



ORIGINAL

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 Blvd; 1321-1331 South Union Avenue

Final Date to Appeal: 12/23/2020

2. APPELLANT

**Appellant Identity:**  
(check all that apply)

- ☒ Representative  
☐ Applicant

- ☒ Property Owner  
☐ 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  
☐ Applicant

- ☐ Owner  
☐ Operator

☐ Aggrieved Party

3. APPELLANT INFORMATION

Appellant's Name: Andrew and Yasmin Corona

Company/Organization: Constance St. Residents For "No Equitas Traffic On Constance Street"

Mailing Address: 1354 Constance Street

City: Los Angeles

State: California

Zip: 90015

Telephone: (213) 380-1940

E-mail: ajcym@sbcglobal.net

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

- ☒ Self    ☒ Other: Constance Street Residents

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: 14 (a)

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:  Date: 12/15/20

#### 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: <b>\$89</b>	Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner): <b>Ruben Vasquez</b>	Date: <b>12/18/20</b>
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

Reference Number: 2020353001-55  
Date/Time: 12/18/2020 11:09:48 AM PST

User ID: hhoun

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.

DEPT OF CITY PLANNING - PCTS  
2020353001-55-1  
DEPT OF CITY PLANNING - PCTS DOC INFO  
Document Number: 6800169009

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: 4035

Total Received: \$109.47



C E 2 0 2 0 3 5 3 0 0 1 - 5 5

## 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  
ning.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.

N ( 213-3801940 )

	Fee	%	Charged Fee
Original Applicant *	\$89.00	100%	\$89.00
<b>Case Total</b>			<b>\$89.00</b>

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

Los Angeles Department of Building  
and Safety  
Metro 4th Floor 12/18/2020 11:09:48  
AM  
User ID: hhoun  
Receipt Ref Nbr: 2020353001-55  
Transaction ID: 2020353001-55-1  
Operating Surcharge \$6.23  
General Plan Maintenance Surcharge  
\$6.23  
City Planning Systems Development S  
urcharge \$5.34  
Appeal by Aggrieved Parties Other t  
han the Origina \$89.00  
Development Services Center Surchar  
ge \$2.67  
Amount Paid: \$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

Honorable Members of City Council,

December 14, 2020

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

**Appeal to Apply Conditional Use Permit To Equitas Elementary Schools at 1608-1636 West Pico Blvd., 1321 – 1331 South Union Avenue to include:**

- **Prohibition of Equitas' traffic egressing from drop-offs and pickups, or any school-related event, to travel northbound or southbound on Constance Street**
- **Appeal reference; Determination Letter, Item 14 (a), Loading and Onloading:  
See CPC-2020-4095, Traffic Circulation Plan: Exhibit A, page 41.**

We are representing 100 Constance Street residents who are appealing this case because the City Planning Commission did not take into account the request of the Constance Street residents living within 500 to 1000 feet radius to impose the same, and or similar Conditional Use Permit which exists at Equitas' 1700 W. Pico Blvd location.

**The Commission overlooked the serious and significant traffic impact on Constance Street and its effects on the residents without a Conditional Use Permit imposed on Equitas 5 and 6.**

- Without one, the Constance Street residents will be subjected to more traffic, more pollution, more noise, and vehicle back-up that will interfere with the residents' ability to drive freely. This traffic dilemma is proven by Equitas' own data.
  - Aurora Corona and Yasmin Corona spoke on behalf of residents during the City Commission Planning hearing, and requested that if the Commission decided to approve the Project, the Conditional Use Permit must be applied. This was necessary to protect the Constance residents from proposed flow of traffic produced by 691 vehicles using Constance as an exit point during Equitas' drop-offs and pick-ups. This data of 691 vehicles was provided to the Commission in Equitas' case file. Yet, no consideration of this was taken into account.  
**See CPC-2020-4095, page 258. See Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2, page 262-263**
    - ❖ **"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)."**
    - ❖ **LADOT MOU dated 01/28/20 and 01/30/20 shows expected generated vehicle trips as 719 in the AM, and 152 vehicle trips in the PM.**
- The importance and reasons behind this request were explained to the Commission as follows on 11/19/20, but went unheeded:
  - "This Conditional Use Permit was adopted to mitigate the impact of Equitas' traffic on the community with their school at 1700 W. Pico which has a student body enrollment of 462. The new location will triple the amount of traffic problems with 1000 students which made it all the more necessary to apply the Conditional Use Permit to it."
    - ❖ Due to the 1-minute speaker limitation which was quite unfair, only a partial breakdown was given to the Commission:
      - The Conditional Use Permit forbids the following:

