

Communication from Public

Name: Karin McGaughey

Date Submitted: 08/14/2023 09:18 AM

Council File No: 23-0497

Comments for Public Posting: This project is completely out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. Our neighborhood is one of the few remaining historic neighborhoods in Los Angeles and projects like this will bulldoze us off the map. This project is too tall. It doesn't provide the kind of housing needed in the neighborhood. The design of the parking structure will impinge on the neighbors' clean air. Please quit approving projects that are purely for profit of the developer. The more we see projects like this built around LA, the more homeless people we have. The two things ARE related.

Communication from Public

Name: Laura Meyers

Date Submitted: 08/14/2023 01:38 PM

Council File No: 23-0497

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Council Members: As one of the Appellants in this matter, I urge you to please SUPPORT our CEQA Appeal and REJECT the Categorical Exemption for the proposed project at 1848 S. Gramercy Place (Council File 23-0497), for the numerous reasons I outline below. There is substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies. *** My foremost concern is the DISPLACEMENT OF 20-PLUS RESIDENTS – my longtime neighbors – who have been living in the house at 1848 S. Gramercy Place for more than two decades, in a de facto supportive housing (sober living) setting. The development premise for density bonus incentives is to provide additional affordable housing units; the incentives are meant to financially support the costs of the 3 affordable units to be offered in this proposed building. However, this is like a comic strip reverse “Bizarro world,” where white is black, tall is short, and in this case we are to believe that three units would house more low-income people than the current residence, which previously housed two dozen residents (and currently is home to 8-11 residents). *** I don’t understand how the City of Los Angeles can look the other way and grant multiple incentives and waivers for a project that REDUCES our affordable housing for the most vulnerable, and which will send the current residents onto the streets looking on their own for hard-to-come-by equivalent housing. *** Regarding CEQA: The City Planning Commission (CPC) stated that its hands were tied due to changes in state law requiring the approval of this grossly incompatible housing project. We disagree. In any case, CPC’s hands were NOT tied regarding the California Environmental Quality Act. The CPC made clear in its comments that this project will not enhance the built environment, will be materially detrimental to the surrounding community, actually removes affordable housing, and it does not create a healthy community. Indeed, many CPC comments indicated a shared belief that the project is disrespectful to the community, and that it in many ways raises social equity issues. *** The comments by these Commissioners added to the already substantial evidence in the record, which you have copies of, that there are severe and adverse impacts if this project moves forward in its present form. It should not be CEQA

exempt. *** >>> The project demolishes a 1908 residence that has been IDENTIFIED AS A CONTRIBUTOR TO A HISTORIC DISTRICT; and there are CUMULATIVE DEMOLITIONS of other nearby historical properties. The Historic Survey report is included in the case file. >>> It does NOT enhance the character of the community. >>> It does not provide quality nor safe housing (given the extreme lack of open space and specifically the waiver of the size of the passageway from the required 20 feet to 3 feet, a major safety issue). >>> Its above-ground parking levels are vented directly toward the multi-family building located directly to the north, with only a 5-foot separation. Vehicles located in parking garages release harmful gases. (Applicant refused to redesign to vent toward the south because, he said, in the future someone may also build a zero-foot-setback building in that commercial zone, thus recognizing the issue!) >>> Its complete lack of landscaping, and its removal of the mature ROW street tree for its driveway onto Gramercy Place, is another adverse effect. >>> It is non-compliant and incompatible with local zoning and the General Plan: There are so many variations from the underlying zoning that the project has become, at core, a C4-D2 level project (specifically equivalent to the zoning of the Figueroa Corridor south of Downtown, which is zoned to allow an FAR of 6:1 and building heights of 8 stories) that would be built in the C1.5-1VL-CPIO / redevelopment plan zone. >>> The Project falls within an Exception to an Exemption from the Class 32 "Infill" Categorical Exemption, e.g. Section 15300.2. CEQA Guideline Section 15332 exempts infill development within urbanized areas if it meets certain criteria. THE CLASS CONSISTS OF ENVIRONMENTALLY BENIGN INFILL PROJECTS that are consistent with the General Plan, Zoning requirements and specific plans (the CPIO and the Redevelopment Plan). This class is not intended for projects that would result in any significant impacts. And, it is not intended for projects where there unique or unusual circumstances or are in sensitive locations. The exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15332 does not apply because THE PROJECT IS NOT BENIGN and will have a demonstrable significant effect. *** In view of these reasons (and other persuasive arguments in the case file), I urge the City Council PLUM Committee to SUPPORT THE APPEAL and initiate an in-depth environmental review of the proposed project. Thank you very much.

