



Planning Environmental Review <planning.envreview@lacity.org>

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Roy Snell

1 message

**Save Sunset Boulevard** <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Dec 22, 2014 at 7:18 AM

Reply-To: Roysnell@gmail.com

To: jonathan.brand@lacity.org, planning.envreview@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, Roysnell@gmail.com

From:

Roy Snell

Roysnell@gmail.com

54 Summerley Street

london

london

sw184ex

To:

The City Planning Department, Councilman Tom LaBonge, and Jonathan Brand,

I strongly object to the oversized and completely out of context development being proposed for the south-west junction of Sunset & Crescent Heights on these grounds;

This EIR makes reference to general conformance, yet general conformance is not the standard on which a project may be approved. In the EIR there is no serious respect given to the historical context for a development of this scale, mass or design. This project stands in direct conflict to the Hollywood General Plan and CEQA.

### HEIGHT

The land use detailed in the 8150 Sunset Blvd EIR is simply too excessive. At 216 feet this will be the tallest skyscraper on the historically low rise Sunset Strip.

8150 is applying for a permit to build condominiums. I ask that the city of Los Angeles reject this permit because on the way in which the approval process for rentals and condominiums differs. The EIR Represents the project as 16 stories when it is actually over a realistic 20 stories at 10 feet per story. I believe this to be an intentional misrepresentation to confuse the public, and because of this I demand a new EIR that correctly states the height without this misleading and incorrect figure of just sixteen stories.

### HISTORICAL RESOURCE DISTRICT

The Chateau Marmont and the surrounding French Chateau style apartment buildings represent some of Los Angeles's premier historical treasures, so to tower of them with a massive skyscraper will be a blight upon the area and a tragedy of urban design that cannot be undone. The EIR does not accurately represent the destruction to the neighborhood that this project will cause. The current design will have a disastrous effect on the historical nature of the immediate surroundings by:

- Demolishing the Lytton Building.
- The EIR fails to correctly address the aesthetic and financial effects of blocking the light and views of the historic Chateau Marmont, the Colonial House, Andalusia, Mi Casa, Chateau Marmont, The Granville, and The Savoy and countless hillside residents.
- The shading the Chateau Marmont, Colonial House, and The Andalusia will completely destroy one of the most open and spacious areas of Hollywood's original residential district.

### DENSITY

The Hollywood general plan states that it will:

"Protect lower density housing from the scattered intrusion of apartments" and states that...

"Transition building heights should be imposed, especially in the medium density housing designated areas where the designation is immediately adjacent to properties designated Low Medium 1 or more restrictive"

This project shares a property line with a 2 story residential building and I believe it is not consistent with the general plan. Specifically, the project immediately borders R4B zoned buildings on Havenhurst, R4a on Crescent Heights, and R2 – 1xl zoning across Havenhurst.

#### TRAFFIC

The EIR falsely claims that 5,296 daily trips are made by the present shopping mall and bases its traffic impact by subtracting this number. At present, the real number is approximately 1500 daily trips that are made by the shopping mall, and at its peak occupancy it was still only around 3000. The EIR says that it will only increase traffic by 1077 cars by building this development, but the real and honest number for 240 apartments containing at least 480 new residents, the restaurants, retail spaces, offices and gym employees, deliveries and the sheer number of the customers those business will need to cover their rent, the real figure will be closer to 8-10,000 new vehicle movements per day at this already abysmally overcrowded intersection.

I demand that the city of Los Angeles independently reassess the real figures based on actual traffic rather than the ridiculous disingenuous 'trips per day' guestimate made in the EIR.

Laurel Canyon Blvd (between Sunset & Ventura) is one of the most heavily congested corridors, as identified in the CGPF analysis of 2010 population and employment projections. (City of Los Angeles General Plan, Transportation, Chapter 2)

The proposal to take out a turning lane on the intersection of Laurel and Sunset will worsen traffic and slow emergency response times. This application must be denied.

The lead agency, the City of LA Planning Department, must consider whether this project will cause unsafe conditions for roadway users, residents and tax payers to avoid more expensive and disastrous lawsuits by properly determining the consequences of:

- The developers goal of pushing 900 new bicyclists into totally unsafe streets.
- Greater speed differentials between bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles in one of the most congested and dangerous junctions in Hollywood.
- Increased danger to bicyclists and pedestrians in "vehicle conflict areas"
- The resulting inadequate emergency access to all hillside residents and neighbors as a result of this new and unmanageable congestion.

