TO: Department of City Planning  
City of Los Angeles  
221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1350  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Attn: Mindy Nguyen, City Planner via Email: Mindy.Nguyen@lacity.org  

CC: Eric Garcetti, LA City Mayor (mayor.garcetti@lacity.org)  
Mitch O’Farrell, LA City Council Member District 13 (councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org) Central Hollywood Neighborhood Council District (alex@mcapus.com)  
David Ryu, LA City Council Member District 4 (david.ryu@lacity.org)  
Vince Bertoni, Director of City Planning (vince.bertoni@lacity.org)  
Kevin Keller, Officer of City Planning (kevin.keller@lacity.org)  

RE: Public Comment–Hollywood Center Project Environmental Case: ENV‐2018‐2116‐EIR State Clearinghouse No.: 2018051002  

Department of City Planning, Mindy Nguyen, Mayor Garcetti and Councilmember O’Farrell,  

I am a resident at the Broadway Hollywood Building at 1645 Vine Street.

The building and sign are a LA Historical‐Cultural Monument and the building is a contributor to the Hollywood Blvd Commercial and Entertainment District with its primary entrance now located at 1645 Vine Street, at the corner of Hollywood Blvd. The building is identified in the EIR as: 6300 Hollywood Boulevard (B.H. Dyas Department Store Building/Broadway Department Store), Map No. B.12.

I am writing w/r/t the above captioned EIR regarding the Hollywood Center Project. It was surprising to me that the EIR was released on April 15, in the middle of a pandemic, with only a 45‐day comment period. This is far too short a period for review and comment.

The EIR fails to adequately examine the very negative aesthetic impact of the Hollywood Center. Its two gigantic skyscrapers are inconsistent with the height and scale of every other building in the area. I am not opposed to developing these parking lots with facilities like those proposed. I am opposed to the scope of this project as described in the EIR.

One great feature of this area is the Broadway Hollywood sign located at my building, which can be viewed by cars on the 101 Freeway as they enter Hollywood. This view will be lost. The aesthetic damage is equally severe at the Broadway Hollywood (and neighboring buildings), since the Hollywood Center will block views of such Hollywood landmarks as the Hollywood Sign and the Griffith Park Observatory, diminishing the aesthetic and cultural significance of the building.

Perhaps most importantly, the EIR is completely deficient in its conclusion that the Hollywood Center Project will have no significant transportation impact. Before the pandemic, traffic was jammed at the Hollywood/Vine intersection. This has been exacerbated by the recent installation of a four‐way walk sign (which was not taken into account in the EIR). Traffic will be even worse in future years since diminished ridership on public transportation will result from concerns over the spreading of infectious diseases in crowded spaces. Neither of these factors is considered in the EIR.

The Broadway Hollywood will be particularly negatively impacted because its only entrance is a narrow alley that can be entered only by going south on Vine past Hollywood Blvd and then turning right. The increase in traffic at the Hollywood/Vine intersection will make it even more difficult to enter our building.

Notwithstanding this, the EIR reaches the somewhat ridiculous conclusion that the Hollywood Center Project will result in no increased traffic. I am shocked by this conclusion and request that the traffic study be redone appropriately.

Finally, the EIR notes that the Hollywood Center may take up to six years to build. This will clearly result in major traffic disruption for a long period. This factor by itself demands that the utmost scrutiny be given to the project before it disrupts Hollywood for the better part of a decade. It is clear to me that such scrutiny has not occurred.

Sincerely,

Hunter Jackson