



APPLICATIONS:

APPEAL APPLICATION

Instructions and Checklist

Related Code Section: Refer to the City Planning case determination to identify the Zone Code section for the entitlement and the appeal procedure.

Purpose: This application is for the appeal of Department of City Planning determinations authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

A. APPELLATE BODY/CASE INFORMATION

1. APPELLATE BODY

- Area Planning Commission
 City Planning Commission
 City Council
 Director of Planning
 Zoning Administrator

Regarding Case Number: CPC-2020-495-ZV-CU-SPR

Project Address: 1608-1636 West.Pico Boulevard;1321-1331 South Union Avenue

Final Date to Appeal: 12/23/2020

2. APPELLANT

Appellant Identity:
(check all that apply)

- Representative
 Property Owner
 Applicant
 Operator of the Use/Site

Person, other than the Applicant, Owner or Operator claiming to be aggrieved

Person affected by the determination made by the **Department of Building and Safety**

- Representative
 Owner
 Aggrieved Party
 Applicant
 Operator

3. APPELLANT INFORMATION

Appellant's Name: Aurora Corona

Company/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: 1354 Constance Street

City: Los Angeles State: California Zip: 90015

Telephone: (213) 793-1502 E-mail: PINKIEDEE007@yahoo.com

a. Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on behalf of another party, organization or company?

Self Other: _____

b. Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position? Yes No

4. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION

Representative/Agent name (if applicable): _____

Company: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Telephone: _____ E-mail: _____

5. JUSTIFICATION/REASON FOR APPEAL

a. Is the entire decision, or only parts of it being appealed? Entire Part

b. Are specific conditions of approval being appealed? Yes No

If Yes, list the condition number(s) here: _____

Attach a separate sheet providing your reasons for the appeal. Your reason must state:

- The reason for the appeal
- How you are aggrieved by the decision
- Specifically the points at issue
- Why you believe the decision-maker erred or abused their discretion

6. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

I certify that the statements contained in this application are complete and true:

Appellant Signature: *[Signature]*

Date: 12/17/20

GENERAL APPEAL FILING REQUIREMENTS

B. ALL CASES REQUIRE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS - SEE THE ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC CASE TYPES

1. Appeal Documents

a. **Three (3) sets** - The following documents are required for each appeal filed (1 original and 2 duplicates) Each case being appealed is required to provide three (3) sets of the listed documents.

- Appeal Application (form CP-7769)
- Justification/Reason for Appeal
- Copies of Original Determination Letter

b. Electronic Copy

Provide an electronic copy of your appeal documents on a flash drive (planning staff will upload materials during filing and return the flash drive to you) or a CD (which will remain in the file). The following items must be saved as individual PDFs and labeled accordingly (e.g. "Appeal Form.pdf", "Justification/Reason Statement.pdf", or "Original Determination Letter.pdf" etc.). No file should exceed 9.8 MB in size.

c. Appeal Fee

- Original Applicant - A fee equal to 85% of the original application fee, provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) to calculate the fee per LAMC Section 19.01B 1.
- Aggrieved Party - The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01B 1.

d. Notice Requirement

- Mailing List - All appeals require noticing per the applicable LAMC section(s). Original Applicants must provide noticing per the LAMC
- Mailing Fee - The appeal notice mailing fee is paid by the project applicant, payment is made to the City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC), a copy of the receipt must be submitted as proof of payment.

SPECIFIC CASE TYPES - APPEAL FILING INFORMATION

C. DENSITY BONUS / TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITIES (TOC)

1. Density Bonus/TOC

Appeal procedures for Density Bonus/TOC per LAMC Section 12.22.A 25 (g) f.

NOTE:

- Density Bonus/TOC cases, only the *on menu* or *additional incentives* items can be appealed.
- Appeals of Density Bonus/TOC cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants (must have documentation), and always only appealable to the Citywide Planning Commission.

- Provide documentation to confirm adjacent owner or tenant status, i.e., a lease agreement, rent receipt, utility bill, property tax bill, ZIMAS, drivers license, bill statement etc.

D. WAIVER OF DEDICATION AND OR IMPROVEMENT

Appeal procedure for Waiver of Dedication or Improvement per LAMC Section 12.37 I.

NOTE:

- Waivers for By-Right Projects, can only be appealed by the owner.
- When a Waiver is on appeal and is part of a master land use application request or subdivider's statement for a project, the applicant may appeal pursuant to the procedures that governs the entitlement.

E. TENTATIVE TRACT/VESTING

1. Tentative Tract/Vesting - Appeal procedure for Tentative Tract / Vesting application per LAMC Section 17.54 A.

NOTE: Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract (TT or VTT) by the Area or City Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of said Commission.

- Provide a copy of the written determination letter from Commission.

F. BUILDING AND SAFETY DETERMINATION

- 1. Appeal of the Department of Building and Safety determination, per LAMC 12.26 K 1, an appellant is considered the **Original Applicant** and must provide noticing and pay mailing fees.**

a. Appeal Fee

- Original Applicant - The fee charged shall be in accordance with LAMC Section 19.01B 2, as stated in the Building and Safety determination letter, plus all surcharges. (the fee specified in Table 4-A, Section 98.0403.2 of the City of Los Angeles Building Code)

b. Notice Requirement

- Mailing Fee - The applicant must pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of receipt as proof of payment.

