



## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Steven Poster ASC reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:16 PM

Reply-To: stevenasc@aol.com

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

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

From:

Steven Poster ASC

stevenasc@aol.com

9663 Santa Monica Blvd

Beverly Hills

CA

90210

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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Steven Poster ASC  
stevenasc@aol.com  
9663 Santa Monica Blvd  
Beverly Hills  
CA  
90210





---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Carol Gray reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

---

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:02 PM

Reply-To: caroldhgray@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Carol Gray

caroldhgray@gmail.com

8301 Marmont Ln

Los Angeles

CA

90069

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**

Traffic on Sunset/Crescent Hgts already at dangerous critical mass. PLEASE don't build this high density building and destroy our community.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Carol Gray  
caroldhgray@gmail.com  
8301 Marmont Ln  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90069







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Stephen Badger reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 11:57 AM

Reply-To: Stephen.bAdger@effem.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, Stephen.bAdger@effem.com

From:

Stephen Badger

Stephen.bAdger@effem.com

1698 MarMont Ave

Los Angeles

CA

87501

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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Stephen Badger  
Stephen.bAdger@effem.com  
1698 MarMont Ave  
Los Angeles  
CA  
87501





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Matthew Schneider reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 11:54 AM

Reply-To: racer810@sbcglobal.net

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, racer810@sbcglobal.net

From:

Matthew Schneider

racer810@sbcglobal.net

1565 Selma Drive

Los Angeles

California

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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Matthew Schneider  
racer810@sbcglobal.net  
1565 Selma Drive  
Los Angeles  
California  
90046







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Janet Eckholm reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 11:48 AM

Reply-To: janeteckholm@sbcglobal.net

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

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

From:

Janet Eckholm

janeteckholm@sbcglobal.net

7433 Kimdale Lane

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 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**

This location is too congested - developing a highrise there would be irresponsible.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Janet Eckholm  
janeteckholm@sbcglobal.net  
7433 Kimdale Lane  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Rob Lewine reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 11:24 AM

Reply-To: rob@roblewine.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, rob@roblewine.com

From:

Rob Lewine

rob@roblewine.com

8929 Holly Place

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 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**

**Dear Planning:**

**I've lived in Laurel Canyon for 48 years. It seems illogical to me that the answer to expanded density in Hollywood (and in the Hollywood Hills) is to allow a massive development at an already-crowded intersection.**

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

**Thank you, yours sincerely,**

**Rob Lewine  
rob@roblewine.com  
8929 Holly Place  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046**







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Peter Falk reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 10:12 AM

Reply-To: peterandrenafalk@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Peter Falk

peterandrenafalk@gmail.com

8206 Skyline Drive

Los Angeles

CA

90046-1037

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 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**

I am a Laurel Canyon resident who uses the Crescent Heights and Sunset corridors daily. I greatly object to this ill-conceived project. Please support residents, drivers and pedestrians and review the EIR for this plan.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Peter Falk  
peterandrenafalk@gmail.com  
8206 Skyline Drive  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046-1037





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Rena E. Falk reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 10:07 AM

Reply-To: rena.falk@cshs.org

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, rena.falk@cshs.org

From:

Rena E. Falk

rena.falk@cshs.org

8206 Skyline Drive

Los Angeles

CA

90046-1037

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 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

As a resident of the Hollywood Hills who uses Laurel Canyon Blvd daily, I have witnessed the huge changes in traffic in general and, specifically at the Sunset-Crescent Heights corner. This is a horribly congested and dangerous corner already.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Rena E. Falk  
rena.falk@cshs.org  
8206 Skyline Drive  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046-1037







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from sondra anderson reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 8:13 AM

Reply-To: shanafe3@sbcglobal.net

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, shanafe3@sbcglobal.net

From:

sondra anderson

shanafe3@sbcglobal.net

1566 North Crescent Heights Blvd.

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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

sondra anderson  
shanafe3@sbcglobal.net  
1566 North Crescent Heights Blvd.  
Los Angeles  
ca  
90046





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from James Parriott reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 6:32 AM

Reply-To: Jamesparriott@gmail.com

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

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

From:

James Parriott

Jamesparriott@gmail.com

8235 Lincoln Terrace

Los Angeles

CA

90069

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

The infrastructure simply can't support this additional population and subsequent traffic. Emergency vehicles will be delayed costly minutes. Houses will burn and people will die. This is a terrible idea.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

James Parriott  
Jamesparriott@gmail.com  
8235 Lincoln Terrace  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90069







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Diane Cary Parriott reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 6:26 AM

Reply-To: attrice17@gmail.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, attrice17@gmail.com

From:

Diane Cary Parriott  
attrice17@gmail.com  
8235 Lincoln Terrace  
West Hollywood  
CA  
90069

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 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

Do not jeopardize safety of our children by allowing size of 8150 Building be constructed!! I had a child in a coma, had to call 911 for emergency in 2006, and they arrived in 5 minutes. This could not happen with heavy traffic that will happen now