- Equitas' parents from driving down Constance Street after drop-offs and pick-ups
  - Parking by parents and staff on Constance Street and neighboring streets
- The fact remains that the schools are one and same entity, and they will be located across from each other separated only by Constance Street. These three schools will house close to 1500 students. So, how can the City Planning Commission and City Council **not require** the new schools which are double in size to be bounded by a similar Conditional Use Permit as the current Equitas 1 with a lesser student body capacity? This is nonsensical, and clearly shows that the Commission, and our City Council, did not carefully consider the degree of traffic impact on Constance Street from Equitas' three schools. Constance Street is only two blocks, and there is a stop sign posted on 14<sup>TH</sup> Street. Back up of traffic will happen.
  - Furthermore, keeping Constance as a residential street which has a lot of HPOZ contributing homes is also a prime reason that the residents are fighting to save our two blocks from being invaded by Equitas' school traffic.
  - We face losing our historical ambience for the sake of implementing a traffic plan to accommodate Equitas' operations.

The residents on Constance Street already have significant traffic and parking problems with Equitas 1 at 1700 W. Pico Boulevard. They are not 100% complainant with this Conditional Use Permit. Equitas' parents continue to violate the agreement, as does their staff at times, which is why our City Councilman, Gil Cedillo, insisted that the new schools, if approved and among other recommendations, must have a 24-Hour Hot Line and a Traffic Ambassador for the residents to report parking or traffic issues. By so requesting these conditions, continued parking and traffic problems are foreseen, which is even more reason why a similar Conditional Use Permit must be imposed on Equitas 5 & 6.

The petitions with the residents' signatures were submitted to City Councilman, Gil Cedillo and to the City Planning Commission for review prior to the hearing of November 19, 2020. To date, we have collected a total of 158 signatures from opposing residents of the project of which 100 signatures are from residents living on Constance Street who do not want Equitas traffic to use our street for the reasons explained above. **See Exhibit 3.**

We ask the City Council to listen to its constituents and reevaluate Equitas' circulation traffic plan (**CPC-2020-4095, Traffic Circulation Plan: Exhibit A, page 41**), and apply a Conditional Use Permit to Equitas 5 and 6 that will prohibit all Equitas' traffic northbound and southbound on Constance Street. The resident believe this is the least that the City Council can do to mitigate some of the traffic congestion problems that Constance Street residents and the community will have to face with future construction of this project, and as Equitas' 5 & 6 increases their student body yearly to a maximum capacity of 1000 students.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Andrew and Yasmin Corona

Representing Constance Street Residents for **"No Equitas' Traffic on Constance Street"**

## 6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- ***Project Description*** – The Project consists of the repurposing of the existing commercial building on the School Site for the operation of two charter elementary schools (Grades K-4) accommodating a total maximum enrollment of 1,000 students and 5,432 square feet of corporate office floor area. A total of 54 parking spaces will be provided in the surface parking lot located on the Parking Site. Construction of the Project is proposed to be completed, and occupancy to occur, by the year 2022.
- ***Study Scope*** – This transportation assessment (i) presents a CEQA assessment of Project-related VMT, (ii) provides a CEQA assessment of whether the Project conflicts or is inconsistent with local plans and policies, (iii) presents a non-CEQA assessment of pedestrian, bicycle and transit access, (iv) provides a non-CEQA evaluation of Project access, safety and circulation, and (v) provides a non-CEQA review of Project construction activities. LADOT confirmed the appropriateness of the analysis criteria when it entered into a transportation assessment MOU for the Project.
- ***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).

## EXHIBIT 2:

CPC-2020-4095, page 262-263



### Transportation Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This MOU acknowledges that the Transportation Assessment for the following Project will be prepared in accordance with the latest version of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines:

#### I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: Equitas Charter Elementary Schools Project

Project Address: 1612-1636 W. Pico Boulevard

Project Description: Development of two charter elementary schools (Grades K-4) accommodating a total maximum enrollment of 1,000 students and 5,572 of office floor area.