- 2. Appeal of the Director of City Planning determination per LAMC Section 12.26 K 6, an applicant or any other aggrieved person may file an appeal, and is appealable to the Area Planning Commission or Citywide Planning Commission as noted in the determination.**

a. Appeal Fee

- Original Applicant - The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B 1 a.

b. Notice Requirement

- Mailing List - The appeal notification requirements per LAMC Section 12.26 K 7 apply.
- Mailing Fees - The appeal notice mailing fee is made to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC), a copy of receipt must be submitted as proof of payment.

G. NUISANCE ABATEMENT

1. Nuisance Abatement - Appeal procedure for Nuisance Abatement per LAMC Section 12.27.1 C 4

NOTE:

- Nuisance Abatement is only appealable to the City Council.

a. Appeal Fee

Aggrieved Party the fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B 1.

2. Plan Approval/Compliance Review

Appeal procedure for Nuisance Abatement Plan Approval/Compliance Review per LAMC Section 12.27.1 C 4.

a. Appeal Fee

Compliance Review - The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B.

Modification - The fee shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B.

NOTES

A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an individual on behalf of self.

Please note that the appellate body must act on your appeal within a time period specified in the Section(s) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) pertaining to the type of appeal being filed. The Department of City Planning will make its best efforts to have appeals scheduled prior to the appellate body's last day to act in order to provide due process to the appellant. If the appellate body is unable to come to a consensus or is unable to hear and consider the appeal prior to the last day to act, the appeal is automatically deemed denied, and the original decision will stand. The last day to act as defined in the LAMC may only be extended if formally agreed upon by the applicant.

This Section for City Planning Staff Use Only		
Base Fee: \$89	Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner): Ruben Vasquez	Date: 12/18/20
Receipt No:	Deemed Complete by (Project Planner):	Date:
<input type="checkbox"/> Determination authority notified		<input type="checkbox"/> Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)

Los Angeles Dept of Building and Safety
 201 N. Figueroa St., 4th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

City of Los Angeles
 Department of City Planning



Scan this QR Code® with a barcode reading app on your Smartphone. Bookmark page for future reference.



Reference Number: 2020353001-54
 Date/Time: 12/18/2020 11:06:08 AM PST

User ID: hhoun

City Planning Request

ent will analyze your request and accord the same full and impartial consideration to of whether or not you obtain the services of anyone to represent you.

g fee is required by Chapter 1, Article 9, L.A.M.C.

se contact the planner assigned to this case. To identify the assigned planner, please ining.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/ and enter the Case Number.

unless the payment is received prior to 4:30PM on the last day of the appeal period.

12)	

	Fee	%	Charged Fee
Original Applicant *	\$89.00	100%	\$89.00
Case Total			\$89.00

	Charged Fee
	\$89.00
	\$0.00
	\$89.00
	\$0.00
3%)	\$2.67
Charge (6%)	\$5.34
	\$6.23
	\$6.23
	\$109.47
	\$109.47
Total Overpayment Amount	\$0.00
Total Paid (this amount must equal the sum of all checks)	\$109.47

Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety
 Metro 4th Floor 12/18/2020 11:06:08 AM
 User ID: hhoun
 Receipt Ref Nbr: 2020353001-54
 Transaction ID: 2020353001-54-1
 Operating Surcharge \$6.23
 General Plan Maintenance Surcharge \$6.23
 City Planning Systems Development Surcharge \$5.34
 Appeal by Aggrieved Parties Other than the Original \$89.00
 Development Services Center Surcharge \$2.67
 Amount Paid: \$109.47

DEPT OF CITY PLANNING - PCTS
 2020353001-54-1
 DEPT OF CITY PLANNING - PCTS DOC INFO
 Document Number: 6800169007
 Operating Surcharge \$6.23
 General Plan Maintenance Surc \$6.23
 City Planning Systems Develop \$5.34
 Appeal by Aggrieved Parties \$89.00
 Development Services Center S \$2.67
 Amount: \$109.47
 Total: \$109.47
 1 ITEM TOTAL: \$109.47
 TOTAL: \$109.47
 ICL Check \$109.47
 Method:
 Check Number: 0602
 Total Received: \$109.47



Total Overpayment Amount	\$0.00
Total Paid (this amount must equal the sum of all checks)	\$109.47

Council District: 1
 Plan Area: Westlake
 Processed by VASQUEZ, RUBEN on 12/18/2020

Signature: Ruben Vasquez

Los Angeles City Hall
Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

December 9, 2020

Honorable City Council Members,

Re: **Case No. CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU- SPR**

Elementary Schools at 1608-1636 West Pico Blvd., 1321 – 1331 South Union Avenue

I am appealing the approval decision of this project by the City Planning Commission. It is apparent that the Commission did not fully review this case file, and it did not give adequate weight to facts pointed out by opposing individuals who live within the 500 feet radius, and who are cognizant of the problems and issues in their community.