#### PARKING

The EIR does not satisfactorily address the fact that there are nothing like enough parking spaces for the 480+ residents, 100+ retail, restaurant and gym employees along the thousands of clients they will need to attract to cover their rent. This will mean thousands of cars a day circling one of the most congested areas in Hollywood searching for parking, adding massive amounts of pollution, destroying our quality of life, and making it impossible for residents and emergency vehicles to have speedy access to the hillside neighborhoods.

#### THE "CONDO" LOOPHOLE

Townscape, the developers, are now applying to the city for condo parcel numbers. This means the units will be considered "individual homes" and are not subject to city rent increase guidelines. This is clearly a way to get around city rent guidelines, and to turn the unenforced "low income housing" benefits they are asking for into yet more easy to flip profit. I also ask that these loopholes are closed.

#### LOSS OF SERVICE

The addition of traffic and the overburden of parking to this already overcrowded intersection is going to result in a huge loss of speedy emergency service to all hillside residents. When seconds matter in the event of fire or heart attack this loss of service will open the door to potentially massive law suits against the city in the event of catastrophic or fatal accidents in the hillside communities.

12/31/2014

City of Los Angeles Mail - Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Roy Snell

These are some of my concerns, and I would like to know that City Hall will address them.

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Roy Snell  
Roysnell@gmail.com  
54 Summerley Street  
london  
london  
sw184ex



Planning Environmental Review &lt;planning.envreview@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Chau Phan

1 message

---

**Save Sunset Boulevard** <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Tue, Dec 23, 2014 at 10:33 AM

Reply-To: chauberry@gmail.com

To: jonathan.brand@lacity.org, planning.envreview@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, chauberry@gmail.com

From:

Chau Phan

chauberry@gmail.com

8952 Wonderland Ave

Los Angeles

CA

90046

To:

The City Planning Department, Councilman Tom LaBonge, and Jonathan Brand,

I strongly object to the oversized and completely out of context development being proposed for the south-west junction of Sunset & Crescent Heights on these grounds;

This EIR makes reference to general conformance, yet general conformance is not the standard on which a project may be approved. In the EIR there is no serious respect given to the historical context for a development of this scale, mass or design. This project stands in direct conflict to the Hollywood General Plan and CEQA.

### HEIGHT

The land use detailed in the 8150 Sunset Blvd EIR is simply too excessive. At 216 feet this will be the tallest skyscraper on the historically low rise Sunset Strip.

8150 is applying for a permit to build condominiums. I ask that the city of Los Angeles reject this permit because on the way in which the approval process for rentals and condominiums differs. The EIR Represents the project as 16 stories when it is actually over a realistic 20 stories at 10 feet per story. I believe this to be an intentional misrepresentation to confuse the public, and because of this I demand a new EIR that correctly states the height without this misleading and incorrect figure of just sixteen stories.

### HISTORICAL RESOURCE DISTRICT

The Chateau Marmont and the surrounding French Chateau style apartment buildings represent some of Los Angeles's premier historical treasures, so to tower of them with a massive skyscraper will be a blight upon the area and a tragedy of urban design that cannot be undone. The EIR does not accurately represent the destruction to the neighborhood that this project will cause. The current design will have a disastrous effect on the historical nature of the immediate surroundings by:

- Demolishing the Lytton Building.
- The EIR fails to correctly address the aesthetic and financial effects of blocking the light and views of the historic Chateau Marmont, the Colonial House, Andalusia, Mi Casa, Chateau Marmont, The Granville, and The Savoy and countless hillside residents.
- The shading the Chateau Marmont, Colonial House, and The Andalusia will completely destroy one of the most open and spacious areas of Hollywood's original residential district.

### DENSITY

The Hollywood general plan states that it will:

"Protect lower density housing from the scattered intrusion of apartments" and states that...

"Transition building heights should be imposed, especially in the medium density housing designated areas where the designation is immediately adjacent to properties designated Low Medium 1 or more restrictive"

This project shares a property line with a 2 story residential building and I believe it is not consistent with the general plan. Specifically, the project immediately borders R4B zoned buildings on Havenhurst, R4a on Crescent Heights, and R2 – 1x1 zoning across Havenhurst.

