

Communication from Public

Name: Laura Meyers

Date Submitted: 09/30/2024 10:06 AM

Council File No: 23-0497

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers: I am one of the Appellants in this matter. Please accept my updated comments regarding this matter (letter and documentation attached). I urge you to SUPPORT our CEQA Appeal regarding the proposed project at 1848 S. Gramercy Place, and to REJECT the proposed Categorical Exemption. There is substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies. Please initiate an in-depth environmental review of the proposed project. This way, perhaps we can work together to create a project that enhances our community, provides equitable housing to our neighbors, provides mitigations regarding a historic resource, a mature ROW shade tree, open space and other elements; and which is consistent with the City's local zoning and General Plan goals, especially regarding affordable housing. My complete comments are included with this posting. Thank you for your consideration. --
LAURA MEYERS

Laura Meyers

1818 S. Gramercy Place, Los Angeles CA 90019

323-868-0854

lauramink@aol.com

September 28, 2024

City Clerk, City Council Planning and Land Use Committee (PLUM)
Room 395, City Hall, 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson
Councilmember Heather Hutt
Honorable Members, Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee

RE: Council File: 23-0497

ENV-2020-2116-CE-1A

1848 South Gramercy Place / California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) / Appeal

Honorable Council Members:

I am one of the Appellants in this matter, and I had written you previously when this matter was first scheduled for PLUM in August, 2023. Today I'd like to reiterate the key points we made in the original Appeal, supplemented by new information (particularly a key court decision, *Snowbird v. City of Los Angeles*, which actually changes your decision-making criteria).

I do urge you to please SUPPORT our CEQA Appeal and REJECT the Categorical Exemption, 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.

Before dealing with the technicalities of the case, however, I would like to emphasize that my foremost concern is the DISPLACEMENT OF 20-PLUS LOW-INCOME 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 (mere) three (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 low-income 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.

The CPC Determination Resulted, In Part, from Misinformation Provided by the Planning Department and the City Attorney to the Commissioners:

After receiving instructions from the City Attorney (*which in retrospect were incorrect due to the precedent-setting California Appellate Court decision, Snowbird v. City of Los Angeles, that ruled that cities are NOT required to approve projects under the State's Housing Accountability Act if the project is inconsistent with the parcel's zoning – which this project is*), 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. The Appellants strongly disagree. Their hands were not tied; the City Attorney (who told them they were required to approve the project) was wrong.

(Please read the audio transcript of the CPC hearing, which has been separately submitted to the Council File).

In any case, CPC's hands were NEVER 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 New Historical Assessment Is Insufficient:

In August 2023, PLUM continued this item in order to give the Applicant time to prepare and submit a supplemental Historic Report. After a year of waiting, the Applicant did NOT submit a supplemental report but rather his original Historic Consultant, Margarita Jerabek-Bray, wrote a self-described "Validation Letter" in which she stated, quote, after "a limited effort to prepare this validation letter," her previous research was correct. Applicant should not have made a "limited effort" to have a letter written; Applicant was required prepare a real, bonafide supplemental report (ideally prepared by a new historic consultant).

Unfortunately, she also made two misleading statements (one false, and one simply deceptive):

1). Jerabek-Bray wrote, "The subject property was evaluated as part of a Section 106 Review for HUD in 1987, the DPR (19- 173454) indicates that it was assigned a 6Y CHRS status, denoting 'determined ineligible for NR by consensus through Section 106 process - Not evaluated for CR or Local Listing.' "**She knows this is untrue.**

The property she describes here was actually **1848 NORTH Gramercy Place, in Hollywood**, and the evaluation was conducted at the request of the Hollywood Community Redevelopment Project staff because, yes, the CRA was utilizing HUD funds for some project unrelated to our neighborhood 36 blocks away. This same piece of "evidence" was submitted in 2018 by the Applicant and, for the same reason that it is a different property, was rejected by the Office of Historic Resources (but not before damage was done to the public record, obviously). Again, her statement is provably false.

2). Jerabek-Bray also wrote, “In 2012, SurveyLA conducted a survey of the South Los Angeles Community Plan Area, and did not identify 1848 Gramercy Place as an individually significant historic resources or as a contributor to a potential historic district.” This statement is deceptive. This property was NOT even included in the primary South Los Angeles SurveyLA survey, since at the time of the main historic resources survey the parcel and all of Washington Boulevard in this community was zoned industrial (CM). Later, the Planning Department’s consultants prepared a separate Industrial Resources Context Statement for SurveyLA. The residence may or may not have been looked at as a part of that survey, but, of course, it is NOT AN INDUSTRIAL RESOURCE and therefore would not have been considered as part of a historic district.