LADOT Project Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Site Plan attached? (Required) ☒ Yes ☐ No

#### II. TRIP GENERATION

Geographic Distribution: N 25 % S 25 % E 25 % W 25 %

Illustration of Project trip distribution percentages at Study intersections attached? (Required) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Trip Generation Rate(s): ITE 10th Edition / Other ITE 10th Edition

Trip Generation Adjustment (Exact amount of credit subject to approval by LADOT)	Yes	No
Transit Usage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transportation Demand Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Existing Active Land Use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Previous Land Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Internal Trip	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pass-By Trip	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Trip generation table including a description of the proposed land uses, ITE rates, estimated morning and afternoon peak hour volumes (ins/out/totals), proposed trip credits, etc. attached? (Required) ☒ Yes ☐ No

	IN	OUT	TOTAL
AM Trips	<u>438</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>719</u>
PM Trips	<u>66</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>152</u>

NET Trips <u>1,531</u>
(From VMT Calculator version <u>1.2</u> )

#### III. STUDY AREA AND ASSUMPTIONS

Project Buildout Year: 2022 Ambient Growth Rate: 1.0 % Per Yr.

Related Projects List, researched by the consultant and approved by LADOT, attached? (Required) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Map of Study Intersections/Segments attached? ☒ Yes ☐ No \*Forthcoming

STUDY INTERSECTIONS (May be subject to LADOT revision after access, safety and circulation analysis)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1 <u>Constance Street / Pico Boulevard</u> | 3 <u>Union Avenue / Pico Boulevard</u> |
| 2 <u>Constance Street / 14th Street</u>    | 4 <u>Union Avenue / 14th Street</u>    |

STUDY STREET SEGMENT: Constance Street, between Constance Street Driveway and 14th Street

Is this Project located on a street within the High Injury Network? ☒ Yes ☐ No



City of Los Angeles Transportation Assessment MOU

LADOT Project Case No: CA 20-4930

#### IV. ACCESS ASSESSMENT

Is the project on a lot that is 0.5-acre or more in total gross area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Is the project's frontage 250 linear feet or more along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Is the project's building frontage encompassing an entire block along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? ☐ Yes ☒ No

#### V. CONTACT INFORMATION

##### CONSULTANT

Name: Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers  
Address: 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
Phone Number: (818) 835-8648  
E-Mail: jshender@llgengineers.com

##### DEVELOPER

Equitas Academy Charter School  
1700 W. Pico Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90015  
(213) 542-4707  
jaime@pacificcharter.org

Approved by: x [Signature]  
Consultant's Representative

1/28/2020  
Date

x [Signature]  
LADOT Representative

1/30/2020  
\*Date

\*MOUs are generally valid for two years after signing. If after two years a transportation assessment has not been submitted to LADOT, the developer's representative shall check with the appropriate LADOT office to determine if the terms of this MOU are still valid or if a new MOU is needed.

# EXHIBIT 3 – CONSTANCE STREET PETITIONS

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	Vivian Sanchez	1318 Constance St #2	Vivian Sanchez
2	<del>MANUEL</del>	1318 1/2 Constance St	<del>MANUEL</del>
3	Ovidio Gonzalez	1318 Constance St	Ovidio Gonzalez
4	Tania Campos	1318 1/2 Constance St	Tania Campos
5	Mayra Campos	1318 Constance St	Mayra Campos
6	Cristina Montoya	1337 Constance #2	Cristina Montoya
7	Marisol Canche	1331 Constance St #3	Marisol Canche
8	JACKIE GARCIA	1337 Constance St #4	JACKIE GARCIA
9	JACKIE	1337 Constance St #4	JACKIE
10	Rodolfo Sanchez	1337 S Constance #8	Rodolfo Sanchez
11	Marlene Campos	1337 Constance	Marlene Campos
12	Marcelo Martinez	1341 Constance	Marcelo Martinez
13	Hector Ivan Cervantes	1341 Constance St	Hector Ivan Cervantes
14	Maria Diaz	1341 Constance St	Maria Diaz
15	Hector Cervantes	1341 Constance St	Hector Cervantes
16	Hector Cervantes	1341 Constance St	Hector Cervantes
17	Diana Friedman	1349 Constance St, LA 90015	Diana Friedman
18	Guy Friedman	1349 Constance St, LA 90015	Guy Friedman
19	Monica Rebellon	1701 West 14th St 90015	Monica Rebellon
20	Alejandra Perez	1701 West 14th 90015	Alejandra Perez
21	Alliana Turner	1705 W 14 90015	Alliana Turner
22	STEVIE REIMER	1705 W 14th St 90015	STEVIE REIMER
23	Jonathan Muench	1705 W 14 90015	Jonathan Muench
24	MARIA PERRONI	1357 CONSTANCE ST 90015	MARIA PERRONI
25	MANUEL TORRES	1357 Constance St 90015	MANUEL TORRES
26	Graciela Mahr	1405 Constance St.	Graciela Mahr
27	SIRICO WARD	1409 Constance St	SIRICO WARD
28	Alvin Viera	1421 Constance St	Alvin Viera
29	Maria Viera	1421 Constance St	Maria Viera
30	Luis Viera	1421 Constance St	Luis Viera
31	Daniel Benitez	1437 Constance St.	Daniel Benitez
32	Juvenina Benitez	1437 1/2 Constance St	Juvenina Benitez