#### TRAFFIC

The EIR falsely claims that 5,296 daily trips are made by the present shopping mall and bases its traffic impact by subtracting this number. At present, the real number is approximately 1500 daily trips that are made by the shopping mall, and at its peak occupancy it was still only around 3000. The EIR says that it will only increase traffic by 1077 cars by building this development, but the real and honest number for 240 apartments containing at least 480 new residents, the restaurants, retail spaces, offices and gym employees, deliveries and the sheer number of the customers those business will need to cover their rent, the real figure will be closer to 8-10,000 new vehicle movements per day at this already abysmally overcrowded intersection.

I demand that the city of Los Angeles independently reassess the real figures based on actual traffic rather than the ridiculous disingenuous 'trips per day' guestimate made in the EIR.

Laurel Canyon Blvd (between Sunset & Ventura) is one of the most heavily congested corridors, as identified in the CGPF analysis of 2010 population and employment projections. (City of Los Angeles General Plan, Transportation, Chapter 2)

The proposal to take out a turning lane on the intersection of Laurel and Sunset will worsen traffic and slow emergency response times. This application must be denied.

The lead agency, the City of LA Planning Department, must consider whether this project will cause unsafe conditions for roadway users, residents and tax payers to avoid more expensive and disastrous lawsuits by properly determining the consequences of:

- The developers goal of pushing 900 new bicyclists into totally unsafe streets.
- Greater speed differentials between bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles in one of the most congested and dangerous junctions in Hollywood.
- Increased danger to bicyclists and pedestrians in "vehicle conflict areas"
- The resulting inadequate emergency access to all hillside residents and neighbors as a result of this new and unmanageable congestion.

#### PARKING

The EIR does not satisfactorily address the fact that there are nothing like enough parking spaces for the 480+ residents, 100+ retail, restaurant and gym employees along the thousands of clients they will need to attract to cover their rent. This will mean thousands of cars a day circling one of the most congested areas in Hollywood searching for parking, adding massive amounts of pollution, destroying our quality of life, and making it impossible for residents and emergency vehicles to have speedy access to the hillside neighborhoods.

#### THE "CONDO" LOOPHOLE

Townscape, the developers, are now applying to the city for condo parcel numbers. This means the units will be considered "individual homes" and are not subject to city rent increase guidelines. This is clearly a way to get around city rent guidelines, and to turn the unenforced "low income housing" benefits they are asking for into yet more easy to flip profit. I also ask that these loopholes are closed.

#### LOSS OF SERVICE

The addition of traffic and the overburden of parking to this already overcrowded intersection is going to result in a huge loss of speedy emergency service to all hillside residents. When seconds matter in the event of fire or heart attack this loss of service will open the door to potentially massive law suits against the city in the event of catastrophic or fatal accidents in the hillside communities.

12/31/2014

City of Los Angeles Mail - Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Chau Phan

These are some of my concerns, and I would like to know that City Hall will address them.

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Chau Phan  
chauberry@gmail.com  
8952 Wonderland Ave  
los Angeles  
ca  
90046



Planning Environmental Review &lt;planning.envreview@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from David Benz

1 message

---

**Save Sunset Boulevard** <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Tue, Dec 30, 2014 at 9:50 AM

Reply-To: david@vaughanbenz.com

To: jonathan.brand@lacity.org, planning.envreview@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, david@vaughanbenz.com

From:

David Benz

david@vaughanbenz.com

6446 Innsdale Drive

Los Angeles

CA

90068

To:

The City Planning Department, Councilman Tom LaBonge, and Jonathan Brand,

I strongly object to the oversized and completely out of context development being proposed for the south-west junction of Sunset & Crescent Heights on these grounds;

This EIR makes reference to general conformance, yet general conformance is not the standard on which a project may be approved. In the EIR there is no serious respect given to the historical context for a development of this scale, mass or design. This project stands in direct conflict to the Hollywood General Plan and CEQA.

### HEIGHT

The land use detailed in the 8150 Sunset Blvd EIR is simply too excessive. At 216 feet this will be the tallest skyscraper on the historically low rise Sunset Strip.

8150 is applying for a permit to build condominiums. I ask that the city of Los Angeles reject this permit because on the way in which the approval process for rentals and condominiums differs. The EIR Represents the project as 16 stories when it is actually over a realistic 20 stories at 10 feet per story. I believe this to be an intentional misrepresentation to confuse the public, and because of this I demand a new EIR that correctly states the height without this misleading and incorrect figure of just sixteen stories.