This has been discussed many times in the record of this case. The vagaries of zoning should never have entered into the equation when South Los Angeles was surveyed for SurveyLA. The entirety of South Los Angeles should have been considered at the same time and in the same context. Just didn’t happen, and we cannot change how SurveyLA was conducted. However, we can note, AGAIN, that the City Planning Department has its own Historic Resources Survey document (appended here for, I believe, the 6th time) that does show 1848 S. Gramercy as a Contributor to an identified historic district. Please note that historic district boundaries are not defined by zoning. They may be defined, as was the case in this instance, by the original subdivision, tract or development (that is, “Angelus Vista”).

One presumes that the correct approach to a Supplemental Historic Report in which experts (not the Applicant’s paid consultant but other historic consultants) have been stating for the record that the property is a Contributor, would be to determine whether or not it is a Contributor today (versus at the time of the original survey). Jerabek-Bray’s own original report, dating from 2018, was regarding whether or not 1848 S. Gramercy Place in her opinion qualified as an individual HCM. She did not evaluate it then, and certainly did not evaluate it now in a “limited effort” validation letter, whether or not, objectively, it was a contributor to the previously named “18th Street District” (which comprises the original Angelus Vista and West End tracts).

When instructed to prepare a Supplemental Historic Report by the Honorable Councilmembers, Applicant did not do so. What was submitted does not meet the threshold as a proper supplemental document, especially since false statements were made. Please reject the document.

There Are Many Reasons Why this Project is Not Qualified for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption:

>> 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. Class 32 consists of environmentally benign infill projects that are consistent with the General Plan, Zoning requirements and specific plans (the CPIO and the Redevelopment Plan).

The Project is not consistent with the zoning requirements and specific plans (C1.5-1VL-CPIO + Redevelopment Plan); and may not be consistent with the General Plan given that it is inconsistent with the Housing Element’s goal to preserve housing, especially low-income housing. It will demolish supportive housing, thus hindering the Housing Element’s longtime goal of providing housing for all City residents who have a variety of means and needs.

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.

Class 32 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. (Noting, the Applicant himself claims a unique circumstance because the lot width is “only” 50 feet).

Class 32 does not apply in view of applicable Exceptions. *Guidelines § 15300.2(b), (c) and (f)* exclude categorical exemptions, including Class 32, if a project is not consistent with the underlying zoning; if a project may have cumulative impacts; if a project may have significant impacts due to unusual circumstances; and if a project may have impacts to historical resources. All four apply here.

>> Applicant has argued that the project qualifies for a categorical exemption due to the Housing Accountability Act (HAA). But **HAA does not apply if a project is inconsistent with applicable objective development standards**. In this case, not only is the project inconsistent with the zoning, the multiple waivers the Applicant has requested actually are to abandon (“waive”) objective development standards (in the zoning).

According to the Planning Department’s own Project Screening Zoning Assessment, the project does not meet the following objective standards:

- Height – project would be 89 feet, 8 stories – maximum allowed in the zone is 45 feet plus 11 feet (one story) incentive, for a total of 56 feet. The extra 33 feet are inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- Stories – with the one added story as a density bonus, four stories would be allowed, project would be 8 stories. The extra four stories are inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- Base FAR – the zoning allows 1.5:1. (The LAMC may allow under some circumstances 3:1 FAR). The project would have a 6.04:1 FAR according to the Planning Department’s new transmittal dated August 15, 2024. This is an Off-Menu Incentive that the City is not required to grant, due to the Appellant Court’s HAA decision. The 6.04:1 FAR is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- Density Bonus – Here the allowed density bonus is 32, the project asks for 33 units (and also has set aside “recreation rooms” that seem intended to become ADUs, for a total prospective unit count of 41), with three units set aside for VLI/Very Low Income units. Staff’s Zoning Assessment notes that “15% of the total units need to be Very Low Income to qualify for the density bonus per 12.22A.25.” Therefore, five VLI units would have been required in order to qualify for the density bonus. And thus, the project is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- Setback (side) – the zoning requires a 10-foot setback, per “12.13.58.2,” but the project is requesting a 0-foot setback on both its north and south sides. The project is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.