Communication from Public

Name: stephen wallis

Date Submitted: 08/14/2023 09:12 PM

Council File No: 23-0497

Comments for Public Posting: Do NOT approve the proposed demolition of an historic building at 1848 S. Gramercy Place for the proposed project without a full CEQA evaluation to mitigate the multitude of adverse impacts to the community. The proposed project - REDUCES the amount of affordable housing units - does NOT comply with the underlying zoning - demolishes a building that is a contributor to the local Historic District in Angelus Vista - has NO setbacks on the front and sides - exhausts toxic fumes onto an adjacent property

Communication from Public

Name: Skei Saulnier

Date Submitted: 08/14/2023 09:25 PM

Council File No: 23-0497

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Planning, As a nearby resident of 1848 S Gramercy Pl., I urge you to uphold the CEQA appeal and stop the destruction of the sober living facility at 1848 S Gramercy Place. As the granddaughter of a recovering alcoholic, I can tell you the importance of preserving these facilities is a matter of life and death for the people who need them. I wouldn't be here if my grandmother hadn't had the opportunity to continue her recovery from alcoholism in a sober living facility. These are unique places that are safe and supportive environments for people when they need them the most. There are very few opportunities for people struggling with addiction, to take away a place that's dedicated to supporting them is unconscionable. There are plenty of opportunities for people to build developments, conversely there aren't many places dedicated to supporting people from stepping out of addiction. With the mandate for housing, I'm sure this isn't the only sober living facility that the city is losing. You have an opportunity to save this one. In terms of the environment, CD10 has the lowest ratio of green space than any other council district in LA. We don't need any more pollution. Adding a building which will bring more pollution into our district, is a civil rights matter. Pollution is a matter that disproportionately impacts communities of color at a higher rate. On the matter of Civil Rights this leads me to my next point. Like many cities in the United States, much of our district has been impacted by racially motivated zoning regulations. These regulations have led to several outcomes, one is the urbanization of black communities(and thus more pollution), and the suburbanization of white communities. These racially targeted zoning regulations prevented Black communities from taking advantage of good city planning. While our lots were "up zoned" or bulldozed for highways, many people saw assets they had worked their whole lives to obtain, become worthless and significantly devalued. Only in the United States can city planning officials make the dream of home ownership an economic loss for Black Families. After decades of city planning having its way with our community, our lots are now worth less money and are now being targeted for the state's housing mandate and predatory developers, which will continue the objective of systematic racism in this country: destroy black communities. Meanwhile, white communities were

granted exclusionary zoning regulations allowing white people to have single family houses and maintain communities that were less dense. These less dense communities, which you can see today when you drive by the several tennis courts on San Vicente in Brentwood, you can get there by taking the 10 Freeway which is routed over the remains of homes owned by some of the most prominent black artists in our time, just like the one at 1848 S Gramercy Place. They have created generational wealth and allowed predominantly white communities to maintain and increase in value while staying less dense in comparison to communities of color. We are now decades into trying to build the communities we deserve, despite the constant hammering of racially oppressive city planning regulations, one which allows us to have some control over what it looks like and who it serves. A community with less pollution and a place where, if we choose, we can preserve our history. Please stand on the right side of history, and be in opposition of a legacy of racially oppressive zoning regulations. Sincerely, Skei Saulnier