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Diane Cary Parriott  
attrice17@gmail.com  
8235 Lincoln Terrace  
West Hollywood  
CA  
90069





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Phyllis Present reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

2 messages

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 11:15 PM

Reply-To: ppresent@aol.com

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

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

From:

Phyllis Present  
ppresent@aol.com  
7839 Electra Drive  
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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Phyllis Present  
ppresent@aol.com  
7839 Electra Drive  
Los Angeles  
Ca.  
90046

---

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

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 11:28 PM

Reply-To: ppresent@aol.com

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

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

[Quoted text hidden]

**ADDITIONAL CONCERNS**

Horried at this project and the greed and fact the City is willing to "rent" the extra corner that is imperative for East bound traffic on Sunset to make a right-hand turn (South). A necessity for safety AND pedestrians crossing the road.

[Quoted text hidden]







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Philippe reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 11:18 PM

Reply-To: morafilms@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Philippe

morafilms@gmail.com

1400 North Havenhurst Drive

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 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

This is a ridiculous and bad faith proposal by any reasonable criteria. It is an aesthetic, cultural, environmental and community fiasco in the making. On the border it also promotes a "civil war" between LA and West Hollywood.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Philippe  
morafilms@gmail.com  
1400 North Havenhurst Drive  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from sherry sexton reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 10:18 PM

Reply-To: sherrysexton7@aol.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, sherrysexton7@aol.com

From:

sherry sexton

sherrysexton7@aol.com

8286 presson pl

los angeles

ca

90069

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 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 with 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 be 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**

This structure will impact the value of our homes. It will block views we have spent millions to have and will make our traffic situation, which is already terrible, impossible.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

sherry sexton  
sherrysexton7@aol.com  
8286 presson pl  
los angeles  
ca  
90069







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from JR reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 9:24 PM

Reply-To: shamepyle@aol.com

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

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

From:

JR

shamepyle@aol.com

8360 Hollywood Blvd

Los Angeles

ca

90069

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**

**I have lived on this mountain my entire life.**

**This area in NO WAY SHAPE or FORM needs another mall or housing development. The traffic w the current LaCienega build makes us all miserable here. Life quality, views & property value will surely suffer**

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

**Thank you, yours sincerely,**

**JR**

**shamepyle@aol.com**

**8360 Hollywood Blvd**

**Los Angeles**

**ca**

**90069**





---

## Comments of City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR - 8150 Sunset Blvd

1 message

---

**Andrew Macpherson** <macfly@macfly.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 10:26 AM

To: Jonathan Brand <jonathan.brand@lacity.org>, planning.envreview@lacity.org, "tom.labonge@lacity.org" <tom.labonge@lacity.org>

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, Jay Grodin <jgrodin@wkmgroup.com>, Alex Rose <nemorose@sbcglobal.net>, Robert Silverstein <Robert@robertsilversteinlaw.com>, Rory Barish <n2swimng@aol.com>, Adara Salim <adarasalim@gmail.com>

**Andrew Macpherson**  
8278 Hollywood Blvd  
LA CA 90069  
323 620 6565

ATTN:  
Environmental Analysis Section  
Department of City Planning  
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801  
Attn.: Ms. Srimal Hewawitharana

Dear Ms Hewawitharana,

Please confirm your receipt of my notes and comment here in PDF format.

### GENERAL NOTES AND COMMENTS:

A. The Applicant should have already provided a complete description of the existing building uses on the site with all the floor areas and with parking counts currently allocated to each use. This information should be in the "Master Land Use Application" online on the City's website link for this project. Someone should review this application.

The EIR should include full research on the history of this site, including how, when and why the zoning was changed/dow nsized from 3:1 FAR to 1:1 FAR (Perhaps a "Q Condition"?) and more importantly the reason it was dow nsized.

Please justify permitting a development with a height of 220 feet on this site without a variance from Code Section SEC. 12.22.A.25.f.5

Specifically: (5) Height. A percentage increase in the height requirement in feet equal to the percentage of Density Bonus for which the Housing Development Project is eligible. This percentage increase in height shall be applicable over the entire parcel regardless of the number of underlying height limits. For purposes of this subparagraph, Section 12.21.1 A.10. of this Code shall not apply.

(i) In any zone in which the height or number of stories is limited, this height increase shall permit a maximum of eleven additional feet or one additional story, whichever is lower, to provide the Restricted Affordable Units.

Re: Affordable Housing

- The project's residential unit count appears to be based on density bonuses provided under the City's housing policy. It appears that the total proposed amount of affordable housing at 11% of the total residential units. Research how the Applicant summarizes how the unit counts qualify for this bonus based on number of one and two bedroom units and number of very low and low income units.