### HISTORICAL RESOURCE DISTRICT

The Chateau Marmont and the surrounding French Chateau style apartment buildings represent some of Los Angeles's premier historical treasures, so to tower over them with a massive skyscraper will be a blight upon the area and a tragedy of urban design that cannot be undone. The EIR does not accurately represent the destruction to the neighborhood that this project will cause. The current design will have a disastrous effect on the historical nature of the immediate surroundings by:

- Demolishing the Lytton Building.
- The EIR fails to correctly address the aesthetic and financial effects of blocking the light and views of the historic Chateau Marmont, the Colonial House, Andalusia, Mi Casa, Chateau Marmont, The Granville, and The Savoy and countless hillside residents.
- The shading the Chateau Marmont, Colonial House, and The Andalusia will completely destroy one of the most open and spacious areas of Hollywood's original residential district.

### DENSITY

The Hollywood general plan states that it will:

"Protect lower density housing from the scattered intrusion of apartments"

and states that...

"Transition building heights should be imposed, especially in the medium density housing designated areas where the designation is immediately adjacent to properties designated Low Medium 1 or more restrictive"

This project shares a property line with a 2 story residential building and I believe it is not consistent with the general plan. Specifically, the project immediately borders R4B zoned buildings on Havenhurst, R4a on Crescent Heights, and R2 – 1xl zoning across Havenhurst.

#### TRAFFIC

The EIR falsely claims that 5,296 daily trips are made by the present shopping mall and bases its traffic impact by subtracting this number. At present, the real number is approximately 1500 daily trips that are made by the shopping mall, and at its peak occupancy it was still only around 3000. The EIR says that it will only increase traffic by 1077 cars by building this development, but the real and honest number for 240 apartments containing at least 480 new residents, the restaurants, retail spaces, offices and gym employees, deliveries and the sheer number of the customers those business will need to cover their rent, the real figure will be closer to 8-10,000 new vehicle movements per day at this already abysmally overcrowded intersection.

I demand that the city of Los Angeles independently reassess the real figures based on actual traffic rather than the ridiculous disingenuous 'trips per day' guestimate made in the EIR.

Laurel Canyon Blvd (between Sunset & Ventura) is one of the most heavily congested corridors, as identified in the CGPF analysis of 2010 population and employment projections. (City of Los Angeles General Plan, Transportation, Chapter 2)

The proposal to take out a turning lane on the intersection of Laurel and Sunset will worsen traffic and slow emergency response times. This application must be denied.

The lead agency, the City of LA Planning Department, must consider whether this project will cause unsafe conditions for roadway users, residents and tax payers to avoid more expensive and disastrous lawsuits by properly determining the consequences of:

- The developers goal of pushing 900 new bicyclists into totally unsafe streets.
- Greater speed differentials between bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles in one of the most congested and dangerous junctions in Hollywood.
- Increased danger to bicyclists and pedestrians in "vehicle conflict areas"
- The resulting inadequate emergency access to all hillside residents and neighbors as a result of this new and unmanageable congestion.

#### PARKING

The EIR does not satisfactorily address the fact that there are nothing like enough parking spaces for the 480+ residents, 100+ retail, restaurant and gym employees along the thousands of clients they will need to attract to cover their rent. This will mean thousands of cars a day circling one of the most congested areas in Hollywood searching for parking, adding massive amounts of pollution, destroying our quality of life, and making it impossible for residents and emergency vehicles to have speedy access to the hillside neighborhoods.

#### THE "CONDO" LOOPHOLE

Townscape, the developers, are now applying to the city for condo parcel numbers. This means the units will be considered "individual homes" and are not subject to city rent increase guidelines. This is clearly a way to get around city rent guidelines, and to turn the unenforced "low income housing" benefits they are asking for into yet more easy to flip profit. I also ask that these loopholes are closed.

#### LOSS OF SERVICE

The addition of traffic and the overburden of parking to this already overcrowded intersection is going to result in a huge loss of speedy emergency service to all hillside residents. When seconds matter in the event of fire or heart attack this loss of service will open the door to potentially massive law suits against the city in the event of catastrophic or fatal accidents in the hillside communities.



12/31/2014

City of Los Angeles Mail - Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from David Benz

These are some of my concerns, and I would like to know that City Hall will address them.

