

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Eghbali
Date Submitted: 05/12/2025 05:18 PM
Council File No: 25-0499
Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached letter.

Michael Eghbali
7119 SUNSET BLVD., #380
L.A., CA 90046
323-816-6928
sleenterprisesinc@gmail.com

- I urge you to support the project and uphold the original decision made by the City Planning Commission and by the City Planning Department, which was to approve the project.

- We are a standard TOC Project; we are sticking to the Menu of Incentives allowed. The Guidelines are very black and white. So long as a project provides the requisite amount of affordable set-aside units, then the city is mandated to approve certain incentives and concessions. In this particular case, we are only required to have an 11% Extremely Low-Income set-aside, which yields to 3 units.

- However, per our Senate Bill 8 (“SB 8”) Replacement Unit Determination (“RUD”), we were required to replace 4 units as affordable housing. As such, the project already exceeds the affordable set-aside needed to satisfy TOC Guidelines, and is providing 1 additional affordable unit to satisfy SB 8 replacement requirements. Therefore, the project would provide 19 units, 4 of which would be affordable.

- It makes no Zoning or Planning sense to deny a 19-unit project, with 4 affordable housing units, because of 2 existing dwelling units and/or 2 existing tenancies.

- We have followed the proper channels with LAHD to ensure that our Ellis Act filing was adequate for LAHD submission. We provided each tenant with the relocation amount required based on their tenancies. LAHD even sends out 3rd party contractors to ensure that the proper relocation amounts are provided given each individuals background and tenancy.

- At one point, one of the tenants appealed LAHD’s determination on relocation amount. An LAHD General Manager’s Hearing was held to discuss the appeal, to which the tenant/appellant never attended the Hearing, and it further deemed by LAHD the that proper relocation amount was provided.

- Given the circumstances of where we are, the Applicant would be willing to consider granting an additional 6-month extension. Further, the Applicant would be willing to allow the tenant(s) to continue occupying the units up until 6 months of demolition, consistent with Senate Bill 8. Lastly, the Applicant would be willing to dismiss the ongoing unlawful detainer case(s) with the existing tenant(s). However, these items would need to be granted in exchange for the City Councils’ support to approve the project, deny the appeal, and deny the ongoing motion pertaining to Section 245.

- Again, we have checked all our boxes properly all along the way, and we respectfully ask for a “No” vote on this Section 245 action/motion.