- State Code Section 65915 discusses that the bonus should reflect what is necessary to offset costs.
- This project does not appear to qualify of an off-menu incentive for Affordable Housing because it is more than 1500' from a major transit stop. The Applicant is asking for a Variance in order to qualify for an incentive/bonus density. How does this work legally? Why cannot even developer property owner ask for a variance to qualify for a bonus? Does this not put the City (and taxpayers) at risk of losing more expensive law suits?

#### COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT E.I.R.

- The EIRs Executive Summary should lay out for the general public what is permissible under both the City's General Plan and the adopted Hollywood Community Plan currently in force.
- It would help the EIR to be more accessible to the general public if the EIR consultants were to evaluate each existing business side-by-side with each of the proposed new business uses in a chart or table. Specifically;
- What are **parking requirements** for each of the current land uses on site and for the proposed land uses based on floor area (square footage) and spaces allocated/required?
- What are the metrics for trips generated for each of the current land uses on site and for the proposed land uses, again with square footage, proposed patronage, and individual business or residential use related vehicle movements?
- These metrics should identify all the current commercial uses including Art Storage uses that are a substantial portion of the commercial uses currently.

If some of this information is already contained in the report please indicate where it is shown. If it is missing, please include this information in the revised draft.

- The EIR completely fails to address three specific project alternatives that community input had asked to be included during the Consultant's initial scoping meetings.

- (1) Commercial only development up to the allowable 111,000sq ft
- (2) Mixed use development up to the allowable 111,000sq ft (with the same commercial/residential ratio of the proposed project)
- (3) Mixed use development with affordable housing bonus up to the allowable 111,000sq ft

Please objectively evaluate these project alternatives with respect to the parking requirements, traffic impacts, trip generations, considerations with or without affordable housing and construction-related impacts. Also would these project alternatives require that the applicant to request discretionary actions or variances in order to comply with the code?

Please have the Consultant evaluate each of these potential alternatives under the criteria for Environmentally Superior Alternatives.

- Project Alternatives #3, #4, #5, #6 & #7 all involve development options that were NOT raised by the community during scoping process. There was no explanation as to why these were considered based on the public scoping process. Most if not all appear to non-code compliant options. Please disclose who generated these alternatives, and why they were considered as viable alternatives with respect to the General Plan or the Hollywood Community Plan considerations?

- The draft EIR (ref. Executive Summary, Page E5-10, paragraph 1) concludes that Alternatives # 4 and #5 are the environmentally-superior alternatives. The Consultants should re-evaluate this conclusion as it is not supported in the Report and in fact only Alternative # 2 is identified as reducing one of the impacts. A careful study of the three alternatives that were suggested by the community during the scoping meeting may yield new results. Please consider the environmental superiority of these options and then re-address the current conclusions?
- Section D of the Executive Summary does not list "Hydrology" and underground water impacts resulting from the proposed new concrete parking structure and building foundation walls.

#### EARTHQUAKE - SEISMIC STUDY

- With the release of the latest data for the Hollywood Earthquake Fault, the community should be informed about the location or assumed location of the fault at this site. Please have the Consultant indicate, in Map form in the Report, where the testing was undertaken on the site and what were the results.

#### TRAFFIC

- The EIR Traffic Consultant did not have data for number of trips turning north to exit on Crescent Heights. If there are over 6000 trips per day being generated, how many of these will be exiting at Crescent Heights and of these how many will be turning north?
- The EIR states unavoidable impacts to Havenhurst Dr. What are the figures for this increased traffic flow on Havenhurst, which is an entirely residential street? The Consultants indicated that no left turns will be permitted for the exiting on to Havenhurst and their mitigation recommendations is to add traffic lights at both Sunset and Fountain. A traffic signal would primarily assist south bound traffic on Havenhurst that is turning east on to Fountain. Are the consultants assuming increased traffic moving northbound up Havenhurst from the south? Why is a traffic signal needed on Fountain if all traffic leaving the building will be forced to turn north?
- A significant portion of the current property is an art storage facility. What figures are ascribed to this use? Is any storage in the new project proposed as this use has a desirable minimal traffic flow?
- The EIR refers to a "walk-in" bank in their project proposal? Is this different from the current type of bank on the site now? Does the EIR treat the loads from the existing bank any different than the proposed "walk-in" bank or is it the same load?

#### PARKING

- The project is proposing 100% valet. Does this apply to the low income units as well? How will they pay for this service or will the other residents subsidize this cost in their charges?

Please evaluate the street parking available in the area. Will there be conditions that can be applied to ensure no impacts to the adjacent streets? The site is currently self-parked with free parking. Please evaluate in the Report whether free, self-parked vehicles will help mitigate impacts on the adjacent streets.

- If the one bedroom units are assigned only parking space, will these spaces all be standard stalls? Will any be in tandem? Based on the city's own analysis and criteria, commercial parking should only be 40% compact vehicles, How can this site justify 60% compact?