Thank you, yours sincerely,

David Benz  
david@vaughanbenz.com  
6446 Innsdale Drive  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90068



---

**Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Curtis wayne brown**1 message

---

**Save Sunset Boulevard** <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Tue, Dec 30, 2014 at 2:56 PM

Reply-To: Rascalcbrown@aol.com

To: jonathan.brand@lacity.org, planning.envreview@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, Rascalcbrown@aol.com

From:

Curtis wayne brown

Rascalcbrown@aol.com

2333 San Marco Drive

Los Angeles

California

90068

To:

The City Planning Department, Councilman Tom LaBonge, and Jonathan Brand,

I strongly object to the oversized and completely out of context development being proposed for the south-west junction of Sunset & Crescent Heights on these grounds;

This EIR makes reference to general conformance, yet general conformance is not the standard on which a project may be approved. In the EIR there is no serious respect given to the historical context for a development of this scale, mass or design. This project stands in direct conflict to the Hollywood General Plan and CEQA.

**HEIGHT**

The land use detailed in the 8150 Sunset Blvd EIR is simply too excessive. At 216 feet this will be the tallest skyscraper on the historically low rise Sunset Strip.

8150 is applying for a permit to build condominiums. I ask that the city of Los Angeles reject this permit because on the way in which the approval process for rentals and condominiums differs. The EIR Represents the project as 16 stories when it is actually over a realistic 20 stories at 10 feet per story. I believe this to be an intentional misrepresentation to confuse the public, and because of this I demand a new EIR that correctly states the height without this misleading and incorrect figure of just sixteen stories.

**HISTORICAL RESOURCE DISTRICT**

The Chateau Marmont and the surrounding French Chateau style apartment buildings represent some of Los Angeles's premier historical treasures, so to tower over them with a massive skyscraper will be a blight upon the area and a tragedy of urban design that cannot be undone. The EIR does not accurately represent the destruction to the neighborhood that this project will cause. The current design will have a disastrous effect on the historical nature of the immediate surroundings by:

- Demolishing the Lytton Building.
- The EIR fails to correctly address the aesthetic and financial effects of blocking the light and views of the historic Chateau Marmont, the Colonial House, Andalusia, Mi Casa, Chateau Marmont, The Granville, and The Savoy and countless hillside residents.
- The shading the Chateau Marmont, Colonial House, and The Andalusia will completely destroy one of the most open and spacious areas of Hollywood's original residential district.

**DENSITY**

The Hollywood general plan states that it will:

"Protect lower density housing from the scattered intrusion of apartments"  
and states that...

"Transition building heights should be imposed, especially in the medium density housing designated areas where the designation is immediately adjacent to properties designated Low Medium 1 or more restrictive"

This project shares a property line with a 2 story residential building and I believe it is not consistent with the general plan. Specifically, the project immediately borders R4B zoned buildings on Havenhurst, R4a on Crescent Heights, and R2 – 1xl zoning across Havenhurst.

#### TRAFFIC

The EIR falsely claims that 5,296 daily trips are made by the present shopping mall and bases its traffic impact by subtracting this number. At present, the real number is approximately 1500 daily trips that are made by the shopping mall, and at its peak occupancy it was still only around 3000. The EIR says that it will only increase traffic by 1077 cars by building this development, but the real and honest number for 240 apartments containing at least 480 new residents, the restaurants, retails spaces, offices and gym employees, deliveries and the sheer number of the customers those business will need to cover their rent, the real figure will be closer to 8-10,000 new vehicle movements per day at this already abysmally overcrowded intersection.

I demand that the city of Los Angeles independently reassess the real figures based on actual traffic rather than the ridiculous disingenuous 'trips per day' guestimate made in the EIR.

Laurel Canyon Blvd (between Sunset & Ventura) is one of the most heavily congested corridors, as identified in the CGPF analysis of 2010 population and employment projections. (City of Los Angeles General Plan, Transportation, Chapter 2)

The proposal to take out a turning lane on the intersection of Laurel and Sunset will worsen traffic and slow emergency response times. This application must be denied.

The lead agency, the City of LA Planning Department, must consider whether this project will cause unsafe conditions for roadway users, residents and tax payers to avoid more expensive and disastrous lawsuits by properly determining the consequences of:

- The developers goal of pushing 900 new bicyclists into totally unsafe streets.
- Greater speed differentials between bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles in one of the most congested and dangerous junctions in Hollywood.
- Increased danger to bicyclists and pedestrians in "vehicle conflict areas"
- The resulting inadequate emergency access to all hillside residents and neighbors as a result of this new and unmanageable congestion.

