



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Chase Bank/Lytton Savings bank

1 message

D'Orsogna, Maria-Rita R <dorsogna@csun.edu>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 11:32 AM

To: "cd4.issues@lacity.org" <cd4.issues@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>

Cc: "william.lamborn@lacity.org" <william.lamborn@lacity.org>, "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Dear Councilmember Ryu,

my name is Maria D'Orsogna. I am a professor of Mathematics at CSUN where I am also faculty in the Sustainability Institute.

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed redevelopment of

the southwest corner of Sunset and Crescent Heights boulevards in the city of LA. The proposal calls to demolish the historic Chase Bank to build 250 APARTMENTS with more than 100,000 square feet for retail/restaurant uses in buildings that can reach up to SIXTEEN stories.

Are you out of your minds? Please stop killing our city and its history for the benefit of developers, in this case Townscape Partners.

As you may know the LA Conservancy believes that this building is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources and as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM).

Why not integrate it and reuse it in a way that its historic significance is preserved? So that it can be used as a teaching moment for future generations who can learn about post World War II history, savings and loans personal lending and the beautiful modernity of the architectural design of LA in the 1960-s , that in my opinion at least, has not been surpassed in this town?

I am sure that someone of the caliber of Frank Gehry can present a plan that accomodates preservation.

Also, I understand the need for new housing etc, but 16 STORIES? Really? When people come

to see me from New York, my hometown, the first thing they tell me about the nicest thing about LA is that you can look up and see the sky. We should not turn this place into Manhattan, or Miami beach, and kill all its character.

People are getting angry. The LUVE initiative in Santa Monica, the protests against developers in Hollywood, and all around town. I think it is time to honor our history, persevere what we can about our past, stop giving away our town to greedy developers, and this insanity.

Sincerely,

Maria R D'Orsogna, PhD
Professor of Mathematics
California State University at Northridge
Los Angeles, CA 91330
dorsogna@csun.edu
www.csun.edu/~dorsogna



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Preservation-Based Solution for Sunset/Crescent Heights

1 message

wolff1990@aol.com <wolff1990@aol.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 10:28 AM

To: cd4.issues@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, william.lamborn@lacity.org, afine@laconservancy.org

To Whom It May Concern,

As I sit and watch my neighborhood slowly lose its' essence, I am in dismay. The lack of concern and effort on the parts of developers to take into consideration the long-lasting effects of what they are tearing down and building. Having lived in NYC, I love the city for not only it's speed and agility, but also for the historical ambiance that circles you on every turn. On the other coast, in the city of Los Angeles, are removing any reference to the past. The building at the corner of Sunset and Crescent Heights is a prime example. The old Lytton Savings building is a great reference point to Modernist architecture. It is one of the few remaining buildings which could possibly be saved to show the evolving work throughout the decades. I live only a few blocks from this corner and can hardly believe that there are not limitations to what can be destroyed.

I am writing to ask that this building be looked at in a historical manner and to please try to develop another solution. I am asking that people take pride in the differences which Los Angeles has to offer. When a tourist comes to Los Angeles, especially this area, they are looking for the things which make us unique, not the buildings which look like Tokyo or Times Square. Please demand that these developers take another look and incorporate the past with the present. It may take more time, but it will be worth it. We only have one shot at making the right decision.

Thank you for your time,

P. Staton, PhD

Los Angeles, CA 90046



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

VTT-72370-CN

1 message

William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 10:27 AM

To: Michael Grace <mlpgrace@gmail.com>

Mr. Grace,

Per your request, please see the link below to the subject VTT Staff Report.

<http://planning.lacity.org/eir/8150Sunset/8150SunsetscannedCaseFiles/VTT-72370-CN.pdf>

Best,

--



William Lamborn

Major Projects

Department of City Planning

200 N. Spring Street, Rm 750

Ph: [213.978.1470](tel:213.978.1470)

Please note that I am out of the office every other Friday.