- These individuals pointed out deficiencies in Equitas traffic plan, and they were dismissed with no resolution.
- *In addition, more credence was given to individuals outside the perimeter, namely parents of students, students, teachers, and alumni because they outnumbered the opposing parties during all meetings and hearings. This was largely due to little to no community outreach by Equitas and the City Planning Commission's Public Hearing notices.*

I will address these key issues and why the entire process was unfair.

BLOCKING PRIVATE PARKING LOTS: The Commission did not give any consideration to the property owner and tenants of the Doria Apartments and the business owners from Pico Medica Clinica Latina and Imperial Liquor Store, who objected to Equitas' traffic circulation plan which will block their private alley parking lots, and thus, interfere with customer parking, delivery and pick-up services, trash collections and their ability to enter and exit their lot freely. In addition, the alley is narrow. Therefore, trying to maneuver a vehicle and in out with the assistance of traffic monitors as proposed by Equitas, is ridiculous. It poses a danger to all. **See Exhibit 1-4**

- Blocking access to private parking lots is as severe inconvenience, and moreover, a violation. If not a traffic one, but it violates the people's freedom to access to their own lots. The fact that Equitas' is forcing people to adjust their schedules to accommodate their operation is immoral and unacceptable. So, for the Commission to allow this for the school's operational benefit is unconscionable.
- Would anyone want their driveways or parking lots blocked? The obvious answer is no.
- A petition against blockage of private parking lots by of owners and tenants from 1600,1602,1604 West Pico Boulevard was submitted to City Commission and City Council. **See Exhibit 5.**

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT: The Commission ignored the request by residents who live on Constance Street to impose the same or similar Conditional Use Permit which now applies to the 1700 W. Pico location which has 462 students to the 1608-1636 W. Pico Blvd and 1321-1331 S. Union location which will house 1000 students

100 Constance Street residents signed a petition requesting that a Conditional Use Permit be implemented because the proposed traffic plan will generate 691 daily vehicles trips to be egressing from the alley onto this residential street which is only 2 blocks in length and has a stop sign on 14th Street. **See Exhibit 6.** This will create a backup. This data is supported by traffic studies conducted by LADOT. **See CPC-2020-4095, page 75.**

“Project Trip Generation – The Project is expected to generate 539 vehicle trips (328 inbound trips and 211 outbound trips) during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, the Project is expected to generate 152 vehicle trips (66 inbound trips and 86 outbound trips).”

Conditional Use Permit for one school and not one for the other is absurd since the schools will be located across the street separated only by Constance Street. Equitas 1 and the Equitas 5 and 6 are one entity. This will amount to 1500 total student body.

Margaret Ford and Malka Borrego from Equitas Academy Schools along with their lawyer, Jack Rubens and City Councilmembers Gerald Gubutan and Luis Gonzalez were made aware of these two serious issues pointed out by residents during all public hearings and community forums. And yet, this alley and Conditional Use Permit on Constance St concerns which adversely affect Pico-Union residents and business owners continues to be ignored by all parties. No resolution has ever been made by Equitas, and nor has the Commission or City Council questioned how Equitas will resolve these problems.

PETITIONS - TRAFFIC AND PARKING ISSUES: The Commission disregarded the opposition petitions of 104 residents collected from the most impacted residents living within 500-1000 feet radius of the project and gave more credence to supporters outside this zone. With regards to traffic and parking problems, the residents' eyewitness accounts of Equitas' long drop-off/pick-up queues were not taken seriously.

- Mr. Jack Rubens, Equitas' lawyer, in his submission letter to the City Planning Commission dated November 12, 2020, frequently and erroneously stated that "several Pico-Union residents," "some residents" or "few residents" had raised concerns about traffic. This is not true. In total 158 residents opposed Equitas' conversion. By no means are these a few residents. **Reference Exhibit 6.**
- 73 of the 97 signatures were from residents living within the 500 feet radius opposed the project listing traffic as one of the problems as well as the usage of Constance Street as an outlet for Equitas' traffic. To date, we have collected 158 signatures of which 100 are from Constance Street residents.
- Equitas collected 370 e-signatures in support from CD1 residents. However, Equitas did not disclose that only 19 of 370 signatures were from residents living within the 500 feet radius. **See Exhibit 7.**
- Therefore, more residents living within the 500 feet radius oppose the project; 73 to 19. No credence was given to the people who will be significantly impacted by this project.
- Equitas is adamant that based on their parent polling data, 70% of their students walk to school, and their traffic plan for Equitas 5 & 6 is based on this data.
 - At all meetings and hearings, the residents and business owners have pointed that this data is not accurate. As eyewitnesses to Equitas' every school day drop-off and pickup operation, their queues can reach up to Westlake Ave, and sometimes to Alvarado; a car queue stretching 4-5 blocks long on Pico Blvd. These car lines block business parking spaces, block residents from entering and exiting their residential streets and pollute while idling. No importance was given to this fact.
- There are 54 parking spaces for over a hundred employees, consisting of approximately 40 teachers, and 60 administrative staff and corporate employees. Where will the rest of the employees park? **See CPC-2020-4095, page 77.**

