric of our historic neighborhood and changing the quality of life for us.

I respectfully request that this project is not approved. You can reach me at acanty63@aol.com or 310.753.9678 for any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andrea Canty
Homeowner
West Adams Neighborhood Association Block Captain
NANDC Past President



Planning APC South LA <apcsouthla@lacity.org>

Fwd: Denial of Appeal for VTT-83081-SL-HCA-1A

1 message

Adrienne Kuhre <adrienne.motlagh@gmail.com>
To: apcsouthla@lacity.org

Tue, Jul 19, 2022 at 8:02 PM

Dear South LA Planning Commissioners,

I am Adrienne Kuhre, former NANDC President and resident of the area in which [1840 - 1848 West Adams Boulevard](#) is located. You just made a terrible mistake that will continue the destruction of our neighborhood.

Your denial of our appeal with conditions to sell does nothing. Tripalink (the developer) will make the argument that they are unable to sell the units, and lease them, or easily sell them to an LLC. This development will be student housing. Not family housing. Not affordable housing. None of Tripalink's properties have been available for sale to individual buyers. Tripalink is very accustomed to exploiting loopholes. I am extremely upset by your decision, as is our community. You failed to LISTEN to us and now we will continue to suffer. We are exhausted from this fight but will continue to do so.

As stated by numerous residents, there is an open violation with the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division due to Tripalink's discrimination of only allowing students to rent. The City of Los Angeles is a part of this violation as they allow these discriminatory developments to continue to be operate. The case number is 128756-DBS. I encourage you to review The Fair Housing Act (https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/fair_housing_act_overview).

I wish I could say thank you but your perpetual inaction hurts us all.

Adrienne Kuhre



Planning APC South LA <apcsouthla@lacity.org>

Public Comment on Case No.: VTT-83081-SL-HCA-1A

1 message

Melissa Rojas <melroja94@gmail.com>
To: apcsouthla@lacity.org

Tue, Jul 19, 2022 at 4:06 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Melissa Rojas, a resident from South Los Angeles and a member of the Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE). I am writing in support of this appeal. This project is adjacent to a historic community known as the Charles Victor Hall Tract which used to be part of the Normandie 5 Redevelopment Project. It will have severe negative impacts and should not be exempted from CEQA.

We want to see a project that truly conforms to the purpose and intent and the design guidelines but most importantly takes its neighbors into consideration.

Thank you,
Melissa