- Setback (rear) – the zoning requires a 19-foot rear setback; the project is requesting a 5-foot rear setback. The project is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- Open Space – the zoning requires 2,960 square feet of open space, including 1,480.4 square feet of common open space. The project requests only 1,480.4 total open space (e.g. 50% of the requirement), with all of that being “private” open space and ZERO square feet devoted to common area open space. Therefore, the project is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- Passageway – 20 feet is required, 3 feet is what the project has requested. The project is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- CPIO requirements for commercial space – the CPIO mandates 17.5 feet of commercial frontage, the project requests only 10 feet; and the CPIO also mandates the ceiling height be 14 feet, but the project is designed for an only 10-foot ceiling in the (small) commercial space. Once again, the project is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.
- Landscape Buffer requirement in the CPIO – the CPIO requires a 5-foot landscape buffer; the project has a 0-foot landscape buffer – that is, ZERO landscaping. At the same time, the one remaining piece of landscaping – a mature camphor tree in the Right-of-Way parkway – will be removed to create the parking garage driveway on the north side of the new building. A zero-foot landscape buffer is inconsistent with objective standards and the actual C1.5-1VL-CPIO zoning.

Technically, the project requests two Off-Menu Incentives and nine waivers of objective standards, which the City is NOT required to grant since the majority of these relate to the zoning requirements and the project is clearly WILDLY not consistent.

>> Staff also argues in its Appeal Response that the project “supports the goals, objectives and policy of the Land Use Element of the General Plan by providing affordable housing.” No, it doesn’t. The project in fact REMOVES affordable housing, since the residence at 1848 S. Gramercy Place has been utilized as permanent supportive housing as a sober living home for at least two decades, housing more than 20 low-income residents. The project will not be providing the right of return to those soon-to-be evicted residents, nor will there be that number of beds in the new units set aside for low income residents. The project proposes to have only three VLI units (in lieu of the 5 required VLI units needed to even qualify for some of the requested incentives and waivers). At the CPC hearing there was a reference made to a Housing Department requirement that there also be one circa 3,400-square-foot, 4-bedroom replacement unit BUT no such unit appears on the submitted architectural plans.

>> As described above, the project demolishes a 1908 residence that has been IDENTIFIED AS A CONTRIBUTOR TO A HISTORIC DISTRICT in a Historic Resources Survey commissioned by the Planning Department and which is in the Department’s own files (and which had been provided to Appellants by the Office of Historic Resources in February 2018). The Historic Survey report was included in the case file and resubmitted every step of the way (despite the Planning Department’s statement that Appellant had not provided any evidence). I have attached it once again to this communication, and emphasize this is the Department’s own document.

>> **CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2(b)** provides that a project is not exempt where the **cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place over time is significant**. Appellants have noted that a component of the project is the demolition of the 1908 residence at 1848 S. Gramercy Place. There have been **CUMULATIVE DEMOLITIONS** of other nearby historical residences dating from c. 1903 to 1910, many designed by significant architects and erected by master builders.

These are all within the boundaries of Washington Boulevard on the south, Pico on the north, Manhattan Place on the east, and the east side of Arlington on the west (e.g., the neighborhood today called Angelus Vista). The previous demolitions include **1509 S. Gramercy Pl.**; **1537 S. Wilton Pl.**; **1839 S. Gramercy Pl.** (across from the Subject property); **1540 and 1546 S. St. Andrews Pl.**; and **1660 S. Arlington**, all of which were constructed between 1903 and 1910 and represent the remaining original homes. Since the time of our Appeal filing, two more residences (**1522 S. St. Andrews Place** and **1809 S. St. Andrews Place**) have been demolished. Several other homes from that era are facing demolition, including **1310 S. St. Andrews**, **1614 S. Gramercy Place**, and the **subject property at 1848 S. Gramercy Place**. So, as of this writing, the number has increased to 10 such demolitions.

Notably, Planning staff in their Appeal response dodged the topic of “Cumulative Impact” by ignoring that Appellants specifically referenced “demolitions,” instead creating a circumventing narrative that, *Number One*, staff needed only to evaluate the cumulative impact within 500 feet of the subject property and, *Number Two*, staff needed only to look at complete density bonus projects rather than demolitions. There is no CEQA guidance that would allow staff to create an alternative universe defining the only cumulative impact as being a “succession of known similar density bonus projects” rather than a succession of demolitions.