UNFAIR PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS AND EQUITAS OUTREACH WAS BIAS:

- All public hearing notices were mailed and posted only in English in a predominately Spanish speaking community. There was a small footnote at the bottom with the phone number to request a Spanish version. As I collected signatures and spoke to residents, it became clear that the residents who had received the notices, and spoke Spanish only, ignored the bulletin.
- The public was only given short notice of this project even though Equitas Academy Schools has been planning this project for over a year and a half.
- First Public Hearing is on 10/21/20 and within a month, on 11/19/20 the City Planning Commission had approved the project.

- Time limit of 2 minutes for first meeting on 10/21/2020, and then 1 minute on 11/19/2020 was inadequate for those with opposing views because it takes more time to explain the reasons behind the opposition in order for the Commission to fully understand the issues.
- Equitas was allowed to give a full-fledge presentation in support of their project, but those who opposed the project were not given any opportunity.
- There was little to no community outreach by Equitas.
 - Only a one-week notice was given by Equitas for the first community forum which occurred on 10/08/20, and very few residents received physical flyers. Whereas, Equitas had been contacting parents for months in advance; offering preprinted approved letters in English and Spanish addressed to City Council with e-signature capacity. **Reference Exhibit 7.**
 - Our household found out about the meeting via text from a friend who had contact with the City Council office.
- Equitas' Community Forum flyer's wording was misleading. It sounded as if Equitas was announcing their project which had already been approved, and was being endorsed by our Councilman, Gil Cedillo. The flyer did not express an open forum format to discuss community issues or concerns about Equitas proposed project as had been done in the previous meeting for Equitas 1. It made it sound as if the community was invite to only ask question and make comments. I, and several residents, sent an e-mail to Gil Cedillo, but only received a replied that "it was duly noted." **See Exhibit 8.**
- Equitas posted the public hearing notices in conspicuous locations, and one in front of their building was folded over for several days due to inadequate tape, one was taped on the parking lot fence on Union Ave about 15 feet from sidewalk, and third was adhered on the back door of their employee entrance. **See Exhibit 9**

In all the meetings and hearings, the opposing residents rejected the layout of the proposed traffic circulation plan which is flawed, and seriously impacts many residents and businesses along its path. In addition, the increase student body to 1000 students, even if it is staggered, will be in full effect within 5 years. In the end, the residents will be left to deal with the increase in traffic congestion of 1500 students.

Minimally impacting the neighboring residents should be top priority by Equitas, and it was the Commission's responsibility to listen to all the evidence, and to ensure that this project will be in the best interest of the community without causing significant difficulties to the neighboring residents. In the case, this was not done.

Equitas must redesign their traffic circulation so that it will not inconvenience any residents or business owners. Only one City Planning Commissioner questioned why Equitas needed three schools so close to each other. It was not answered by Malka Borrego, but by Jack Rubens, who stated that Equitas 5 and 6 were located elsewhere in CD1, and fully licensed, but they needed a new permanent location.

I would like City Council to know that I oppose the location and traffic impact on the neighboring streets and businesses, not Equitas Academy Schools. I firmly believe that all children must have the opportunity for quality learning especially for those in our Pico-Union community.

I, therefore, ask City Council to carefully review the issues and problems raised in this appeal letter, and render a judgment of non-approval.

Thank you for your time and consideration.


Aurora Corona

Exhibit 1:

CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR Impacted Parking Lots



- Equitas plans to have parents enter the drop-off and pick-up location via the alley behind the proposed expansion.
- There are two parking lots off this alley
 - One is for the Doria Apartments, Imperial Liquor and Pico Clinica Medica Latina
 - The other is for the 4-Plex at 1318-1320 Constance St. (see slide #Y)
- These parking lots will be blocked, interfering with residents, visitors, employees, customers, patients and deliveries!
- This issue was not mentioned at the public hearing, and Equitas' traffic plan ignores it entirely.
- The expansion is opposed by the impacted parties (see next slide)

Exhibit 2:

CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR Impacted Parking Lots - Alley View



Residents, Businesses and Customers' Lots for 1600, 1602 and 1604 W. Pico Blvd

Exhibit 9:

From: Aurora Pink
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 1:54 PM
To: alexander.truong@lacity.org
Cc: luis.e.gonzalez@lacity.org; jose.a.rodriguez@lacity.org; Hugo Ortiz; Debby.Kim@lacity.org <Debby.Kim@lacity.org>; Gandhi Diaz
Subject: Photos of Public Hearing Not Clearly Visible - Equitas Academy Proposed Conversion -CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

Good afternoon Mr. Truong,

We wanted to submit these photos and the comments below for the record in regards to the Equitas Public Hearing -CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR scheduled for 10/21/2020.