#### PARKING

The EIR does not satisfactorily address the fact that there are nothing like enough parking spaces for the 480+ residents, 100+ retail, restaurant and gym employees along the thousands of clients they will need to attract to cover their rent. This will mean thousands of cars a day circling one of the most congested areas in Hollywood searching for parking, adding massive amounts of pollution, destroying our quality of life, and making it impossible for residents and emergency vehicles to have speedy access to the hillside neighborhoods.

#### THE "CONDO" LOOPHOLE

Townscape, the developers, are now applying to the city for condo parcel numbers. This means the units will be considered "individual homes" and are not subject to city rent increase guidelines. This is clearly a away to get around city rent guidelines, and to turn the unenforced "low income housing" benefits they are asking for into yet more easy to flip profit. I also ask that these loopholes are closed.

#### LOSS OF SERVICE

The addition of traffic and the overburden of parking to this already overcrowded intersection is going to result in a huge loss of speedy emergency service to all hillside residents. When seconds matter in the event of fire or heart attack this loss of service will open the door to potentially massive law suits against the city in the event of catastrophic of fatal accidents in the hillside communities.

**ADDITIONAL CONCERNS**

There is so much developing going on that people cannot afford nor live in not all the buildings or even being filled up why build another high-rise to block the views from people who can actually afford to live here

These are some of my concerns, and I would like to know that City Hall will address them.

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Curtis wayne brown  
Rascalcbrown@aol.com  
2333 San Marco Drive  
Los Angeles  
California  
90068



Planning Environmental Review &lt;planning.envreview@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Julie Olen

1 message

---

**Save Sunset Boulevard** <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Tue, Dec 30, 2014 at 5:28 PM

Reply-To: julieolen@sbcglobal.net

To: jonathan.brand@lacity.org, planning.envreview@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, julieolen@sbcglobal.net

From:

Julie Olen

julieolen@sbcglobal.net

1270 Havenhurst Dr. #14

West Hollywood

CA

90046

To:

The City Planning Department, Councilman Tom LaBonge, and Jonathan Brand,

I strongly object to the oversized and completely out of context development being proposed for the south-west junction of Sunset & Crescent Heights on these grounds;

This EIR makes reference to general conformance, yet general conformance is not the standard on which a project may be approved. In the EIR there is no serious respect given to the historical context for a development of this scale, mass or design. This project stands in direct conflict to the Hollywood General Plan and CEQA.

### HEIGHT

The land use detailed in the 8150 Sunset Blvd EIR is simply too excessive. At 216 feet this will be the tallest skyscraper on the historically low rise Sunset Strip.

8150 is applying for a permit to build condominiums. I ask that the city of Los Angeles reject this permit because on the way in which the approval process for rentals and condominiums differs. The EIR Represents the project as 16 stories when it is actually over a realistic 20 stories at 10 feet per story. I believe this to be an intentional misrepresentation to confuse the public, and because of this I demand a new EIR that correctly states the height without this misleading and incorrect figure of just sixteen stories.

### HISTORICAL RESOURCE DISTRICT

The Chateau Marmont and the surrounding French Chateau style apartment buildings represent some of Los Angeles's premier historical treasures, so to tower over them with a massive skyscraper will be a blight upon the area and a tragedy of urban design that cannot be undone. The EIR does not accurately represent the destruction to the neighborhood that this project will cause. The current design will have a disastrous effect on the historical nature of the immediate surroundings by:

- Demolishing the Lytton Building.
- The EIR fails to correctly address the aesthetic and financial effects of blocking the light and views of the historic Chateau Marmont, the Colonial House, Andalusia, Mi Casa, Chateau Marmont, The Granville, and The Savoy and countless hillside residents.
- The shading the Chateau Marmont, Colonial House, and The Andalusia will completely destroy one of the most open and spacious areas of Hollywood's original residential district.

### DENSITY

The Hollywood general plan states that it will:

"Protect lower density housing from the scattered intrusion of apartments"

and states that...

"Transition building heights should be imposed, especially in the medium density housing designated areas where the designation is immediately adjacent to properties designated Low Medium 1 or more restrictive"

This project shares a property line with a 2 story residential building and I believe it is not consistent with the general plan. Specifically, the project immediately borders R4B zoned buildings on Havenhurst, R4a on Crescent Heights, and R2 – 1x1 zoning across Havenhurst.