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

8150 Sunset, Townscape, John Duran and Vince Bertoni

1 message

jsmitford@yahoo.com <jsmitford@yahoo.com>

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 4:15 PM

Reply-To: jsmitford@yahoo.com

To: "david.ryu@lacity.org" <david.ryu@lacity.org>

Cc: "hailey.branson@latimes.com" <hailey.branson@latimes.com>, "lmeister@weho.org" <lmeister@weho.org>

Hi David,

I received the attached this morning regarding John Duran and 8150 Sunset. I had no idea this was going on! It is very disturbing and makes me wonder if it might be time for a citizen's committee to approach the FBI like they did with Bell? Did you take campaign contributions from Townscape like Mr. Duran and other West Hollywood City Council members?

Regards and thanks,

Mitford

Sent from Yahoo Mail. [Get the app](#)

 **Duran.pdf**
1934K



(Left to Right: WEHO City Councilman John Duran; Townscape NY Developers; Duran with Townscape lobbyist)

- **"Los Angeles is the second most corrupt area in the USA according to a University of Illinois study. Chicago is first and LA second."** Steve Lopez and Patricia Morrison - Los Angeles Times
- Is West Hollywood City Councilman John Duran part of the problem?
- **Can Duran be trusted to vote impartially when it comes to the 8150 Sunset development?**
- Townscape Partners (a New York backed development company) has paid thousands of dollars in political contributions to be sure John Duran continues to be on the West Hollywood City Council.

Duran claims to have "rainbow coalition values" but he is backing 8150 Sunset. This is a NY development project totally run by white males – no women and no minorities.

As for Duran and his connection to this New York group with New Yorker values:

- Townscape Partners, after buying the 8150 Sunset property, started charging customers \$3 per 15 minutes for parking. **Tenants sued Townscape** stating they didn't have the option of offering validation for parking and had lost 50 percent of their business as a result of the fees. Only McDonalds and Chase Bank were able to offer validation for 30 free minutes. **For an average meal at El Pollo, it cost \$12 to park.** Does Townscape hate Mexicans and their food?
- The New York developers' intention was to destroy the local businesses (many owned by minorities) driving them to financial ruin, and forcing them to surrender leases early. **Gay owned businesses went bankrupt.**
- Townscape installed the parking system without LA Building and Safety Permits. It was dangerous and struck pedestrians. It took nine months for the City of Los Angeles to do anything about the grave problem.
- **After LA had been threatened with a lawsuit,** the L.A. Planning Dept forced Townscape to shut it down.
- Los Angeles politicians have received big political contributions from NY developers like Townscape.
- Townscape plans to have the 8150 Sunset development's parking entrances and exits on Havenhurst Drive. Across from West Hollywood senior housing. **Many residents have AIDS and respiratory problems.**
- **Is Townscape anti-senior, minorities and gays? Can they be trusted after the NY style parking rip-off?**
- **Can WEHO trust the Los Angeles Planning Dept after doing nothing about the illegal parking?**



(Left to Right: Townscape NY Developers; Illegal Parking Signs; Duran with assistant that cost WEHO \$500,000; L.A. Planning Director: Vince Bertoni)

Duran has been the focus of continued investigations and potential scandals, yet certain political cohorts on the West Hollywood City Council continued to back him and paid **\$500,000 in settlements** to keep him in a voting position to back New York developers. Major campaign donations for three city council members came from Townscape.

- The City of West Hollywood paid out **\$500,000 to settle a lawsuit from Duran's former assistant** who claimed the city councilman was sexually harassing him. Duran met the assistant on a sex hookup website (Grinder), and the city employee salary was a \$150,000 a year.
- Los Angeles County prosecutors pursued **Duran on criminal charges** for misuse of a city credit card. WEHO spent thousands of dollars defending Duran.

Can Duran be trusted when it comes to 8150 Sunset and his very close association with the NY developers?