- 1.The public hearing notices were not properly displayed. There locations seem inconspicuous. Also considering the majority of residents in the impacted area speak Spanish, these should have been posted in Spanish as well. There is only a tiny footnote at the bottom to call to request a Spanish version. No one will call.
- 2.The notice in front of the school on Pico Blvd has been folded ove for several days. No one from Equitas has bothered to display it correctly. As you can see, their banners are nice and neat.
3. There was a notice on their side entrance door on Constance St. as of Sunday, but now it has been removed. Either way, no residents are going to read a bulletin posted far from the sidewalk and obscured by the windows protruding outward. It appears more to be a notice for their staff and not the public.
4. The notice posted on their parking lot fence is too far away from the sidewalk and requires the individual move closer to be able to read it.

Thank you for your time,

Aurora, Andrew Corona and Yasmin Mero-Corona



CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

Petition for 1600-1602-1604 Pico Blvd

Attention: Councilman Gil Cedillo

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

Equitas Academy Charter Schools - CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

October 23, 2020

We, the undersigned Pico-Union Residents residing at the Doria Apartments at 1604 W. Pico Blvd, business owners at La Clinica at 1600 Pico Blvd, and Imperial Liquor Store at 1602 W. Pico Blvd oppose Equitas' traffic plan because it will interfere and disrupt our accessibility to enter and exit our parking lot via the alley, as well, as affect our businesses.

	PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
1	Silvia Cruz	1604 W. Pico Blvd LAC 9005	[Signature]
2	José T. Mendez	1604 W. Pico Blvd LAC 9005	[Signature]
3	Roque Mendez	1604 W Pico Blvd # 20	Roque P. Mendez - LAC
4	Joan Aguinaga	1604 W Pico Blvd # 10	J.A.
5	[Signature]	1604 W Pico Blvd # 10	[Signature]
6	Julce Vezquez	1604 W Pico LAC 9005	[Signature]
7	Maribel Lopez H	1604 W Pico Blvd LAC 9005	[Signature]
8	Uriel Hernandez	1604 W Pico Blvd	[Signature]
9	Joann Lee	1604 W Pico Blvd	[Signature]
10	Reyna Lopez	1604 W Pico Blvd	[Signature]
11	Bianca Mendez	1604 W Pico Bl. # 24	[Signature]
12	CHRISTINA LOPEZ	1600 W Pico Blvd	[Signature]
13	Tamara Q. Zora	1600 W. Pico Blvd	[Signature]
14			

Equitas Academy Charter Schools - CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

Attention: Councilman Gil Cedillo

October 23, 2020

We, the undersigned Pico-Union Residents residing on Constance Street, do not want any parents' or staff vehicles associated with Equitas Academy Charter Schools at 1610-1612 W. Pico Blvd and from 1700 W. Pico Blvd, driving or parking down our street. We will not endorse the Equitas proposed conversion plan without a Conditional Use Permit stipulating this condition.

	PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
1	Kevin Sanchez	1318 Constance St #2	[Signature]
2	[Signature]	1318 1/2 Constance St	[Signature]
3	Ovidio Gonzalez	1318 Constance St	[Signature]
4	Tania Campos	1318 1/2 Constance St	[Signature]
5	Mayra Campos	1318 Constance St	[Signature]
6	Cristos Montano	1337 Constance #2	[Signature]
7	Marisol Canche	1331 Constance St #3	[Signature]
8	Jorge Gue	1337 Constance #4	[Signature]
9	Jackie	1337 Constance St #4	[Signature]
10	Pedro Sanchez	13375 Constance #8	[Signature]
11	Mylene Campos	1337 Constance	[Signature]
12	Marcos Martinez	1341 Constance	[Signature]
13	Hector Ivan Cervantes	1341 Constance St	[Signature]
14	Maria Carr	1341 Constance St	[Signature]
15	Hector Cervantes	1341 Constance St	[Signature]
16	Hector Cervantes	1341 Constance St	[Signature]
17	Diana Friedman	1349 Constance St, LA 90015	[Signature]
18	Gary Friedman	1349 Constance St, LA 90015	[Signature]
19	Andros Rebellan	1701 West 14th St 90015	[Signature]
20	Alejandra Perez	1701 West 14th 90015	[Signature]
21	Alliana Turkel	1705 W 14 90015	[Signature]
22	Stevie Reimel	1705 W 14th St 90015	[Signature]
23	Jonathan Muench	1705 W 14 90015	[Signature]
24	Marta Perroni	1357 Constance St 90015	[Signature]
25	Manuel Toribio	1357 Constance St 90015	[Signature]
26	Graham Mahr	1405 Constance St	[Signature]
27	Carla Ward	1409 Constance St	[Signature]
28	Arvin Viera	1421 Constance St	[Signature]
29	Maria Viera	1421 Constance St	[Signature]
30	Luis Viera	1421 Constance St	[Signature]
31	Daniel Benitez	1437 Constance St	[Signature]
32	Juvenina Benitez	1437 1/2 Constance St	[Signature]

Equitas Academy Charter Schools - CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