#### TRAFFIC

The EIR falsely claims that 5,296 daily trips are made by the present shopping mall and bases its traffic impact by subtracting this number. At present, the real number is approximately 1500 daily trips that are made by the shopping mall, and at its peak occupancy it was still only around 3000. The EIR says that it will only increase traffic by 1077 cars by building this development, but the real and honest number for 240 apartments containing at least 480 new residents, the restaurants, retail spaces, offices and gym employees, deliveries and the sheer number of the customers those businesses will need to cover their rent, the real figure will be closer to 8-10,000 new vehicle movements per day at this already abysmally overcrowded intersection.

I demand that the city of Los Angeles independently reassess the real figures based on actual traffic rather than the ridiculous disingenuous 'trips per day' guestimate made in the EIR.

Laurel Canyon Blvd (between Sunset & Ventura) is one of the most heavily congested corridors, as identified in the CGPF analysis of 2010 population and employment projections. (City of Los Angeles General Plan, Transportation, Chapter 2)

The proposal to take out a turning lane on the intersection of Laurel and Sunset will worsen traffic and slow emergency response times. This application must be denied.

The lead agency, the City of LA Planning Department, must consider whether this project will cause unsafe conditions for roadway users, residents and tax payers to avoid more expensive and disastrous lawsuits by properly determining the consequences of:

- The developers goal of pushing 900 new bicyclists into totally unsafe streets.
- Greater speed differentials between bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles in one of the most congested and dangerous junctions in Hollywood.
- Increased danger to bicyclists and pedestrians in "vehicle conflict areas"
- The resulting inadequate emergency access to all hillside residents and neighbors as a result of this new and unmanageable congestion.

#### PARKING

The EIR does not satisfactorily address the fact that there are nothing like enough parking spaces for the 480+ residents, 100+ retail, restaurant and gym employees along the thousands of clients they will need to attract to cover their rent. This will mean thousands of cars a day circling one of the most congested areas in Hollywood searching for parking, adding massive amounts of pollution, destroying our quality of life, and making it impossible for residents and emergency vehicles to have speedy access to the hillside neighborhoods.

#### THE "CONDO" LOOPHOLE

Townscape, the developers, are now applying to the city for condo parcel numbers. This means the units will be considered "individual homes" and are not subject to city rent increase guidelines. This is clearly a way to get around city rent guidelines, and to turn the unenforced "low income housing" benefits they are asking for into yet more easy to flip profit. I also ask that these loopholes are closed.

#### LOSS OF SERVICE

The addition of traffic and the overburden of parking to this already overcrowded intersection is going to result in a huge loss of speedy emergency service to all hillside residents. When seconds matter in the event of fire or heart attack this loss of service will open the door to potentially massive law suits against the city in the event of catastrophic or fatal accidents in the hillside communities.

**ADDITIONAL CONCERNS**

Please let common sense prevail. **DO NOT DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOOD !!!** This would be an absolute disaster, displacing hundreds of people, ruining the Harper historic district & the continuity of the entire area.

These are some of my concerns, and I would like to know that City Hall will address them.

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Julie Olen  
julieolen@sbcglobal.net  
1270 Havenhurst Dr. #14  
West Hollywood  
CA  
90046



Planning Environmental Review &lt;planning.envreview@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Eda G Hallinan

1 message

---

**Save Sunset Boulevard** <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Tue, Dec 30, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Reply-To: TinseltownEda@gmail.com

To: jonathan.brand@lacity.org, planning.envreview@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, TinseltownEda@gmail.com

From:

Eda G Hallinan

TinseltownEda@Gmail.com

2593 1/2 Beachwood Dr

Los Angeles

California

90068

To:

The City Planning Department, Councilman Tom LaBonge, and Jonathan Brand,

I strongly object to the oversized and completely out of context development being proposed for the south-west junction of Sunset & Crescent Heights on these grounds;

This EIR makes reference to general conformance, yet general conformance is not the standard on which a project may be approved. In the EIR there is no serious respect given to the historical context for a development of this scale, mass or design. This project stands in direct conflict to the Hollywood General Plan and CEQA.

### HEIGHT

The land use detailed in the 8150 Sunset Blvd EIR is simply too excessive. At 216 feet this will be the tallest skyscraper on the historically low rise Sunset Strip.

8150 is applying for a permit to build condominiums. I ask that the city of Los Angeles reject this permit because on the way in which the approval process for rentals and condominiums differs. The EIR Represents the project as 16 stories when it is actually over a realistic 20 stories at 10 feet per story. I believe this to be an intentional misrepresentation to confuse the public, and because of this I demand a new EIR that correctly states the height without this misleading and incorrect figure of just sixteen stories.