## PUBLIC TRANSIT

- Bus Stop location should be evaluated as part of the EIR as the adjacent streets are impacted by its location. Moving the location east to mid block between Crescent Heights and Laurel could work if the right turn lane and triangular median at the east lane of Crescent Heights were improved. Please study how this new location and improvements might help mitigate impacts for this Project.
- Removing the traffic island on the north west corner of Sunset/Crescent Heights will cause mobility issues for east-bound traffic on Sunset trying to turn south. The acute angle will make it impossible for large vehicles to make that turn, and in turn add congestion to Sunset by forcing all heavy traffic to remain on Sunset until Fairfax. This is not addressed at all in the EIR.
- The current site does not have a problem entering at Crescent Heights or exiting to the south. There appears to be a carriage or drop off lane proposed on Crescent Heights. If there is only an "insignificant increase in the daily trips, what is this for? Other projects in the area and on similar corners do not have this feature. Is this feature necessitated by recommendation from the Consultant allowing new north bound turns on to Crescent Heights?
- There is no safe provision of entry, exit, or riding of the 972 bicycles they are proposing to park. Bike paths are not on Sunset. They are on Santa Monica Blvd. The ridership suggested by the number is not supported by any current use patterns on Sunset. This extraordinarily large quantity is clearly an unrealistic proposal. Real data needs to be evaluated much more accurately and carefully in the EIR.

In conclusion I also ask for a completely new Historic Resource review to be conducted by an independent group, such as the LA Conservancy, as the 'lack of significant impact' stated in the DEIR is completely and utterly ridiculous. This neighborhood destroying 220 foot tall monstrosity should not be allowed to tower over the heart of Hollywood's most architecturally significant areas.

Please confirm that all these comment have been entered into the public record.

Thank you, Andrew Macpherson.



Macpherson Comments of City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR.pdf

72K



**Andrew Macpherson  
8278 Hollywood Blvd  
LA CA 90069  
323 620 6565**

**ATTN:  
Environmental Analysis Section  
Department of City Planning  
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801  
Attn.: Ms. Srimal Hewawitharana**

Dear Ms Hewawitharana,

Please confirm your receipt of my notes and comment here in PDF format.

**GENERAL NOTES AND COMMENTS:**

A. The Applicant should have already provided a complete description of the existing building uses on the site with all the floor areas and with parking counts currently allocated to each use. This information should be in the "Master Land Use Application" online on the City's website link for this project. Someone should review this application.

The EIR should include full research on the history of this site, including how, when and why the zoning was changed/downsized from 3:1 FAR to 1:1 FAR (Perhaps a "Q Condition"?) and more importantly the reason it was downsized.

Please justify permitting a development with a height of 220 feet on this site without a variance from Code Section SEC. 12.22.A.25.f.5

Specifically: (5) Height. A percentage increase in the height requirement in feet equal to the percentage of Density Bonus for which the Housing Development Project is eligible. This percentage increase in height shall be applicable over the entire parcel regardless of the number of underlying height limits. For purposes of this subparagraph, Section 12.21.1 A.10. of this Code shall not apply.

(i) In any zone in which the height or number of stories is limited, this height increase shall permit a maximum of eleven additional feet or one additional story, whichever is lower, to provide the Restricted Affordable Units.

Re: Affordable Housing

- The project's residential unit count appears to be based on density bonuses provided under the City's housing policy. It appears that the total proposed amount of affordable housing at 11% of the total residential units. Research how the Applicant summarizes how the unit

counts qualify for this bonus based on number of one and two bedroom units and number of very low and low income units.

- State Code Section 65915 discusses that the bonus should reflect what is necessary to offset costs.
- This project does not appear to qualify for an off-menu incentive for Affordable Housing because it is more than 1500' from a major transit stop. The Applicant is asking for a Variance in order to qualify for an incentive/bonus density. How does this work legally? Why cannot even developer/property owner ask for a variance to qualify for a bonus? Does this not put the City (and taxpayers) at risk of losing more expensive lawsuits?

#### COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT E.I.R.

- The EIRs Executive Summary should lay out for the general public what is permissible under both the City's General Plan and the adopted Hollywood Community Plan currently in force.
- It would help the EIR to be more accessible to the general public if the EIR consultants were to evaluate each existing business side-by-side with each of the proposed new business uses in a chart or table. Specifically;
  - What are **parking requirements** for each of the current land uses on site and for the proposed land uses based on floor area (square footage) and spaces allocated/required?
  - What are the metrics for trips generated for each of the current land uses on site and for the proposed land uses, again with square footage, proposed patronage, and individual business or residential use related vehicle movements?
  - These metrics should identify all the current commercial uses including Art Storage uses that are a substantial portion of the commercial uses currently.

If some of this information is already contained in the report please indicate where it is shown. If it is missing, please include this information in the revised draft.

- The EIR completely fails to address three specific project alternatives that community input had asked to be included during the Consultant's initial scoping meetings.

