

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

MONIQUE LAWSHE  
PRESIDENT  
MICHAEL R. NEWHOUSE  
VICE-PRESIDENT  
MARIA CABILDO  
CAROLINE CHOE  
MARTINA DIAZ  
PHYLLIS KLEIN  
KAREN MACK  
JACOB SAITMAN  
ELIZABETH ZAMORA

CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CALIFORNIA



KAREN BASS  
MAYOR

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP  
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

April 17, 2025

Los Angeles City Council  
c/o Office of the City Clerk  
City Hall, Room 395  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attention: PLUM Committee

Dear Honorable Members

**APPEAL SUMMARY AND STAFF RESPONSE FOR THE PROJECT LOCATED AT 6266 – 6290 Sunset Boulevard, 1460 – 1480 Vine Street and 6251 – 6267 Leland Way; Case No. CPC-2021-10588-DB-MCUP-SPR-VHCA; CF 25-0209**

**Project Background**

On January 22, 2025, the City Planning Commission approved a Density Bonus, Main Conditional Use and Site Plan Review for the demolition of four (4) commercial buildings and a vacant duplex and the construction of a new 201,134 square-foot, eight-story mixed-use building consisting of 170 residential units with 26 units set aside for Very Low Income Households and an additional eight (8) units set aside for Low Income Households. The proposed building will contain 16,680 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. Additionally, the project proposed to retain the existing 19-story tower located at the corner of Vine Street and Sunset Boulevard and a two-story commercial building (Morgan Camera Shop building). The project would provide a total 284 new parking spaces within two (2) screened above grade parking levels and two (2) subterranean levels and 24,997 square feet of open space.

On January 29, 2025, the Site Plan Review, Main Conditional Use and Density On-Menu Incentive was appealed under Case No. CPC-2021-10588-DB-MCUP-SPR-VHCA-1A by Lozeau Drury LLP on behalf of the Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER). For the subject appeal, Planning staff has compiled the appeal points from the Appellant's Justification for Appeals. Staff has responded to the appeal points below.

**Appeal Summary**

The following appeal statements have been compiled and summarized from the appeal justification submitted on January 29, 2025, by the appellant and responded below:

### **Appeal Summary:**

The appellant claims that the City may not rely on the SCEA for the following reasons: the Project is inconsistent with the General Plan's zoning designations, the project is inconsistent with the 2020 and 2024 Connect SoCal Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) specially regarding EV Charging and Solar and the SCEA fails to comply with CEQA because it fails to incorporate "all feasible mitigation measures, performance standards, or criteria set forth in the prior applicable environmental impact reports." The appellant also contends that a project-level CEQA review is required for impacts that were not mitigated to a less-than-significant level in the 2020 and 2024 SCS environmental impact reports ("EIRs").

### **Staff Response:**

As detailed in the Los Angeles City Planning Commission Letter of Determination dated January 22, 2025, the subject property is zoned C4-2D-SN, [Q]C4-2D-SN and R4-2D with a Regional Center Commercial land use designation. The Regional Center Commercial land use designation permits residential and commercial uses. The C4-2D-SN zone limits the Project's density to one (1) dwelling unit per 200 square feet of lot area with a maximum FAR of 2:1 (per "D" Limitation), the [Q]C4-2D-SN zone limits the Project's density to one (1) dwelling unit per 200 feet of lot area with a maximum FAR of 2.3:1 (per "D" Limitation) and the R4-2D limits the density to one (1) dwelling unit per 400 square feet of lot area with a maximum FAR of 2:1 (per "D" Limitation). Therefore, with 32,628 square feet of lot area in the [Q]C4-2D-SN zone, 22,889 square feet of lot area in the C4-2D-SN zone and 13,632 square feet of lot area in the R4-2D zone, the subject property has a total base density of 347 dwelling units. Thus, pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22-A.25, the applicant sought (and was granted) an Off-Menu incentive to allow a FAR increase from 2:3 to 3.88:1 to allow 284,909 square feet in floor area. As such, the granting of a density bonus incentive allowed the City to find the Project consistent with the General Plan.

Additionally, SAFER claims the project is inconsistent with the 2020 and 2024 Connect SoCal Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) because the Project fails to implement mitigation measures and performance standards in the SCS related to electric vehicle (EV) Charging and Solar Energy. SAFER does not identify any SCS mitigation measure or performance standard for EV Charging as there is no such requirement. However, the project meets the CALGREEN 2022 requirements and will comply with the City's EV charging station requirements, California Building Code Title 24 requirements, and the California Energy Code regulations. Regarding solar, SAFER claims the project does not identify ways to incorporate solar energy. However, the project would include the provision of a conduit that is appropriate for future photovoltaic and solar thermal collectors and would allocate roof area for future solar panels. As such, SAFER does not provide sufficient evidence proving that the proposed project does not comply with SCEA requirements, and their claims are found without merit.

Furthermore, the City Planning Commission determined that there was no substantial evidence of any insufficiencies in the SCEA and that all of the project's potential environmental impacts have been appropriately analyzed, with the conclusion that the project will not have any significant impacts with the incorporation of certain mitigation measures. More detailed responses to the appellant's comments are provided in detail by the applicant's environmental consultant in correspondence included in the Council File.

In summary, the appeal do not provide any substantial evidence of any significant environmental

impacts or improper approvals of the project. Planning has evaluated the proposed project and determined that the SCEA appropriately analyzes the project's environmental impacts under CEQA and that no further analysis is necessary. Therefore, Planning recommends that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee deny the appeals and sustain the City Planning Commission's decision to approve the project, as well as adopt the SCEA as the project's environmental clearance.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP  
Director of Planning

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Heather Bleemers', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Heather Bleemers  
Senior City Planner