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

8150 Sunset - John Duran

1 message

jsmitford@yahoo.com <jsmitford@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: jsmitford@yahoo.com

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 2:28 PM

This is very disturbing for residents in West Hollywood regarding John Duran's connection to

Sent from Yahoo Mail. [Get the app](#)



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Preserve the Chase Bank / Lytton Savings Building

2 messages

aaron bernardin <abernardin@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: aaron bernardin <abernardin@yahoo.com>
To: "william.lamborn@lacity.org" <william.lamborn@lacity.org>
Cc: "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 11:20 AM

Mr. William Lamborn,

Character is defined by history. The character of Los Angeles is no exception. Too often, unchecked development harms the historical character of our city. Once gone, we are relegated to photos and static memories. Please honor history and protect this landmark for future generations. As a longtime resident of Los Angeles, I urge you and your colleagues in the L.A. Department of City Planning to push for a preservation-based solution for the Chase Bank / Lytton Savings building at the southwest corner of Sunset and Crescent Heights boulevards.

Thanks.
Aaron Bernardin
Member L.A. Conservancy

William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>
To: aaron bernardin <abernardin@yahoo.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 8:58 AM

Thank you for your comments. They have been received and will be included in the public record for the subject project.

Regards,
William Lamborn
[Quoted text hidden]



William Lamborn
Major Projects
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Rm 750
Ph: [213.978.1470](tel:213.978.1470)

Please note that I am out of the office every other Friday.



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

(no subject)

2 messages

Cherilyn Smith <cheriks@ca.rr.com>

Mon, May 23, 2016 at 2:58 PM

To: William.lamborn@lacity.org

Dear William,

Re: May 24, 2016 hearing for 8150 Sunset mixed-use proposed project as noted above.

Case No.: VTT-72370-CN CPC-2013-2551-CUB-DB-SPR

CEQA No.: ENV-2013-2552-EIR

As has been previously conveyed this proposed project and impacts on community runs deep. The previous traffic study was vague. That's why a request was made to have a new study done by an independent agency to reflect the true impact. So far it doesn't appear a new study has been completed. Losing the right hand turn lane on to Crescent Heights will compromise the flow of traffic, including Fire and Emergency trucks, buses, delivery trucks etc., increasing even more the existing gridlock on Sunset, Crescent Heights, Laurel Canyon and Havenhurst Drive, which is already graded F, so will only get worse! This piece of city property should not be incorporated into the project.

I attended meetings where the developers where the public requested a scale down of this this project to reduce the height and size. Councilman David Ryu also requested the same when he met with the developers (he also addressed traffic issues)Even though there's no height limit on Sunset Blvd., the project is so out of scale with the historic core and look of the residential neighborhood on Havenhurst Drive, surrounding neighborhoods, as well as the nearby buildings such as the Chateau Marmont and the other beautiful one and two story older buildings.

The really sad part is losing historic cores of Los Angeles, the very fabric that visitors far and wide come and want to see like the beautiful Lytton Bank Building.

Thank you.

Cherilyn K. Smith
[323-816-5494](tel:323-816-5494)
cheriks@ca.rr.com

Sent from my iPad Mini

William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 8:55 AM

To: Cherilyn Smith <cheriks@ca.rr.com>

Thank you for your comments. They have been received and will be included in the public record for the subject project.

Regards,
William Lamborn

[Quoted text hidden]



William Lamborn
Major Projects
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Rm 750
Ph: [213.978.1470](tel:213.978.1470)

Please note that I am out of the office every other Friday.



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Preserve the Chase Bank/Lytton Savings building

2 messages

John Schroeder <jeschro@hotmail.com>

Sat, Jun 4, 2016 at 12:16 PM

To: "william.lamborn@lacity.org" <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Cc: "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Dear Mr. Lamborn,

Tearing down a historic Modernist building is unacceptable, especially when it otherwise could be retained and incorporated as part of the proposed project, as previously planned by developer Townscape Partners. Please make every effort to preserve this iconic monument. Thanks for your consideration!

John Schroeder
4018 Beverly Glen Blvd
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 8:53 AM

To: John Schroeder <jeschro@hotmail.com>

Thank you for your comments. They have been received and will be included in the public record for the subject project.

Regards,
William Lamborn

[Quoted text hidden]

—



William Lamborn
Major Projects
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Rm 750
Ph: [213.978.1470](tel:213.978.1470)

Please note that I am out of the office every other Friday.