- (1) Commercial only development up to the allowable 111,000sq ft
- (2) Mixed use development up to the allowable 111,000sq ft (with the same commercial/residential ratio of the proposed project)
- (3) Mixed use development with affordable housing bonus up to the allowable 111,000sq ft

Please objectively evaluate these project alternatives with respect to the parking requirements, traffic impacts, trip generations, considerations with or without affordable housing and construction-related impacts. Also would these project alternatives require that the applicant to request discretionary actions or variances in order to comply with the code?

Please have the Consultant evaluate each of these potential alternatives under the criteria for Environmentally Superior Alternatives.

- Project Alternatives #3, #4, #5, #6 & #7 all involve development options that were NOT raised by the community during scoping process. There was no explanation as to why these were considered based on the public scoping process. Most if not all appear to non-code compliant options. Please disclose who generated these alternatives, and why they were considered as viable alternatives with respect to the General Plan or the Hollywood Community Plan considerations?
- The draft EIR (ref. Executive Summary, Page E5-10, paragraph 1) concludes that Alternatives # 4 and #5 are the environmentally-superior alternatives. The Consultants should re-evaluate this conclusion as it is not supported in the Report and in fact only Alternative # 2 is identified as reducing one of the impacts. A careful study of the three alternatives that were suggested by the community during the scoping meeting may yield new results. Please consider the environmental superiority of these options and then re-address the current conclusions?
- Section D of the Executive Summary does not list "Hydrology" and underground water impacts resulting from the proposed new concrete parking structure and building foundation walls.

#### EARTHQUAKE - SEISMIC STUDY

- With the release of the latest data for the Hollywood Earthquake Fault, the community should be informed about the location or assumed location of the fault at this site. Please have the Consultant indicate, in Map form in the Report, where the testing was undertaken on the site and what were the results.

#### TRAFFIC

- The EIR Traffic Consultant did not have data for number of trips turning north to exit on Crescent Heights. If there are over 6000 trips per day being generated, how many of these will be exiting at Crescent Heights and of these how many will be turning north?
- The EIR states unavoidable impacts to Havenhurst Dr. What are the figures for this increased traffic flow on Havenhurst, which is an entirely residential street? The Consultants indicated that no left turns will be permitted for the exiting on to Havenhurst and their mitigation recommendations is to add traffic lights at both Sunset and Fountain. A traffic signal would primarily assist south bound traffic on Havenhurst that is turning east on to Fountain. Are the consultants assuming increased traffic moving northbound up Havenhurst from the south? Why is a traffic signal needed on Fountain if all traffic leaving the building will be forced to turn north?
-

- A significant portion of the current property is an art storage facility. What figures are ascribed to this use? Is any storage in the new project proposed as this use has a desirable minimal traffic flow?
- The EIR refers to a "walk-in" bank in their project proposal? Is this different from the current type of bank on the site now? Does the EIR treat the loads from the existing bank any different than the proposed "walk-in" bank or is it the same load?

## PARKING

- The project is proposing 100% valet. Does this apply to the low income units as well? How will they pay for this service or will the other residents subsidize this cost in their charges? Please evaluate the street parking available in the area. Will there be conditions that can be applied to ensure no impacts to the adjacent streets? The site is currently self-parked with free parking. Please evaluate in the Report whether free, self-parked vehicles will help mitigate impacts on the adjacent streets.
- If the one bedroom units are assigned only parking space, will these spaces all be standard stalls? Will any be in tandem? Based on the city's own analysis and criteria, commercial parking should only be 40% compact vehicles, How can this site justify 60% compact?

## PUBLIC TRANSIT

- Bus Stop location should be evaluated as part of the EIR as the adjacent streets are impacted by its location. Moving the location east to mid block between Crescent Heights and Laurel could work if the right turn lane and triangular median at the east lane of Crescent Heights were improved. Please study how this new location and improvements might help mitigate impacts for this Project.
- Removing the traffic island on the north west corner of Sunset/Crescent Heights will cause mobility issues for east-bound traffic on Sunset trying to turn south. The acute angle will make it impossible for large vehicles to make that turn, and in turn add congestion to Sunset by forcing all heavy traffic to remain on Sunset until Fairfax. This is not addressed at all in the EIR.
- The current site does not have a problem entering at Crescent Heights or exiting to the south. There appears to be a carriage or drop off lane proposed on Crescent Heights. If there is only an "insignificant increase in the daily trips, what is this for? Other projects in the area and on similar corners do not have this feature. Is this feature necessitated by recommendation from the Consultant allowing new north bound turns on to Crescent Heights?
- There is no safe provision of entry, exit, or riding of the 972 bicycles they are proposing to park. Bike paths are not on Sunset. They are on Santa Monica Blvd. The ridership suggested by the number is not supported by any current use patterns on Sunset. This extraordinarily large quantity is clearly an unrealistic proposal. Real data needs to be evaluated much more accurately and carefully in the EIR.

