

Communication from Public

Name: Anthony

Date Submitted: 11/15/2024 02:03 PM

Council File No: 24-0826

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, my name is Anthony. I am a resident of the area, and yesterday I submitted a comment regarding this council file. However I would like to amend that original comment, as I AM NOW FULLY OPPOSED to this property being granted the right to sell alcohol in ANY CAPACITY. If you search for this council file on the LA City Clerk website, there's a document titled "Attachment to Report dated 7-09-24 - Appeal - S Panosian" which is dated 7-9-24. I wasn't aware of this, but an individual named Seta Panosian filed an appeal regarding this building owner's application to sell alcoholic beverages, which was approved by a non-elected decision-making body. I highly recommend anybody who is interested in this situation read through it, as it thoroughly reinforces something I mentioned in my previous comment: that these building owners have been extremely negligent and dishonest throughout every step of this process, and they have behaved in a manner which suggests that they expect neighbors to put up with them no matter what they do - all at the expense of public safety and well-being. The appeal provides substantial evidence that the building owners have intentionally misled city officials, as well as the public, regarding the true intentions of their project. They have consistently skirted city regulations in order to accomplish their goals; their original stated intention was to use the property for medical offices, but over the course of 10 years they have transformed these "medical offices" into upscale apartments selling a full line of alcoholic beverages. In the process, they have evaded zoning regulations again and again. They have also refused to take the neighboring area into account, including the public elementary school that they knew was right next to their property long before this project began. This quote from the 7-9-24 appeal is key: "Under the existing zoning, the C-2 zoned parcels restricted the applicant to a one-story structure on half of the lot with a maximum of 14,947 sq. ft. of commercial space, and on the RD1.5-1XL parcels the zoning restricts development to a 2-story, 10-unit residential building. Yet what the zoning permitted is a far cry from what has been constructed. Instead, the applicant has at every turn gamed the system and developed a 5-story, 52-unit mixed-use project with 2 approximately 33,000 of commercial space. At 60 feet in height, the project is the tallest structure facing Santa

Monica Blvd. for two miles, with a minimal setback of 5 feet from Kingsley Elementary School's playfield. Additionally, all prior environmental analysis and approvals and public hearings reviewed the project's commercial space as medical offices, not restaurants and bars with a full line of alcohol." Additionally, the building owners have repeatedly scaled down the number of affordable housing units on the property, despite city requirements. And as previously mentioned, they have been consistently rude and hostile when interacting with the public regarding this project. All of this is in conjunction with a point I made in my previous comment, which is that the owners have been so inexcusably negligent that they even signed off on their building being affixed with rooftop showers - which were fully exposed to the Kingsley Elementary School students and campus. Based on all of this evidence, I have no reason to believe that the building owners will honor any of the conditions set upon them. I do not have any faith in their ability to keep the area secure, or in their desire to do what is best for the community. Given the fact that the property is right next to an elementary school, their negligence is incredibly reckless and dangerous. As a reminder, they were initially requesting approval to sell onsite AND offsite alcohol, every school day, from 6AM-2AM, regardless of the concerns brought up by neighbors, parents, etc. With all of that said, I would like to state for the record that I **STRONGLY SUPPORT THE 7-9-24 APPEAL**, and I too request that **THE BUILDING'S RIGHT TO SERVE ALCOHOL BE FULLY DENIED**, as it initially was in 2022 by an LA zoning administrator. The individual who filed the appeal is not alone, and their objections are in lockstep with the Kingsley Elementary School principal, staff, over 100 parents of students, several LAPD officers, concerned neighbors, etc. These irresponsible building owners do not have the right to violate city regulations as well as public trust, yet they have chosen to do so again and again. Their dishonesty and negligence should not be rewarded in any capacity, and any additional rules should not be bent to their advantage. They should be facing more scrutiny, not less. Thank you.