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

8150 Sunset Boulevard Mixed-Use Project

1 message

Rich Mannino <richmannino@yahoo.com>

Sat, Jun 4, 2016 at 11:31 AM

Reply-To: Rich Mannino <richmannino@yahoo.com>

To: "cd4.issues@lacity.org" <cd4.issues@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>

Cc: "william.lamborn@lacity.org" <william.lamborn@lacity.org>, "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Dear Councilmember Ryu,

The Kurt Meyer-designed Lytton Savings and current Chase Bank building is historic and warranting preservation. I strongly object to the needless demolition of a historic building that could otherwise be integrated and reused as part of the overall 8150 Sunset Boulevard development design.

Please preserve Lytton Savings as part of this new development. The new Alternative Nine/Enhanced View Corridor and Additional Underground Parking represents a substantial step backward.

The proposed demolition of Lytton Savings is unjustified and will result in a significant adverse impact and loss to Los Angeles' postwar heritage.

Thank you,
Richard Mannino
Los Angeles Conservancy Member



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Fwd: Out of the office Re: Comment Letter on VTT-72370-CN (8150 Sunset)

1 message

Laura Lake <laura.lake@gmail.com>
To: William.Lamborn@lacity.org
Cc: James O'Sullivan <jamesos@aol.com>

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 2:50 PM

Please confirm receipt.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Luciralia Ibarra" <luciralia.ibarra@lacity.org>
Date: Jun 3, 2016 12:54 PM
Subject: Out of the office Re: Comment Letter on VTT-72370-CN (8150 Sunset)
To: <laura.lake@gmail.com>
Cc:

I will be out of the office Friday, June 3rd, and will be returning to the office on Monday, June 6th. I will respond to your e-mail at that time.

Thank you,
Luci



Luciralia Ibarra | Senior City Planner
Major Projects | Department of City Planning | City of Los Angeles
luciralia.ibarra@lacity.org | **213.978.1378**



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Comment Letter on VTT-72370-CN (8150 Sunset)

2 messages

Laura Lake <laura.lake@gmail.com>

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 12:54 PM

To: luciralia.ibarra@lacity.org

Cc: William.Lamborn@lacity.org, James O'Sullivan <jamesos@aol.com>, Mike Eveloff <meveloff@gmail.com>

Dear Luci,

Attached is a comment letter for 8150 Sunset VTT. Please confirm receipt of this letter and its inclusion in your record. I am available to discuss any questions you may have as a result of my letter.

Laura

--

Laura Lake, Ph.D.

Cell 310-497-5550



VTT Comment Letter.pdf

642K

William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 8:37 AM

To: Laura Lake <laura.lake@gmail.com>

Cc: Luciralia Ibarra <luciralia.ibarra@lacity.org>, James O'Sullivan <jamesos@aol.com>, Mike Eveloff <meveloff@gmail.com>

Hi Laura,

The comment letter has been received and will be included in the record.

Regards,

Will Lamborn

On Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 12:54 PM, Laura Lake <laura.lake@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Luci,

Attached is a comment letter for 8150 Sunset VTT. Please confirm receipt of this letter and its inclusion in your record. I am available to discuss any questions you may have as a result of my letter.

Laura

--

Laura Lake, Ph.D.

Cell 310-497-5550

--



William Lamborn
Major Projects
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Rm 750
Ph: [213.978.1470](tel:213.978.1470)

Please note that I am out of the office every other Friday.

FIX THE CITY

Laura@FixTheCity.org

1557 Westwood Blvd. #235, LA, CA 90024

May 31, 2016

William Lamborn
City of Los Angeles
Major Projects Section
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750
Los Angeles, CA 90012

VIA EMAIL: William.lamborn@lacity.org; Luci.ibarra@lacity.org

RE: 8150 Sunset Boulevard Mixed-Use Project Case Numbers: VTT-72370-CN, CPC-2013-2551-CUB-DB-SPR, CEQA Number: ENV-2013-2552-EIR

Dear Ms. Ibarra:

Fix the City is a nonprofit corporation dedicated to preserving the quality of life in Los Angeles. We hereby submit the following comments on the proposed project cited above.