In conclusion I also ask for a completely new Historic Resource review to be conducted by an independent group, such as the LA Conservancy, as the 'lack of significant impact' stated in the DEIR is completely and utterly ridiculous. This neighborhood destroying 220 foot tall monstrosity should not be allowed to tower over the heart of Hollywood's most architecturally significant areas.

Please confirm that all these comment have been entered into the public record.

Thank you, Andrew Macpherson.



**Andrew Macpherson  
8278 Hollywood Blvd  
LA CA 90069  
323 620 6565**

**ATTN:  
Environmental Analysis Section  
Department of City Planning  
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801  
Attn.: Ms. Srimal Hewawitharana**

Dear Ms Hewawitharana,

Please confirm your receipt of my notes and comment here in PDF format.

**GENERAL NOTES AND COMMENTS:**

A. The Applicant should have already provided a complete description of the existing building uses on the site with all the floor areas and with parking counts currently allocated to each use. This information should be in the "Master Land Use Application" online on the City's website link for this project. Someone should review this application.

The EIR should include full research on the history of this site, including how, when and why the zoning was changed/downsized from 3:1 FAR to 1:1 FAR (Perhaps a "Q Condition"? ) and more importantly the reason it was downsized.

Please justify permitting a development with a height of 220 feet on this site without a variance from Code Section SEC. 12.22.A.25.f.5

Specifically: (5) Height. A percentage increase in the height requirement in feet equal to the percentage of Density Bonus for which the Housing Development Project is eligible. This percentage increase in height shall be applicable over the entire parcel regardless of the number of underlying height limits. For purposes of this subparagraph, Section 12.21.1 A.10. of this Code shall not apply.

(i) In any zone in which the height or number of stories is limited, this height increase shall permit a maximum of eleven additional feet or one additional story, whichever is lower, to provide the Restricted Affordable Units.

**Re: Affordable Housing**

- The project's residential unit count appears to be based on density bonuses provided under the City's housing policy. It appears that the total proposed amount of affordable housing at 11% of the total residential units. Research how the Applicant summarizes how the unit

counts qualify for this bonus based on number of one and two bedroom units and number of very low and low income units.

- State Code Section 65915 discusses that the bonus should reflect what is necessary to offset costs.
- This project does not appear to qualify for an off-menu incentive for Affordable Housing because it is more than 1500' from a major transit stop. The Applicant is asking for a Variance in order to qualify for an incentive/bonus density. How does this work legally? Why cannot even developer property owner ask for a variance to qualify for a bonus? Does this not put the City (and taxpayers) at risk of losing more expensive lawsuits?

#### COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT E.I.R.

- The EIRs Executive Summary should lay out for the general public what is permissible under both the City's General Plan and the adopted Hollywood Community Plan currently in force.
- It would help the EIR to be more accessible to the general public if the EIR consultants were to evaluate each existing business side-by-side with each of the proposed new business uses in a chart or table. Specifically;
  - What are **parking requirements** for each of the current land uses on site and for the proposed land uses based on floor area (square footage) and spaces allocated/required?
  - What are the metrics for trips generated for each of the current land uses on site and for the proposed land uses, again with square footage, proposed patronage, and individual business or residential use related vehicle movements?
  - These metrics should identify all the current commercial uses including Art Storage uses that are a substantial portion of the commercial uses currently.

If some of this information is already contained in the report please indicate where it is shown. If it is missing, please include this information in the revised draft.

- The EIR completely fails to address three specific project alternatives that community input had asked to be included during the Consultant's initial scoping meetings.

- (1) Commercial only development up to the allowable 111,000sq ft
- (2) Mixed use development up to the allowable 111,000sq ft (with the same commercial/residential ratio of the proposed project)
- (3) Mixed use development with affordable housing bonus up to the allowable 111,000sq ft

Please objectively evaluate these project alternatives with respect to the parking requirements, traffic impacts, trip generations, considerations with or without affordable housing and construction-related impacts. Also would these project alternatives require that the applicant to request discretionary actions or variances in order to comply with the code?



Please have the Consultant evaluate each of these potential alternatives under the criteria for Environmentally Superior Alternatives.

- Project Alternatives #3, #4, #5, #6 & #7 all involve development options that were NOT raised by the community during scoping process. There was no explanation as to why these were considered based on the public scoping process. Most if not all appear to non-code compliant options. Please disclose who generated these alternatives, and why they were considered as viable alternatives with respect to the General Plan or the Hollywood Community Plan considerations?
- The draft EIR (ref. Executive Summary, Page E5-10, paragraph 1) concludes that Alternatives # 4 and #5 are the environmentally-superior alternatives. The Consultants should re-evaluate this conclusion as it is not supported in the Report and in fact only Alternative # 2 is identified as reducing one of the impacts. A careful study of the three alternatives that were suggested by the community during the scoping meeting may yield new results. Please consider the environmental superiority of these options and then re-address the current conclusions?
- Section D of the Executive Summary does not list "Hydrology" and underground water impacts resulting from the proposed new concrete parking structure and building foundation walls.