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

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

1	Alfredo Ponce	1436 1/2 Constance St	
2	Irma de la rosa	1436 1/2 Constance St.	
3	FURORA CORONA	1354 Constance St.	
4	YASMIN MERO CORONA	1354 Constance St	
5	CARLOS CARRILLO	1322 Constance St	
6	Saira Castillo	1322 Constance St.	
7	Amalia Najera	1316 CONSTANCE ST LA	Amalia Najera
8	Jaime A. Garcia	1433 Constance St	Jaime A. Garcia
9	MAIRIS ZELAY	1424 Constance	
10	Guillermo Baicomp	1424 Constance	
11	JOSE M. GARCIA	1336 Constance St	
12	Juana Lara	1334 Constance 9005	Juana Lara
13	Jose Ake	1334 Constance St	
14	Maria Garcia	1337 S Constance St #1	
15	Yasmin Ake	1334 S Constance	
16	Archilung Garcia	1337 S. Constance	
17	Oscar Garcia	1337 S Constance	
18	Jose Garcia	1337 S Constance	
19	Maria de la Cruz Garcia	1336 1/2 Constance	
20	Genesto Gomez	1346 Constance	
21	Maria Angeles Medina	1340 Constance	Maria Angeles Medina
23	FURORA CORONA	1354 Constance St	
24	FURORA CORONA	1354 Constance St.	
25	YASMIN MERO CORONA	1354 Constance St	
26	EUIS DIAZ	1410 Constance St	
27	Isleto Soriano	1350 Constance St	
28	Cesar Soriano	1350 Constance St	
29	Martha Eyzaguirre	1357 Constance St	
30	Manuel Soriano	1357 Constance St	
31	ALFONSO SORIANO	1358 CONSTANCE ST	
32	Maria Tolalpa	1328 Constance St	
33	Maria Lopez	1331 S Constance #1	
34	Bridget Nares	1335 Constance St #2	
35	Diego Mundy	1331 S Constance St #4	Diego Mundy
36	Chralia Najera	1318 Constance St #1	Chralia Najera
37	Jose A. Najera	1318 Constance St #1	Jose A. Najera
38	CARLOS MONTERRA	1331 CONSTANCE #2	
39	Winston Del Real	1407 Constance St #1	
40	Henry Carlos	1414 1/2 Constance	
41	Rene Herrera	1408 Constance	
42	Roberto Herrera	1408 Constance	