There are significant procedural and substantive errors in this proceeding that must be corrected prior to any determination by the City. We incorporate by reference all other testimony and documents in the record. Please confirm receipt of this testimony. Since a tract map approval is final unless appealed, it is vital that all of the procedural and substantive concerns flagged in this letter be addressed prior to any approval. Bear in mind that the project is not entitled to fast-tracking under CEQA because it is NOT within 1500 feet of a major transit stop. Thus there is ample time to revise the proposal and city response to what has amounted to a moving target.

The two key questions never addressed in the EIR or VTT Staff Report are: is it safe and is it legal. The answer to both is no.

1. HOLLYWOOD FAULT RUNS THROUGH SITE. It is located on the active Hollywood Fault according to the most recent Alquist-Priolo earthquake map. Revise the EIR to address the fact that the most recent Earthquake Map, as opposed to the 2014 map used for the Seismic Analysis, the project is located within the active Hollywood Fault. is not safe. Please revise the seismic analysis using the most recent maps provided by the State.
2. DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS regarding the taking of city property for private purpose (such as including for lot area calculations) without Fair Market Value being paid to the taxpayers, and a condemnation of private easements for vehicular access (California Streets and Highways Code Section 8353(b)) over the turn lane that would be paved-over and included in the private project. This privatization through a merger represents a vacation of vehicular rights to the street. There is also no analysis of how the closure

and paving of the public right-of-way impacts subsurface easements. All of this is required to be disclosed and analyzed, and then noticed to the public, private easement owners, and all utilities.

3. CONVERSION OF A STREET TO A PUBLIC OPEN SPACE IS A SURFACE VACATION THAT REQUIRES THE CITY ENGINEER TO MAKE A REPORT on whether or not this street or the portion of the street is needed now or in the future. We cannot find any such report from the City Engineer in the record.
4. CLOSURE OF THE STREET ALSO REQUIRES PUBLICATION OF NOTICE IN THE NEWSPAPER, POSTING THE SITE, AND SENDING HEARING NOTICES TO THE PUBLIC. There is no evidence in the record that the site was posted for a street closure, or that the notice of public hearing for a street closure through a tract map was published. Closure and vacation are never mentioned in any city notices, the NOP, or project description.
5. THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION IS NOT STABLE AS REQUIRED BY CEQA It would also help if the staff report provided a comparison of what the project is entitled to, and what it is requesting, and whether those requests are lawful. For example, does the 111,339 SF lot area include the street and the island? Is that area 9K SF? If so, the project is only entitled to 204 dwelling units rather than 249. This is vital to pin down prior to approval of the tract map.
6. TOO MANY INCENTIVES? The Applicant has requested (1) parking reduction; (2) 22% extra units above the 204 permitted by right; (3) 3:1 FAR for the entire project that is more than 1500 feet from a major transit stop; and (4) inclusion of public property as lot area for FAR calculation. The first two incentives are permitted under SB 1818. The third and fourth incentives (“off menu”) are not permitted under SB 1818.
7. SITE HAS AN FAR OF 1:1 (111,339 SF). To reach 333,903 SF (3:1 FAR) requires a Height District Change which is not an “off-menu” incentive. Without a Height District change, there is no ability to add a commercial component.
8. THE PROJECT IS ENTITLED TO BUILD 204 DWELLING UNITS BY RIGHT under the High Residential Density category of the Hollywood Community Plan (80 dwelling units per gross acre). A 22% density bonus would bring it to 249 dwelling units. **To squeeze 249 units on 111,339 SF is problematic.**
9. TO PERMIT ENTERTAINMENT USES IN THE C-4 ZONE REQUIRES A ZONE CHANGE OR VARIANCE. Neither is requested here, and it is not clear that such use would be compatible with the adjacent community under the Wilshire Community Plan. Clearly, the rest of the community is limited to 1:1 FAR. This project would be massive in comparison with adjacent properties and is emblematic of spot zoning at its worst.
10. THE PROJECT IS NOT ENTITLED TO FAST-TRACKING due to a false claim that the project is entitled to an “off menu” incentive due to proximity to a major transit stop. The bus stop adjacent on the island is a local bus stop, not an express stop. Furthermore, there is no off-menu option to exceed an ordinance that specifies proximity to a major transit stop of 1500, not 1560 linear feet. It is not major and it is not 1500 feet away.

11. DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS. The process followed for this Tract Map violates the due process rights of both the general public and **private easement holders within the Crescent Heights Tract, under the California Streets and Highways Code Section 8353(b)**. The public hearing notice for the Tract Map was silent regarding the proposal to close the turn lane to traffic and connect the private property with the city's property.
12. UNLAWFUL GIFT OF PUBLIC PROPERTY. The tract map would permit the use of city property (the island) and the public right of way as well as subsurface easements to be gifted to the applicant without the City receiving Fair Market Value. It is not clear if this city "public space" is being counted as open space for the project. If so, it can't be public and count as project open space.
13. THE NOP AND EIR FAIL TO DISCLOSE SEVERAL DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT. These include
 - a. Condemnation of private street easements (California Streets and Highways Code Section 8353(b)).
 - b. Partial street vacation required in conjunction with tract map merger and City Engineer's Report.
 - c. a Height District change from 1:1 to 3:1 (note: project does not qualify for 3:1 because it is not within 1500 feet of a major transit stop).
 - d. a General Plan Amendment to amend MP 2035 map show the island and the turn lane closed (the project is inconsistent with MP 2035).
 - e. inclusion of property beyond the midline of Crescent Heights in calculating FAR requires density transfer from owner on opposite site of Crescent Heights; no such consent or request is in the record.
 - f. An off-menu incentive cannot include violating the LAMC. A variance would have to be requested, and there needs to be substantial evidence in the record that the bus service on the streets in question actually qualify for the FAR increase (for the housing only – not the commercial portion) requested.
14. LACK OF PUBLIC NOTICE ON CLOSURE OF TURN LANE ON CRESCENT HEIGHTS – A PARTIAL VACATION OF CRESCENT HEIGHTS CURRENTLY USED FOR VEHICULAR ACCESS. State law requires any street vacation or partial vacation to be noticed, published and posted (California Streets and Highways Code Section 8320-8325). Closing vehicular traffic on Crescent Heights has not been reviewed by the City Engineer, as required There is no substantial evidence in the record that this has occurred.
15. THERE WAS NO PUBLIC NOTICE, NO PUBLISHED NOTICE, NO PUBLIC HEARING, AND NO POSTING OF THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY TO BE VACATED/MERGED, IN VIOLATION OF STATE LAW (California Streets and Highways Code Section 8323).
16. THE NOTICE OF THE MAY 24, 2016 PUBLIC HEARING OMITTED THE FACT THAT VEHICULAR ACCESS WOULD BE TERMINATED ON THE TURN LANE. Rather, it only addressed calculating FAR to include the area to be used for street purposes (p. 2, 3.a.). ***This is misleading and incorrect.*** The property right of a property owner goes only to the midline of the street, and does not include the entire area to be vacated and merged with the private property as proposed in the hearing notice. In other words, this is a "taking" by a private party of a public easement, property, without the knowledge or consent of the public.