#### EARTHQUAKE - SEISMIC STUDY

- With the release of the latest data for the Hollywood Earthquake Fault, the community should be informed about the location or assumed location of the fault at this site. Please have the Consultant indicate, in Map form in the Report, where the testing was undertaken on the site and what were the results.

#### TRAFFIC

- The EIR Traffic Consultant did not have data for number of trips turning north to exit on Crescent Heights. If there are over 6000 trips per day being generated, how many of these will be exiting at Crescent Heights and of these how many will be turning north?
- The EIR states unavoidable impacts to Havenhurst Dr. What are the figures for this increased traffic flow on Havenhurst, which is an entirely residential street? The Consultants indicated that no left turns will be permitted for the exiting on to Havenhurst and their mitigation recommendations is to add traffic lights at both Sunset and Fountain. A traffic signal would primarily assist south bound traffic on Havenhurst that is turning east on to Fountain. Are the consultants assuming increased traffic moving northbound up Havenhurst from the south? Why is a traffic signal needed on Fountain if all traffic leaving the building will be forced to turn north?
-

- A significant portion of the current property is an art storage facility. What figures are ascribed to this use? Is any storage in the new project proposed as this use has a desirable minimal traffic flow?
- The EIR refers to a "walk-in" bank in their project proposal? Is this different from the current type of bank on the site now? Does the EIR treat the loads from the existing bank any different than the proposed "walk-in" bank or is it the same load?

## PARKING

- The project is proposing 100% valet. Does this apply to the low income units as well? How will they pay for this service or will the other residents subsidize this cost in their charges? Please evaluate the street parking available in the area. Will there be conditions that can be applied to ensure no impacts to the adjacent streets? The site is currently self-parked with free parking. Please evaluate in the Report whether free, self-parked vehicles will help mitigate impacts on the adjacent streets.
- If the one bedroom units are assigned only parking space, will these spaces all be standard stalls? Will any be in tandem? Based on the city's own analysis and criteria, commercial parking should only be 40% compact vehicles, How can this site justify 60% compact?

## PUBLIC TRANSIT

- Bus Stop location should be evaluated as part of the EIR as the adjacent streets are impacted by its location. Moving the location east to mid block between Crescent Heights and Laurel could work if the right turn lane and triangular median at the east lane of Crescent Heights were improved. Please study how this new location and improvements might help mitigate impacts for this Project.
- Removing the traffic island on the north west corner of Sunset/Crescent Heights will cause mobility issues for east-bound traffic on Sunset trying to turn south. The acute angle will make it impossible for large vehicles to make that turn, and in turn add congestion to Sunset by forcing all heavy traffic to remain on Sunset until Fairfax. This is not addressed at all in the EIR.
- The current site does not have a problem entering at Crescent Heights or exiting to the south. There appears to be a carriage or drop off lane proposed on Crescent Heights. If there is only an "insignificant increase in the daily trips, what is this for? Other projects in the area and on similar corners do not have this feature. Is this feature necessitated by recommendation from the Consultant allowing new north bound turns on to Crescent Heights?
- There is no safe provision of entry, exit, or riding of the 972 bicycles they are proposing to park. Bike paths are not on Sunset. They are on Santa Monica Blvd. The ridership suggested by the number is not supported by any current use patterns on Sunset. This extraordinarily large quantity is clearly an unrealistic proposal. Real data needs to be evaluated much more accurately and carefully in the EIR.

In conclusion I also ask for a completely new Historic Resource review to be conducted by an independent group, such as the LA Conservancy, as the 'lack of significant impact' stated in the DEIR is completely and utterly ridiculous. This neighborhood destroying 220 foot tall monstrosity should not be allowed to tower over the heart of Hollywood's most architecturally significant areas.

Please confirm that all these comment have been entered into the public record.

Thank you, Andrew Macpherson.





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Linda Hamanaka reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 9:02 PM

Reply-To: Nserra@aol.com

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

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

From:

Linda Hamanaka

Nserra@aol.com

8278 Marmont Lane

Los Angeles

Ca

90069

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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Linda Hamanaka  
Nserra@aol.com  
8278 Marmont Lane  
Los Angeles  
Ca  
90069







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Katharine Karabian reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 7:39 PM

Reply-To: kkarabian@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Katharine Karabian

kkarabian@gmail.com

Blue Heights

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 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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Katharine Karabian  
kkarabian@gmail.com  
Blue Heights  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046





---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Joanna P Mockenhaupt reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

---

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:22 PM

Reply-To: joanna@joannaparol.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, joanna@joannaparol.com

From:

Joanna P Mockenhaupt  
joanna@joannaparol.com  
749 N La Jolla 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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Joanna P Mockenhaupt  
joanna@joannaparol.com  
749 N La Jolla Ave  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046