Ironically, one of the two projects that staff then cited was **1808 S. St. Andrews Place**, which while indeed being a TOC density bonus project is also in fact a 100% affordable permanent supportive housing project AND it retains the historic house on the site, incorporating it into the project; the 1808 S. St. Andrews Place project also respects the prevailing setbacks. In fact, the Appellant worked closely with the St. Andrews Place developer (Clifford Beers, now called HOLAS) to help get approvals of the project from community members as well as City departments, since it was an unusual project. (By the way, had the Applicant proposed a similar project on this site with 100% affordable housing and incorporating the existing historic residence, we would not be here today).

Staff in its Appeal Response also stated that the Appellant failed to support the claim that the neighborhood is being affected by multiple demolitions. Not true. Appellants have provided the list of addresses, which is only growing longer, at every step of the way (including above.) For more clarity, in 2018 approximately 145 of the parcels in the Angelus Vista neighborhood still contained original single family residences dating from the period of significance, circa 1903 to 1914, and now TEN of those are either already demolished or pending with approved demolition permits. That’s almost 7% of the total historical housing stock still remaining at the time of the adoption of the updated South Los Angeles Community Plan and its CPIOs which were designed, in part, to protect these properties. So for those of us who live in the community, there has been a dramatic cumulative effect.

>> The project does NOT enhance the character of the community. Although the word “character” is not particularly objective (different people may subjectively define a project’s character differently as it relates to a neighborhood), in this case because the project is not consistent with and does not meet multiple objective development standards, it cannot be defined by any objective observer as enhancing the existing built environment or specific character of this neighborhood – just as the CPC commissioners discussed when they felt forced to approve this project (*please see the transcript*).

>> The project 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). Staff seems to think the width of a passageway is merely “aesthetic” in nature. The Appellants think that when an 8-story building needs to be quickly and safely evacuated in the case of disaster (fire, earthquake), three feet is insufficient to accommodate either the occupants who need to escape nor, especially, the first responders who need to safely traverse the entire building and its eight floors to make sure everyone is safe and can exit the building. Three feet is not even the width of your outspread arms; just imagine fire fighters carrying their gear.

>> The proposed building’s above-ground parking levels are vented directly toward the multi-family building located directly to the north, with only a 5-foot separation (and that five feet is on the adjacent residence’s own property; this project has a 0-foot setback at the parking garage level). 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!)

>> The proposed building’s above-ground parking levels also will create noise from cars coming and going that directly impacts the same adjacent residential property. This noise impact was not evaluated in the new Noise Study submitted by the Applicant.

>> The project’s complete lack of landscaping, and its removal of the mature ROW street tree for its driveway onto Gramercy Place, is another significant adverse 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. This way, perhaps we can have a project that enhances our community, provides equitable housing to our neighbors, provides a mitigation regarding a historic resource, retains a mature tree and provides enhanced landscaping, does not spew toxic fumes toward its neighbors, and is more compatible and consistent with the City’s local zoning and general plan.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Laura Meyers

D R A F T

Historic Studies Section

Community Plan Revision Program

Historic Resources Final Report
for the
South Central Los Angeles
District Plan Area

Work Product 5D

June 21, 1996

Prepared For:

The City of Los Angeles
Department of Planning

Prepared By:

Richard Starzak
MYRA L. FRANK & ASSOCIATES, INC.

in conjunction with:

Leslie Heumann
LESLIE HEUMANN & ASSOCIATES

and:

THE LOS ANGELES CONSERVANCY

SOUTH CENTRAL LOS ANGELES DISTRICT PLAN -- LIST OF POTENTIAL HISTORIC RESOURCES

LOCATION OF RESOURCE	HISTORIC NAME	YEAR BUILT	EVALUATION	DESCRIPTION	ARCHITECT/ BUILDER	SOURCE AND/ OR SIGNIFICANCE	PHOTO NO. & DATE
1645 S GRAMERCY PL		1906 C.	eD	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE/ CLASSICAL BOX, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-14 05/15/1995
1651-1653 S GRAMERCY PL		1908	eD	CRAFTSMAN/ TUDOR REVIVAL, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-13 05/15/1995
1657 S GRAMERCY PL		1904 C.	c/eD	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE/ CRAFTSMAN/ QUEEN ANNE, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-12 05/15/1995
1815 S GRAMERCY PL		1908	eD	CRAFTSMAN/ TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-21 05/15/1995
1818 S GRAMERCY PL		1904	eD	CRAFTSMAN/ TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-05 05/15/1995
1828 S GRAMERCY PL		1907 C.	eD	CRAFTSMAN/ FOLK VICTORIAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-06 05/15/1995
1829 S GRAMERCY PL		1908	eD	CRAFTSMAN/ TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-11 05/15/1995
1829 S GRAMERCY PL		1908	eD	CRAFTSMAN/ CLIPPED GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-20 05/15/1995
1834 S GRAMERCY PL		1905	eD	SHINGLE/ CRAFTSMAN/ CLEFT GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-07 05/15/1995
1834 S GRAMERCY PL		1905	eD	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-18 05/15/1995
1835 S GRAMERCY PL		1909	c/eD	CRAFTSMAN/ TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-10 05/15/1995
1839 S GRAMERCY PL		1906	eD	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-09 05/15/1995
1848 S GRAMERCY PL	Subject Property	1905 C.	eD	CRAFTSMAN/ TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-08 05/15/1995
1849 S GRAMERCY PL		1906 C.	eD	SHINGLE/ CRAFTSMAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD	067-19 05/15/1995
2223 S GRAMERCY PL		1908	e/cD	CRAFTSMAN/ TUDOR REVIVAL, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE SUGAR HILL SHINGLE AND CRAFTSMAN DISTRICT SITUS ADDRESS A.K.A. 2219 S. GRAMERCY PLACE	065-09 05/09/1995
2229 S GRAMERCY PL		1908	cD	SHINGLE/ CRAFTSMAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE SUGAR HILL SHINGLE AND CRAFTSMAN DISTRICT	065-08 05/09/1995
2301 S GRAMERCY PL		1905	cD	SHINGLE/ CRAFTSMAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE		LADOP 1995 SURVEY PART OF THE SUGAR HILL SHINGLE AND CRAFTSMAN DISTRICT	064-17 05/09/1995

SOUTH CENTRAL LOS ANGELES DISTRICT PLAN AREA

HISTORIC RESOURCES PHOTOGRAPHS -- PLATE 67

Subject
Property

Photo No.	Photo Date	Location of Resource	Historic or Common Name or Description
067-01	05/15/1995	1609 S WILTON PL	SHINGLE/CRAFTSMAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-02	05/15/1995	1614 S GRAMERCY PL	SHINGLE/CRAFTSMAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-03	05/15/1995	1618 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/CENTER GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-04	05/15/1995	1624 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/SIDE GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-05	05/15/1995	1818 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-06	05/15/1995	1828 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/FOLK VICTORIAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-07	05/15/1995	1834 S GRAMERCY PL	SHINGLE/CRAFTSMAN/CLEFT GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-08	05/15/1995	1848 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-09	05/15/1995	1839 S GRAMERCY PL	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-10	05/15/1995	1835 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-11	05/15/1995	1829 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-12	05/15/1995	1657 S GRAMERCY PL	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE/CRAFTSMAN/QUEEN ANNE, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-13	05/15/1995	1651-1653 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-14	05/15/1995	1645 S GRAMERCY PL	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE/CLASSICAL BOX, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-15	05/15/1995	1808 SAINT ANDREWS PL	CRAFTSMAN/FRONT GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-16	05/15/1995	1814 SAINT ANDREWS PL	CRAFTSMAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-17	05/15/1995	1824 SAINT ANDREWS PL	CRAFTSMAN/SIDE GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-18	05/15/1995	1834 S GRAMERCY PL	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-19	05/15/1995	1849 S GRAMERCY PL	SHINGLE/CRAFTSMAN, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-20	05/15/1995	1829 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/CLIPPED GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-21	05/15/1995	1815 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-22	05/15/1995	1639 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/FLARED ROOF, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-23	05/15/1995	1615 S GRAMERCY PL	CRAFTSMAN/SIDE GABLE, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-24	05/15/1995	1828 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/FRONT GABLE, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-25	05/15/1995	1838-1840 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/SIDE GABLE, 1 1/2-STORY DUPLEX
067-26	05/15/1995	1831 S MANHATTAN PL	AMERICAN FOURSQUARE/CLASSICAL BOX, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-27	05/15/1995	1829 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-28	05/15/1995	1825 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/SIDE GABLE, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-29	05/15/1995	1326 S MANHATTAN PL	SHINGLE/CRAFTSMAN/ASHLAR MASONRY, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-30	05/15/1995	1400 S MANHATTAN PL	MISSION REVIVAL/COLONIAL REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-31	05/15/1995	1404 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-32	05/15/1995	1510 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/ASHLAR MASONRY, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-33	05/15/1995	1555 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-34	05/15/1995	1547 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/TUDOR REVIVAL, 2-STORY RESIDENCE
067-35	05/15/1995	1533 S MANHATTAN PL	CRAFTSMAN/CLASSICAL REVIVAL INFLUENCE, 2 1/2-STORY RESIDENCE

