

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

MONIQUE LAWSHE
PRESIDENT

ELIZABETH ZAMORA
VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIA CABILDO
CAROLINE CHOE
MARTINA DIAZ
PHYLLIS KLEIN
KAREN MACK
MICHAEL R. NEWHOUSE
JACOB SAIMAN

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



KAREN BASS
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

September 17, 2024

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:

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT REGARDING APPEAL OF CASE NO. ENV-2022-7886-CE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 957-967 SOUTH ARAPAHOE STREET WITHIN THE WILSHIRE COMMUNITY PLAN AREA (CF 24-0333)

The project involves the demolition of a two-story single-family dwelling and a two-story 4-unit apartment building, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new five-story residential building, 60 feet in height, containing a total of 109 dwelling units with 15 units reserved for Very Low Income Households, and one (1) dwelling unit reserved for Extremely Low Income Households. The proposed development will contain 66,040 square feet of floor area, equating to a total floor area ratio (FAR) of approximately 3.46:1. The project will provide a total of 11,150 square feet of open space that consists of private balconies, a fitness center, courtyard, multipurpose room, and roof decks. The project will have one (1) subterranean level that will contain a total of 57 vehicle parking stalls. The project will provide a total of 88 bicycle parking stalls including, 80 long-term, and eight (8) short-term parking stalls.

The Director of Planning approved the project on September 7, 2023. Subsequently, the Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) appealed the Director of Planning's determination to the City Planning Commission. At its meeting of January 25, 2024, the Los Angeles City Planning Commission denied the appeal and upheld the Director of Planning's approval of the project. The City Planning Commission found that the appellant's appeal justification, which primarily concerned potential environmental impacts, did not provide any substantial evidence of any deficiencies in the project's environmental clearance or error in the Director of Planning's determination.

Following the City Planning Commission's denial of the first appeal, SAFER appealed the project's environmental clearance, a Class 32 Categorical Exemption. For the appeal herein, the appellant submitted the same comments that were previously submitted to and evaluated by the City Planning Commission. The appellant's representative, Lozeau Drury, LLP provided a comment letter dated January 11, 2024, which argued that the project would result in significant air quality impacts as a result of emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) as well as significant formaldehyde exposure due to the use of various building materials. Responses to the appellant's

comments are provided in detail by the applicant's environmental consultant, Yorke Engineering, LLC, in correspondence previously submitted to the City Planning Commission and also included in the subject council file.

The appellant contends that the City improperly approved the Site Plan Review request for the project because the project does not qualify for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption and thus was not properly analyzed under CEQA. The appellant specifically states that the project does not qualify for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption because the project will have significant air quality impacts. However, the project's environmental impacts were fully analyzed in the Categorical Exemption document dated May 2023. As noted in this analysis and the supporting technical data in the Appendices, the project will not exceed any air quality thresholds of significance for construction or operation.

Furthermore, as demonstrated in the Justification for the Class 32 Categorical Exemption, the proposed project is subject to Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs) related to air quality, noise, hazardous materials, geology, and transportation. Numerous RCMs in the City's Municipal Code and State law provide requirements for construction activities and ensure impacts from construction related air quality, noise, traffic, and parking are less than significant. For example, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has District Rules related to dust control during construction, type and emission of construction vehicles, architectural coating, and air pollution. All projects are subject to the City's Noise Ordinance No. 144,331, which regulates construction equipment and maximum noise levels during construction and operation.

The Class 32 Categorical Exemption (CE) and associated justification analysis address all environmental impacts related to traffic, noise, air quality or water quality and cumulative impacts. Additionally, the project will be required to comply with all state, regional, and local laws as part of regulatory compliance. Therefore, the CE adequately addresses all impacts relative to the proposed project at 957-967 South Arapahoe Street and additional analysis is not warranted.

In summary, the appeal does not provide any substantial evidence of any significant environmental impacts. Planning has evaluated the proposed project and determined that it qualifies for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption under CEQA. Therefore, Planning recommends that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee deny the appeal and sustain the City Planning Commission's decision.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Director of Planning

Trevor Martin

TREVOR MARTIN
City Planner