17. It is one thing to use the street to calculate lot area. It is another to close it to vehicular access and exceed the midline of the street. This must be corrected.
18. THERE IS NO ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF THE MERGER ON SUBSURFACE UTILITIES THAT ARE LOCATED IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY.
19. WHEN A PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY IS CLOSED, PARTIALLY VACATED, OR MERGED, THE CITY ENGINEER MUST ISSUE A REPORT STATING THAT IT "IS UNNECESSARY FOR PRESENT OR PROSPECTIVE PUBLIC USE" (Ibid., Section 8324(b)). No such finding has been made.
20. The NOP did not disclose several discretionary approvals sought, including but not limited to, closing the turn lane adjacent to the site. In fact, the Notice of Public Hearing failed to disclose that vehicular access would be eliminated (see p. 2, CPC Hearing Officer).
21. THIS SITE IS IN AN ACTIVE EARTHQUAKE FAULT ZONE according to the most current state map. The seismic study relied upon an outdated 2014 map. This must be corrected.
22. INCONSISTENT WITH MAP IN MP 2035. The map for the intersection of Crescent Heights and Sunset in MP 2035 would conflict with the proposed changes to this intersection. Therefore, there is an inconsistency between this project and the General Plan/Community Plan/Mobility Element.
23. DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS NOT INCLUDED IN NOP. The NOP did not disclose the discretionary approvals required for increased FAR, increased density, surface and subsurface vacation of a public right-of-way, and a gift of public land to a private developer. Since this project would alter the intersection shown on the map in MP 2035, a General Plan Amendment is also required. No such amendment has been requested. This clearly violates the CEQA requirement to state up-front all discretionary approvals required for the project.
24. IMPACT ON EMERGENCY ACCESS. Has a determination been made by LAFD regarding the impact on emergency ingress/egress as a result of the vacation of the current turn lane? Can large emergency vehicles safely turn onto Crescent Heights? This determination must be based on substantial evidence in the record.
25. HOW MUCH SLOWER WILL EMT RESPONSE TIME BE AS A RESULT OF THIS PROJECT?
26. WHAT MITIGATIONS ARE PROPOSED FOR THIS PROJECT WHICH IS LOCATED ON THE HOLLYWOOD FAULT? Was the most current and accurate map used for the seismic analysis (2014 was used, there is a newer map). Please update the analysis using the most current map.
27. A GIFT OF PUBLIC PROPERTY. The City is not permitted to make a gift to the applicant of public property (the median and the right-of-way turn lane). The median is clearly city property and may not be merged with the private property without fair market value and a vacation process. The Charter requires fair market value in exchange for

such property. Otherwise this is an unlawful gift of public property. Certainly, the merger would create a gift in terms of buildable which has a value.

28. VALUE OF VACATED PUBLIC PROPERTY AND EASEMENT. What is the Fair Market Value of the island and the street to be vacated? Please provide an appraisal for the right of way and for the median/island.
29. PRIVATE DEVELOPER DOES NOT HAVE RIGHT TO CONDEMN CITY PROPERTY. This is a private taking of public property. The City may not lawfully delegate this authority to a private developer for a private purpose.
30. STREET VACATION PROCEDURE REQUIRED. The turn lane may not be lawfully transferred to the Applicant without a street vacation via the tract map but with the City Engineer's report. The same is true of the median/island in the public right-of-way.
31. STREET VACATION NOT LISTED AS A DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL. The vacation is not listed as a discretionary approval sought for this project. This is mandated by the City Charter and the street vacation procedures in the Municipal Code.
32. NOTICE TO ALL PRIVATE EASEMENT OWNERS REQUIRED. The City must give notice to all private easement owners within the Crescent Heights Tract which shows the turn lane and island on the tract map since 1905. The maps are already in the record.
33. COMPENSATION TO ALL PRIVATE EASEMENT OWNERS DUE. The Applicant must compensate ALL the private easement owners the Fair Market Value of the vacated portion of Crescent Heights and the island in the public right-of-way, per California Streets and Highways Code 8353(b):

“(b) A private easement claimed by reason of the purchase of a lot by reference to a map or plat upon which the street or highway is shown is not extinguished pursuant to subdivision (a) if, within two years after the date the vacation is complete, the claimant records a verified notice that particularly describes the private easement that is claimed in the office of the recorder of the county in which the vacated street or highway is located.”

In other words, all property owners within the tract have a private easement, a property right, that the city cannot give away for free. They must be compensated for this taking. The exposure of the Applicant is long and perilous: two years AFTER the vacation is completed. Given the law, it is prudent for the City to require all condemnation issues be addressed prior to approval.

34. THE FINDINGS REQUIRED FOR A STREET VACATION HAVE NOT BEEN MADE.
35. FOR PURPOSES OF CALCULATING LOT AREA, IS THE MEDIAN OWNED BY THE CITY INCLUDED AS PART OF THE SITE?
36. HOW HAS THE “MERGER” OR VACATION OF A PORTION OF CRESCENT HEIGHTS IMPACTED THE SUBSURFACE EASEMENT OF THE CITY FOR UTILITIES, ETC.?