1	Alejo Ponce	1436 1/2 Constance St	[Signature]
2	Lirma de la rosa	1436 1/2 Constance St.	[Signature]
3	Europa Corona	1354 Constance St.	[Signature]
4	YASMIN MERO CORONA	1354 Constance St	[Signature]
5	Carlos Campillo	1322 Constance St	[Signature]
6	Saira Cayillo	1322 Constance St.	[Signature]
7	Amalia Najera	1316 CONSTANCE ST. LA	Amalia Najera
8	Jaime A Garcia	1433 Constance St.	Jaime A Garcia
9	MARLENE DEL VALLE	1424 Constance St.	[Signature]
10	Guillermo Baicam	1424 CONSTANCE	[Signature]
11	JOSE M. A. BILDA	1336 CONSTANCE ST # 9005	[Signature]
12	Juana Lara	1334 Constance 9005	Juana Lara
13	Jose Ake	1334 S Constance St	[Signature]
14	Maria Garcia	1337 S Constance St #1	[Signature]
15	Yasmin Ake	1334 S Constance St	[Signature]
16	Genilma Garcia	1337 S Constance St	[Signature]
17	Jose Garcia	1337 S Constance St	[Signature]
18	Jose Garcia	1337 S Constance St	[Signature]
19	Maria de la Cruz Garcia	1336 1/2 Constance St	[Signature]
20	Genesto Gomez	1346 Constance	[Signature]
21	Maria Nieves Medina	1340 Constance	[Signature]
23	[Signature]	1354 Constance St	[Signature]
24	AURORA COPANA	1354 Constance St.	[Signature]
25	YASMIN MERO CORONA	1354 Constance St	[Signature]
26	Luis Diaz	1410 Constance St	[Signature]
27	Wileta Soriano	1350 Constance St	[Signature]
28	Cesar Soriano	1350 Constance St	[Signature]
29	Martha Feyera	1357 Constance St	[Signature]
30	Manuel Soriano	1357 Constance St	[Signature]
31	ALPITA SORIANO	1358 CONSTANCE ST	[Signature]
32	Maria Tolalpa	1328 Constance St	[Signature]
33	Maria Lopez	1331 Constance #1	[Signature]
34	Bridget Mackes	1335 Constance St #2	[Signature]
35	Diego Murdy	1331 S Constance St #4	Diego Murdy
36	Chralia Najera	1318 Constance St #1	Chralia Najera
37	Jose A. Najera	1318 Constance St #1	Jose A. Najera
38	Carlos Montemayor	1337 CONSTANCE #2	[Signature]
39	Wileta Soriano	1407 Constance St #1	[Signature]
40	Heleny Vargas	1414 1/2 Constance	[Signature]
41	Rene Herrera	1409 Constance	[Signature]
42	Roberto Herrera	1409 Constance	[Signature]

Equitas Academy Charter Schools - CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
69. Santa Carrillo	1322 Constance St. W. CA 90015	[Signature]
70. Estela Martinez	1322 Constance St. W. CA 90015	[Signature]
* 71. Reginal Jay	1324 1/4 Constance St	[Signature]
* 72. Carole Carrillo	1322 Constance St	[Signature]
* 73. Hazel Dolalpa	1328 Constance St	[Signature]
* 74. JOSE MEDINA	1331 CONSTANCE	[Signature]
* 75. Marcel Martinez	1341 Constance St.	[Signature]
* 76. Yajaira Cevallos	1341 Constance St.	[Signature]
* 77. Maria Diaz	1341 Constance St	[Signature]
* 78. IVAN CERVANTES	1341 Constance St	[Signature]
* 79. Tam Diaz	1341 Constance St	[Signature]
* 80. Lucas Clayton	1345 Constance St Apt 5	[Signature]
* 81. Estela Tobar	1438 Constance St	[Signature]
* 82. Alvin Viera	1421 Constance St	[Signature]
83. ALFONSO RENDERO	1401 S BUR LINGTON #22	[Signature]
84. Humberto Rangel	1346 S. Burlington Ave	[Signature]
85. LOPE RANGEL	1346 S. Burlington Ave	[Signature]
86. Kelley Manzo	1346 S. Burlington Ave	[Signature]
87. Christopher Rangel	1346 S. Burlington Ave	[Signature]
88. JOYCE ZAPATA	1346 S. Burlington Ave	[Signature]
89. Gloria Terry	1400 S. Burlington Ave	[Signature]
90. Margaret Jonata	1317 S. Westlake Ave	[Signature]
91. Anthony Vasquez	1317 S. Westlake Ave.	[Signature]
92. MICHAEL RIEGER	1317 S. WESTLAKE AVE	[Signature]
93. JAVIER DEL REAL	1317 S. WESTLAKE AVE	[Signature]
94. JOAN RIEGER	1317 S Westlake Ave	[Signature]
95. ARMANDO MORALES	1617 W 14TH ST.	[Signature]
96. AMANDA LES	1617 W 14TH ST -	[Signature]
97. REYNA Cundrum	1620 W 14TH Street	[Signature]
98. David Johnson	1406 S. Union Ave	[Signature]
99. Vera Vega	1425 Union Ave LA	[Signature]
100. Sybil Cruz	1424 S Union Ave	[Signature]
101. Jaime Valera	1424 S Union Ave	[Signature]
102. ISABEL VEGA	1415 S. UNION AVE. LA 90015	[Signature]
103. AND NIE TO	1418 BURLINGTON AVE #4	[Signature]
104. NANCY E. VEGA ESTRO	1415 S. UNION AVE. LA 90015	[Signature]
105. CARLOS A. ESTRADA	1415 S Union Ave	[Signature]
* 106. Alan Melgar	1456 1/2 Constance St LA CA	[Signature]
* 107. OSCAR VALERIANO	1325 S. Constance St Apt X	[Signature]
* 108. PATRICIA VAQUERAS	1325 S. Constance St Apt X	[Signature]
* 109. Anuradha Campos	1337 Constance Apt 3	[Signature]
* 110. JESSIE BELTZ	1337 Constance Apt 3	[Signature]
* 111. Carlos Quintana	1337 Constance St #6.	[Signature]
* 112. Juana E. Alar	1337 Constance St #6. L.A.	[Signature]
113. Alex Dow	1359 S. Union Ave	[Signature]