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

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

	PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
69.	Sarah Carrillo	1322 Constance St. LA CA	Sarah Carrillo
70.	Estela Martinez	1322 Constance St. LA CA	Estela Martinez
* 71.	Raquel Carrillo	1324 1/4 Constance St	Raquel Carrillo
72.	Carla Carrillo	1322 Constance St	Carla Carrillo
* 73.	Israel Jotalpa	1328 Constance St	Israel Jotalpa
* 74.	JOSE MEDINA	1331 CONSTANCE	Jose Medina
* 75.	Marcel Martinez	1341 Constance St.	Marcel Martinez
* 76.	Yajaira Cerna	1341 Constance St.	Yajaira Cerna
* 77.	MAURICIO DIAZ	1341 Constance St	Mauricio Diaz
* 78.	IVAN CERVANTES	1341 Constance St	Ivan Cervantes
* 79.	Tom Diaz	1341 Constance St	Tom Diaz
* 80.	Lucas Clayton	1345 Constance St Apt 5	Lucas Clayton
* 81.	Estela Tobar	1438 Constance St	Estela Tobar
* 82.	Alvin Viera	1481 Constance St	Alvin Viera
83.	ALFONSO RENDERO	1401 S BUR LINGTON #22	Alfonso Rendo
84.	Humberto Rangel	1346 S. Burlington Ave	Humberto Rangel
85.	Lupe Rangel	1346 S. Burlington Ave	Lupe Rangel
86.	Kelley Manzo	1346 S. Burlington Ave	Kelley Manzo
87.	Christopher Rangel	1346 S. Burlington Ave	Christopher Rangel
88.	Wendy Rangel	1346 S. Burlington Ave	Wendy Rangel
89.	Gloria Perry	1400 S Burlington Ave	Gloria Perry
90.	Marjaret Jones	1317 S. Westlake Ave	Marjaret Jones
91.	Anthony Vasquez	1317 S. Westlake Ave.	Anthony Vasquez
92.	MICHAEL RIEGER	1317 S. WESTLAKE AVE	Michael Rieger
93.	JANET DELREAL	1317 S. WESTLAKE AVE	Janet DelReal
94.	JOAN RIEGER	1317 S Westlake Ave	Joan Rieger
95.	ARMANDO MORALES	1617 W 14TH ST.	Armando Morales
96.	ANAMORALE	1617 W 14TH ST	Anamorale
97.	REYNALDO GONZALEZ	1620 W 14TH Street	Reynaldo Gonzalez
98.	David Johnson	1406 S. Union Ave	David Johnson
99.	Vera Vega	1424 S Union LA	Vera Vega
100.	Isabel Vega	1424 S Union CA	Isabel Vega
101.	Isabel Vega	1424 S Union CA	Isabel Vega
102.	ISABEL VEGA	1415 S. UNION AVE. LA 90015	Isabel Vega
103.	AND NIE TO	1411 S. BURLINGTON AVE #4	And NIE TO
104.	NANCY E. VEGA ESTRA	1415 S. UNION AVE. LA 90015	Nancy E. Vega Estrada
105.	CARLOS A. ESTRADA	1415 S Union Ave	Carlos A. Estrada
* 106.	Alex Melgarejo	1436 1/2 Constance St LA CA	Alex Melgarejo
* 107.	OSCAR VARELA	1325 S. Constance St Apt X	Oscar Varela
* 108.	PATRICIA VARELA	1325 S. Constance St Apt X	Patricia Varela
* 109.	Angela Campos	1337 Constance Apt 3	Angela Campos
* 110.	Isabel Vega	1337 Constance Apt 3	Isabel Vega
* 111.	Carlos Alar	1337 Constance St #6.	Carlos Alar
* 112.	Judana E. Alar	1337 Constance St #6. LA	Judana E. Alar
113.	Isabel	1359 Union Ave	Isabel

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

Petition Against Equitas' Proposed Traffic Plan

	PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
* 24.	Edwin Palencia	1447 1/2 Constance St	[Signature]
* 25.	Fernando Torres	1436 Constance St	[Signature]
* 26.	JOSE Palencia	1447 1/2 Constance St	[Signature]
* 27.	Mylia Bonagel	1430 Constance St	[Signature]
* 28.	Quilley Colburn	1430 Constance St	[Signature]
* 29.	Maria Zelaya	1414 Constance St	[Signature]
30.	Raymond Scott	1314 So. BONAVILLE AVE	Raymond Scott
31.	Edu Rodriguez	14315 Union Ave - W.A. CO.	[Signature]
32.	Natalia Rodriguez	14335 Union Ave	[Signature]
33.	Jose Rodriguez	14335 Union Ave	[Signature]
* 34.	JOSE ZAMORA	1430 S CONSTANCE	[Signature]
* 35.	ESTER ZAMORA	1430 S CONSTANCE	[Signature]
* 36.	JOSE Hernandez	1438 S Constance	[Signature]
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.			

\* Denotes Constance Street residents on page 4

**Applicant Copy**  
Office: Downtown  
Application Invoice No: 69009

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: 2020353001-55, Amount: \$109.47, Paid Date: 12/18/2020**

Applicant: CORONA, ANDREW AND YASMIN ( 213-3801940 )
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
<b>Case Total</b>			<b>\$89.00</b>

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

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



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:2020353001-55, Amount:\$109.47, Paid Date:12/18/2020

Applicant: CORONA, ANDREW AND YASMIN ( 213-3801940 )
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: \_\_\_\_\_