37. WHAT IS THE DISTANCE FROM THE STREET/FIRE LANE TO THE BUILDING STRUCTION FROM THE MERGED MEDIAN? IS IT GREATER THAN 150 FEET? LAFD requires: "No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane." Does the merger/vacation result in the building being further than 150 feet.?
38. WHILE THE LAFD FIRE MARSHALL STATES THERE ARE NO PLANS TO EXPAND FIRE FACILITIES, THIS IS NON-RESPONSIVE TO THE CEQA QUESTION OF WHETHER CURRENT FACILITIES CAN PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE.
39. THE FIRE MARSHALL'S LETTER OF MAY 10, 2016 DID NOT ADDRESS THE IMPACT OF RECONFIGURING CRESCENT HEIGHTS ON THE TURNING RADIUS REQUIREMENTS OF FIRE EQUIPMENT.
40. THE NOV. 17, 2014 LETTER FROM EDMUND YEW, REQUIRES DEDICATIONS AND DOES NOT ADDRESS STREET VACATION/MERGER. PLEASE EXPLAIN.
41. The 1-D is a permanent condition imposed by AB 283 in 1989. They are limited to a 1 to 1 FAR. There was an earlier Ordinance 163513 (cannot find it) with T and Q conditions. AB 283 made them permanent.
42. The map (AB 283) shows 8118 (island) and flow around it. The Island is C4-1
43. The bus stop is 1,560 feet away from the project, not 1500 feet. They lose one of the requirements of the fast track.
44. There is no off menu incentive to make up for the lack of the 1500 or to get a 3:1 FAR. STAFF REPORT STATES (page 1) "Off-Menu Incentive to allow a 3:1 Floor Area Ratio for a Housing Development Project located within 1,560 feet of a Transit Stop, in lieu of the 1,500-foot distance specified in LAMC Section 12.22-A,25(f)(4)(ii);"
45. The gift of a street and a City owned (8118 Sunset) property which is to be merged with the private property under the VTT.

Sincerely,

Laura Lake

Laura Lake, Ph.D.
FIX THE CITY



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Chase Bank / Lytton Savings

1 message

Eleanor Whitledge <elliegirl303@yahoo.com>

Thu, Jun 2, 2016 at 5:05 PM

Reply-To: Eleanor Whitledge <elliegirl303@yahoo.com>

To: "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, "cd4.issues@lacity.org" <cd4.issues@lacity.org>, "william.lamborn@lacity.org" <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Cc: "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

A proposed redevelopment at the corner of Sunset and Crescent Heights threatens the historic 1960 Lytton Savings, now used as a Chase Bank. We urge you to find a solution that preserves this important modernist building. It's an ironic shame that the Garden Of Allah no longer exists in this location as a result of the modernist bank and the mini mall, but shall we not have any historic character in our commercial zones? Our fair city is on its way to looking like every other place with the bland commercial architecture that replaces such structures. Please, please consider a plan of compromise that preserves this lovely, whimsical building!

Sincerely,

Eleanor Whitledge

(longtime Los Angeles resident, modernism lover)



William Lamborn <william.lamborn@lacity.org>

Please integrate the City Bank building at Sunset and Crescent Heights into the new plan. EOM

1 message

Richard Stanley <rstanley@richardstanleyrealtor.com>

Thu, Jun 2, 2016 at 3:44 PM

To: councilmemberryu@lacity.org

Cc: afine@laconservancy.org, william.lamborn@lacity.org



Richard Stanley

Estates Director

*Architectural and Historic
Properties Specialist*

213 300-4567 cell

1917 Hillhurst Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90027



RESIDENTIAL BROKERAGE

CABRE license 00971211



Richard Stanley

*Estates Director
Architectural and Historic
Properties Specialist*

213 300-4567 cell

1917 Hillhurst Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90027



RESIDENTIAL BROKERAGE

CABRE license 00971211

PastedGraphic-3.tiff
186K