Equitas Academy Charter Schools - CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

	PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
*	24. EDWIN PALERUA	1447 1/2 Constance St	
*	25. EDUARDO TORRES	1436 Constance St	
*	26. JOSE PALERUA	1447 1/2 Constance St	
*	27. MYLINA BORGES	1430 Constance St	
*	28. JUANITA COLON	1430 Constance St	
*	29. MARIA ZELVA	1414 Constance St #106	
*	30. RAYMOND SCOTT	1314 SO. BONNIE BRAE	
	31. EDU RODRIGUES	1433 S Union Ave - W.A. W.	
	32. NATALIA RODRIGUES	1433 S Union Ave	
	33. JOSE RODRIGUES	1433 S Union Ave	
*	34. JOSE ZAMBRANO	1430 S Constance	
*	35. ESTER ZAMBRANO	1430 S Constance	
*	36. JOSE FELICIANO	1438 S Constance	
	37.		
	38.		
	39.		
	40.		
	41.		
	42.		
	43.		
	44.		
	45.		
	46.		
	47.		
	48.		
	49.		
	50.		
	51.		
	52.		
	53.		
	54.		
	55.		
	56.		
	57.		
	58.		
	59.		
	60.		
	61.		
	62.		
	63.		
	64.		
	65.		
	66.		
	67.		
	68.		

Exhibit 8:



**COMMUNITY FORUM
FORO COMUNITARIO**



Equitas Academy Charter Schools is excited to share information, answer questions, and hear your comments on the permanent homes for **Equitas Academy #5 and Equitas Academy #6!** Proudly in cooperation with the office of City Council member, Gil Cedillo, District 1.

Join us on **October 8th** to learn more about the project!

Equitas Academy Charter Schools se complace en presentar sobre el proyecto, escuchar sus comentarios, y responder sus preguntas sobre **Equitas Academy #5 y Equitas Academy #6!** Orgullosamente en cooperación con la oficina del miembro del Consejo Municipal, Gil Cedillo, Distrito 1.

¡Únase a nosotros el **8 de octubre** para obtener más información del proyecto!

When to Join	How to Join
Virtual Community Forum Equitas Academy #5 & Equitas Academy #6 Thursday, October 8th 10:00 - 11:00 pm	Click the link to join Zoom Meeting below or Phone: +1 646 900 6833 Zoom Meeting ID: 962 0391 9862 Passcode: 515626

Cuando unirse	Como unirse
Foro de la comunidad virtual Equitas Academy #5 & Equitas Academy #6 Jueves, 8 de octubre 10:00 - 11:00 pm	Click the link to join Zoom Meeting below or Phone: +1 646 900 6833 Zoom Meeting ID: 962 0391 9862 Passcode: 515626

From: Aurora Pink
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2020 5:04 PM
To: gilbert.cedillo@lacity.org; luis.e.gonzalez@lacity.org; alfonso.palacios@lacity.org; Debby.Kim@lacity.org <Debby.Kim@lacity.org>
Subject: Equitas Academy Community Forum Flyer Wording

Hello Mr. Gil Cedillo,

I already spoke to Luis Gonzalez to address our concern with the wording in Equitas Community Forum Flyer. I have highlighted the words, “permanent homes” and phrase, “Proudly in cooperation with the Office of City Council member, Gil Cedillo, District 1” which sends a mixed message. In fact, the entire statement does not feel as if the forum is to discuss community issues and concerns with Equitas’ school proposal. The flyer makes it sound as if Equitas Charters Schools have already been approved and is being endorsed by the City Council. The meeting is for the community to merely “ask questions and share comments.”

As written, this flyer will confuse and demoralize the community into thinking since it is a done deal, why bother to attend the Zoom meeting. Perhaps this was the intent.

In any event, I hope that you will speak to Equitas about rephrasing their statement to the community.

