



---

# ERRATA TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT Sapphire Project

---

Case Number: ENV-2015-3033-EIR  
State Clearinghouse Number: 2016031029

**Project Addresses:** 1324-1342 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 1101-1135 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street, and 517-521 S. Bixel Street  
Los Angeles, California 90017

**Community Plan:** Westlake

**Council District:** 1

**Project Description:** The project involves the demolition of the existing structures on-site, which include a three-level parking structure, one five-story commercial office and medical office building, and one four-story commercial office and medical office building, for the development of a residential and commercial mixed-use project. The Proposed Project would consist of the construction of two buildings (North Building and South Building) that would be connected by a footbridge spanning above the adjacent alleyway. The North Building would include 142 apartment units within seven levels and would front 5<sup>th</sup> Street. The South Building would include 22,000 square feet (sf) of ground-floor retail and 227 apartment units within six levels above the ground-floor retail and would front both 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Bixel Street. The Proposed Project would have a total of 369 residential apartment units and approximately 22,000 sf of ground-floor commercial space. The ground-floor commercial space may include retail, restaurant, coffee shop uses, and/or other uses permitted by the Central City West Specific Plan ("CCWSP"). The unit mix would include 193 studio units, 96 one-bedroom units, 56 two-bedroom units, and 24 three-bedroom units of varying sizes and configurations. Both buildings include seven stories above grade and two levels of subterranean parking. The elevation across the Project Site increases from south to north and west to east. The Proposed Project would provide required on-site vehicle and bicycle parking spaces pursuant to the LAMC. Open space courtyards and landscaping features are proposed throughout the Project Site which would include 16,075 sf of open space within the North Building property and 24,600 sf of open space within the South Building property for a total of 40,675 sf of open space on-site. In total, the Project would contain approximately 348,431 sf of floor area.

**APPLICANT:**  
Sapphire Equity, LLC

**PREPARED BY:**  
Parker Environmental Consultants

**ON BEHALF OF:**  
The City of Los Angeles  
Department of City Planning  
Major Projects Section

**February 2018**

---

## A. INTRODUCTION

This document comprises an Errata to the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) to include additional clarifying information to the proposed Sapphire Project (Project) relative to the local street designation of 5<sup>th</sup> Street between the Mobility Plan 2035 and the Central City West Specific Plan (CCWSP). The information provided herein does not represent significant new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. Section 15088.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states:

“New information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. ‘Significant new information’ requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.”

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088.5 (b) and (c) also provide that “[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR... A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.”

The clarifying information contained in this Errata to the Final EIR does not contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the Applicant has declined to adopt. Additionally, information provided in this Errata does not present a feasible Project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the Draft EIR. All of the information added to the Final EIR pursuant to this Errata merely clarifies information in the Draft EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Errata and has determined that it does not change

---

any of the basic findings or conclusions of the Final EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a), and does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR. This Errata, combined with the Draft EIR and Final EIR, including technical appendices and reports thereof, comprise the Final EIR.

## **B. ERRATA**

The following additional information clarifies the analytical assumptions contained in the Final EIR as it pertains to the local street designation of W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street. As noted in Section II, Project Description, one of the Applicant’s discretionary requests is to deviate from the street standards of W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, as required by the CCWSP Appendix C.1.K to be consistent with the newly adopted Mobility Plan 2035.

Appendix C of the CCWSP, provides a list of transportation improvements that were anticipated to be implemented as part of the buildout of the CCWSP area. As identified in Appendix C, W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, from Lucas Avenue to the Harbor Freeway, is designated to be “improved to one-way, modified Collector Street standards; 56-foot roadway in 76-foot right-of-way. Four travel lanes and one parking lane westbound on Fifth Street, with 10-foot sidewalk/parkways.” While these roadway standards and improvements were identified within the CCWSP, they were never realized and do not reflect the current environmental conditions as analyzed in the EIR. W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, between Lucas Avenue and Bixel Street, is a two way street with one travel lane per direction with no left- or right-turn channelization and permitted on-street parking. East of Bixel Street, between Bixel and S. Beaudry Avenue, W. Fifth Street is vacated and access is restricted as a private driveway.

Based on the existing buildings that front W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street between Lucas Street and Bixel Avenue, it would be infeasible and impractical for W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street to be improved as a 76 foot right-of-way with four travel lanes in one direction. The buildout of W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street in conformance with the street improvements as identified in the CCWSP would result in the acquisition of private property and demolition of three existing buildings. The buildings located at 1350 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 1312 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street<sup>1</sup>, and 1349 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street are constructed within 30 feet of the centerline and would preclude the improvement of a 56-foot roadway within a 76-foot right-of-way. Furthermore, W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street is vacated with restricted access between Bixel Avenue and S. Beaudry Avenue. Thus, the circulation pattern identified within the CCWSP would necessitate re-opening of W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street as a public road between S. Beaudry Avenue and Bixel Street. Due to these physical impediments, the traffic analysis was based on the existing roadway configuration as proposed to be consistent with the roadway standards of the Mobility Plan 2035.

Under the new Mobility Plan 2035, which was adopted in August 2015, “modified Collector Streets” were reclassified as “Collector Streets.” The roadway standards for Collector Street in the Mobility Plan 2035 call for a 66-foot right of way with a 40-foot roadway. 5<sup>th</sup> Street is currently classified as a Collector Street

---

<sup>1</sup> *The property at 1312 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street is also identified as 501 S. Bixel Avenue.*

in the Mobility Plan 2035. (see Draft EIR at page IV.K-4) The proposed Project is consistent with the street standards of the Mobility Plan 2035.

The discrepancy between the street designations of the CCWSP and the Mobility Plan was addressed in Ordinance 184718 (adopted in January 2017). Ordinance 184718 amended various sections of the LAMC and repealed previous ordinances establishing street designations in order to implement the modifications to the General Plan's Circulation Element (as adopted by the Mobility Plan 2035). Specifically, Ordinance 184718 provides that "...those portions of any and all ordinances, including specific plans, that establish street designations for any street or street segment are hereby repealed. Such designations are hereby replaced by the designations set forth in the Citywide Circulation System Map located in Council File No. 15-0719. The Director of Planning is hereby delegated the authority to revise all non-codified land use ordinances to reflect the correct street designations." By adopting Ordinance 184718, and due to the express language in this ordinance, the City Council of the City of Los Angeles repealed the portion of the CCWSP that is in conflict with the Mobility Plan 2035. Nevertheless, the Draft EIR analyzed a potential conflict with the CCWSP. See Draft EIR pp. IV.G-28, IV.K-5 and IV.K-7.