### HISTORICAL RESOURCE DISTRICT

The Chateau Marmont and the surrounding French Chateau style apartment buildings represent some of Los Angeles's premier historical treasures, so to tower over them with a massive skyscraper will be a blight upon the area and a tragedy of urban design that cannot be undone. The EIR does not accurately represent the destruction to the neighborhood that this project will cause. The current design will have a disastrous effect on the historical nature of the immediate surroundings by:

- Demolishing the Lytton Building.
- The EIR fails to correctly address the aesthetic and financial effects of blocking the light and views of the historic Chateau Marmont, the Colonial House, Andalusia, Mi Casa, Chateau Marmont, The Granville, and The Savoy and countless hillside residents.
- The shading the Chateau Marmont, Colonial House, and The Andalusia will completely destroy one of the most open and spacious areas of Hollywood's original residential district.

### DENSITY

The Hollywood general plan states that it will:



"Protect lower density housing from the scattered intrusion of apartments" and states that...

"Transition building heights should be imposed, especially in the medium density housing designated areas where the designation is immediately adjacent to properties designated Low Medium 1 or more restrictive"

This project shares a property line with a 2 story residential building and I believe it is not consistent with the general plan. Specifically, the project immediately borders R4B zoned buildings on Havenhurst, R4a on Crescent Heights, and R2 – 1xl zoning across Havenhurst.

#### TRAFFIC

The EIR falsely claims that 5,296 daily trips are made by the present shopping mall and bases its traffic impact by subtracting this number. At present, the real number is approximately 1500 daily trips that are made by the shopping mall, and at its peak occupancy it was still only around 3000. The EIR says that it will only increase traffic by 1077 cars by building this development, but the real and honest number for 240 apartments containing at least 480 new residents, the restaurants, retail spaces, offices and gym employees, deliveries and the sheer number of the customers those business will need to cover their rent, the real figure will be closer to 8-10,000 new vehicle movements per day at this already abysmally overcrowded intersection.

I demand that the city of Los Angeles independently reassess the real figures based on actual traffic rather than the ridiculous disingenuous 'trips per day' guestimate made in the EIR.

Laurel Canyon Blvd (between Sunset & Ventura) is one of the most heavily congested corridors, as identified in the CGPF analysis of 2010 population and employment projections. (City of Los Angeles General Plan, Transportation, Chapter 2)

The proposal to take out a turning lane on the intersection of Laurel and Sunset will worsen traffic and slow emergency response times. This application must be denied.

The lead agency, the City of LA Planning Department, must consider whether this project will cause unsafe conditions for roadway users, residents and tax payers to avoid more expensive and disastrous lawsuits by properly determining the consequences of:

- The developers goal of pushing 900 new bicyclists into totally unsafe streets.
- Greater speed differentials between bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles in one of the most congested and dangerous junctions in Hollywood.
- Increased danger to bicyclists and pedestrians in "vehicle conflict areas"
- The resulting inadequate emergency access to all hillside residents and neighbors as a result of this new and unmanageable congestion.

#### PARKING

The EIR does not satisfactorily address the fact that there are nothing like enough parking spaces for the 480+ residents, 100+ retail, restaurant and gym employees along the thousands of clients they will need to attract to cover their rent. This will mean thousands of cars a day circling one of the most congested areas in Hollywood searching for parking, adding massive amounts of pollution, destroying our quality of life, and making it impossible for residents and emergency vehicles to have speedy access to the hillside neighborhoods.

#### THE "CONDO" LOOPHOLE

Townscape, the developers, are now applying to the city for condo parcel numbers. This means the units will be considered "individual homes" and are not subject to city rent increase guidelines. This is clearly a way to get around city rent guidelines, and to turn the unenforced "low income housing" benefits they are asking for into yet more easy to flip profit. I also ask that these loopholes are closed.

#### LOSS OF SERVICE

The addition of traffic and the overburden of parking to this already overcrowded intersection is going to result in a huge loss of speedy emergency service to all hillside residents. When seconds matter in the event of fire or heart attack this loss of service will open the door to potentially massive law suits against the city in the event of catastrophic or fatal accidents in the hillside communities.

**ADDITIONAL CONCERNS**

The shopping center is an eyesore....but I would pick that over this building which is simply a bigger eyesore.

These are some of my concerns, and I would like to know that City Hall will address them.

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Eda G Hallinan  
TinseltownEda@Gmail.com  
2593 1/2 Beachwood Dr  
Los Angeles  
California  
90068