Aurora, Andrew and Yasmin Corona
 Maggie and Mike Rieger and Family
 Pico-Union Constituents

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Exhibit 9:

From: Aurora Pink
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 1:54 PM
To: alexander.truong@lacity.org
Cc: luis.e.gonzalez@lacity.org; jose.a.rodriguez@lacity.org; Hugo Ortiz; Debby.Kim@lacity.org
<Debby.Kim@lacity.org>; Gandhi Diaz
Subject: Photos of Public Hearing Not Clearly Visible - Equitas Academy Proposed Conversion -CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR

Good afternoon Mr. Truong,

We wanted to submit these photos and the comments below for the record in regards to the Equitas Public Hearing -CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR scheduled for 10/21/2020.

- 1.The public hearing notices were not properly displayed. There locations seem inconspicuous. Also considering the majority of residents in the impacted area speak Spanish, these should have been posted in Spanish as well. There is only a tiny footnote at the bottom to call to request a Spanish version. No one will call.
- 2.The notice in front of the school on Pico Blvd has been folded ove for several days. No one from Equitas has bothered to display it correctly. As you can see, their banners are nice and neat.
3. There was a notice on their side entrance door on Constance St. as of Sunday, but now it has been removed. Either way, no residents are going to read a bulletin posted far from the sidewalk and obscured by the windows protruding outward. It appears more to be a notice for their staff and not the public.
4. The notice posted on their parking lot fence is too far away from the sidewalk and requires the individual move closer to be able to read it.

Thank you for your time,

Aurora, Andrew Corona and Yasmin Mero-Corona



Applicant Copy
 Office: Downtown
 Application Invoice No: 69007

City of Los Angeles
 Department of City Planning



Scan this QR Code® with a barcode reading app on your Smartphone. Bookmark page for future reference.



City Planning Request

NOTICE: The staff of the Planning Department will analyze your request and accord the same full and impartial consideration to your application, regardless of whether or not you obtain the services of anyone to represent you.

This filing fee is required by Chapter 1, Article 9, L.A.M.C.

If you have questions about this invoice, please contact the planner assigned to this case. To identify the assigned planner, please visit <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/> and enter the Case Number.

Receipt Number:2020353001-54, Amount:\$109.47, Paid Date:12/18/2020

Applicant: CORONA, AURORA (213-7931502)
Representative:
Project Address: 1608-1636 W. PICO BLVD

NOTES:

CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR-1A			
Item	Fee	%	Charged Fee
Appeal by Aggrieved Parties Other than the Original Applicant *	\$89.00	100%	\$89.00
Case Total			\$89.00

Item	Charged Fee
*Fees Subject to Surcharges	\$89.00
Fees Not Subject to Surcharges	\$0.00
Plan & Land Use Fees Total	\$89.00
Expediting Fee	\$0.00
Development Services Center Surcharge (3%)	\$2.67
City Planning Systems Development Surcharge (6%)	\$5.34
Operating Surcharge (7%)	\$6.23
General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (7%)	\$6.23
Grand Total	\$109.47
Total Invoice	\$109.47
Total Overpayment Amount	\$0.00
Total Paid (this amount must equal the sum of all checks)	\$109.47

Council District: 1
 Plan Area: Westlake
 Processed by VASQUEZ, RUBEN on 12/18/2020

Signature: _____

Building & Safety Copy
 Office: Downtown
 Application Invoice No: 69007

City of Los Angeles
 Department of City Planning



Scan this QR Code® with a barcode reading app on your Smartphone. Bookmark page for future reference.



City Planning Request

NOTICE: The staff of the Planning Department will analyze your request and accord the same full and impartial consideration to your application, regardless of whether or not you obtain the services of anyone to represent you.

This filing fee is required by Chapter 1, Article 9, L.A.M.C.

If you have questions about this invoice, please contact the planner assigned to this case. To identify the assigned planner, please visit <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/> and enter the Case Number.

Receipt Number:2020353001-54, Amount:\$109.47, Paid Date:12/18/2020

Applicant: CORONA, AURORA (213-7931502)
Representative:
Project Address: 1608-1636 W. PICO BLVD

NOTES:

CPC-2020-4095-ZV-CU-SPR-1A			
Item	Fee	%	Charged Fee
Appeal by Aggrieved Parties Other than the Original Applicant *	\$89.00	100%	\$89.00
Case Total			\$89.00

Item	Charged Fee
*Fees Subject to Surcharges	\$89.00
Fees Not Subject to Surcharges	\$0.00
Plan & Land Use Fees Total	\$89.00
Expediting Fee	\$0.00
Development Services Center Surcharge (3%)	\$2.67
City Planning Systems Development Surcharge (6%)	\$5.34
Operating Surcharge (7%)	\$6.23
General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (7%)	\$6.23
Grand Total	\$109.47
Total Invoice	\$109.47
Total Overpayment Amount	\$0.00
Total Paid (this amount must equal the sum of all checks)	\$109.47

Council District: 1
 Plan Area: Westlake
 Processed by VASQUEZ, RUBEN on 12/18/2020

Signature: _____