South Central District Plan Area

Date: 05/15/95

Roll: 067



LEVEL 5 IS LISTED OR APPEARS ELIGIBLE FOR LISTING UNDER A LOCAL
LANDMARK ORDINANCE

- 5 Is listed under a local landmark ordinance.
- 5P Appears eligible for listing under a local landmark ordinance as a result of a previous survey, and/or a visual analysis substantiated by research.
- e Appears eligible for listing under a local landmark ordinance as a result of a visual analysis only.
- 5D Is listed as a contributor to a locally designated historic district or preservation area.
- 5PD Appears eligible for listing as a contributor to a potential locally designated historic district or preservation area as a result of a previous survey, and/or a visual analysis substantiated by research. In a thematic group, this evaluation is meant to define that the resource was previously evaluated, although not necessarily as part of the thematic group established as a result of the LADOP 1991 Survey.
- eD Appears eligible for listing as a contributor to a potential locally designated historic district or preservation area as a result of a visual analysis only. In the case of a thematic group, this evaluation indicates that the resource had not been previously evaluated in any known documentation.

Los Angeles Planning Department, Historic Studies Section
Community Plan Revision Program
"List of Potentially Significant Historic Resources for the
South Central Los Angeles District Plan Area,"
June 21, 1996

Authors: Richard Starzak, MYRA L. FRANK & ASSOCIATES, INC.,
in conjunction with:
Leslie Heumann, LESLIE HEUMANN & ASSOCIATES

THE 18TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD
(AKA Angelus Vista + Angelus Vista #2 tracts)

The 81 buildings that are part of the 18th Street Neighborhood were all constructed from 1904 to 1917. 89% of the buildings are 2 stories in height while 9% of the buildings are 1 story in height. Of the architectural styles represented: 19% are Craftsman; 14% are Craftsman/Tudor Revival; 11% are Shingle/Craftsman; 10% are Craftsman/Side Gable; 6% are Craftsman/Folk Victorian; 5% are American Foursquare; 4% are Shingle; 1% are Craftsman/Oriental Influence; 1% are Mediterranean Revival/Moorish; 1% are Craftsman/Shingle; 4% are Craftsman/Flared Roof; 1% are Craftsman Shed Dormer; 2% are American Foursquare/Classical Revival; 1% are Shingle/Classical Revival; 5% are Craftsman/Cross Gable; 1% are Craftsman/Arroyo Stone; 1% are Craftsman/Ashlar Masonry; 1% are Shingle/Craftsman W/Arroyo Stone Details; 1% are Colonial Revival; 1% are Craftsman/Center Gable.

Address ranges:

1619-1839 S VAN NESS AVE

1625-1841 CIMARRON ST

1609-1847 S WILTON PL

1614-1849 S GRAMERCY PL¹ See footnote below, includes 1848 S. Gramercy Place

1808-1824 SAINT ANDREWS PL

1825-1838 S MANHATTAN PL

1996 general description:

Each district, cluster, or neighborhood has been selected on the basis of some consistent theme or unifying features, whether it be style of architecture, period of construction, or even scale. Several important criteria are used to determine qualification as a type of district, namely: the group should exhibit architectural quality and integrity, that is, lack intrusions of non-compatible structures and significant alterations; the group should exhibit an overall quality of design, preferably anchored by exceptional individual examples; the group should have definable geographic boundaries; and the character and quality of the group should be significant relative not only to the immediate area, but also to the overall City of Los Angeles.... A cluster is a small group of structures, usually less than 10. A district represents a larger area, often exceeding the length of a block. A neighborhood may be much larger in size and less dense than a district, usually because many structures which have become isolated are still significant examples of style, but probably would not otherwise qualify for individual monument status.

¹ Includes 1848 S. Gramercy Place, identified as a Contributor and described as a Craftsman-Tudor. See spreadsheet.