---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Joanna Parol reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

---

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:20 PM

Reply-To: jparol@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Joanna Parol

jparol@gmail.com

8287 Marmont Ln

Los Angeles

CA

90069

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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Joanna Parol  
jparol@gmail.com  
8287 Marmont Ln  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90069





---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Simon Jones reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

2 messages

---

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

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:23 PM

Reply-To: simonvjones1@gmail.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, simonvjones1@gmail.com

From:

Simon Jones

simonvjones1@gmail.com

8287 Marmont Ln

Los Angeles

CA

90069

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 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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Simon Jones  
simonvjones1@gmail.com  
8287 Marmont Ln  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90069

---

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

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:25 PM

Reply-To: simon@znakjones.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, simon@znakjones.com

From:

Simon Jones  
simon@znakjones.com  
749 N La Jolla Ave  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046

[Quoted text hidden]

simon@znakjones.com  
749 N La Jolla Ave  
Los Angeles  
CA  
90046







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Ebon Alabastur reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:28 PM

Reply-To: Alabastur@aol.com

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

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

From:

Ebon Alabastur

Alabastur@aol.com

1344 Havenhurst Dr

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 – 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 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

Health and safety concerns for the traffic that will generated by this development onto Havenhurst Dr, which for the last 10+ years has had speed bumps to mitigate traffic to and from Sunset & Fountain. Also, no mention as to "staging" during buildi

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Ebon Alabastur  
Alabastur@aol.com  
1344 Havenhurst Dr  
West Hollywood  
CA  
90046





---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Christopher Rice reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

---

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:31 PM

Reply-To: c.rice78@yahoo.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, c.rice78@yahoo.com

From:

Christopher Rice

c.rice78@yahoo.com

1424 N Crescent Heights Blvd. #74

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**

As current president of the Granville Towers HOA, a landmarked building across the street from the site, I note that construction damage could endanger physical aspects of our building which secure our landmark status and thereby our financial health

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Christopher Rice  
c.rice78@yahoo.com  
1424 N Crescent Heights Blvd. #74  
West Hollywood  
CA  
90046







---

## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Michael Schwartz reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

---

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

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:45 PM

Reply-To: proptrends@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Michael Schwartz

proptrends@gmail.com

1521 N Sierra Bonita Ave

Los Angeles

California

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**

This developer should not be able to build anything over 3 stories on this historic site. Our infrastructure is not adequate and the traffic is already gridlocked. Please redo the traffic study as it is incorrect as to the number of cars and trips

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Michael Schwartz  
proptrends@gmail.com  
1521 N Sierra Bonita Ave  
Los Angeles  
California  
90046





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Jonah Schwartz reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:47 PM

Reply-To: livefreeordiii@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Jonah Schwartz

livefreeordiii@gmail.com

1521 N Sierra Bonita Ave

Los Angeles

California

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 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 traffic study is flawed and does not reflect how much traffic is on the adjoining streets and it does not take into consideration any of the intersections on of Sunset and Hollywood Blvds ast La Brea or Highland

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Jonah Schwartz  
livefreeordiii@gmail.com  
1521 N Sierra Bonita Ave  
Los Angeles  
California  
90046







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Tamara Bergman reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:49 PM

Reply-To: sbsierra@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Tamara Bergman

sbsierra@gmail.com

1521 N Sierra Bonita Ave

Los Angeles

California

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 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 traffic study is flawed it does not reflect true amount of traffic on the streets, it does not take into consideration any of the intersections on of Sunset and Hollywood Blvds at La Brea or Highland  
Please redo traffic study

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Tamara Bergman  
sbsierra@gmail.com  
1521 N Sierra Bonita Ave  
Los Angeles  
California  
90046





## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Brandon Frederick Jones reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:57 PM

Reply-To: brandotheblue@hotmail.com

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

Cc: info@savesunsetboulevard.com, brandotheblue@hotmail.com

From:

Brandon Frederick Jones  
brandotheblue@hotmail.com  
1255 N. Kings #203  
West Hollywood  
CALIFORNIA  
90069

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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Brandon Frederick Jones  
brandotheblue@hotmail.com  
1255 N. Kings #203  
West Hollywood  
CALIFORNIA  
90069







## Objection to 8150 Sunset Blvd. from Cousteau Magee reference City Case No. ENV-2013-2552-EIR

1 message

Save Sunset Boulevard <info@savesunsetboulevard.com>

Mon, Jan 19, 2015 at 12:58 PM

Reply-To: artofaltermity@gmail.com

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

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

From:

Cousteau Magee

artofaltermity@gmail.com

5121 Klump Ave #202

North Hollywood

CA

91601

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.

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

Thank you, yours sincerely,

Cousteau Magee  
artofalternity@gmail.com  
5121 Klump Ave #202  
North Hollywood  
CA  
91601

