

Communication from Public

Name: Brent

Date Submitted: 09/21/2021 03:21 PM

Council File No: 21-0646

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Brent and I would like to comment in support of the appeal about the development proposal at 1432 S Beverly Dr. It should be known that this approval happened without any notice nor was it listed on the CPC agenda. No one knew about it in the neighborhood, and many still don't, because it was never mailed to anyone or posted anywhere. Last we heard the project was deemed DENIED. This project should not be allowed to go forward and be approved on the basis of this and so many other logical and important reasons. I am a rental tenant that lives at the neighboring property just south of the proposed lot. The property I live on is two, two-story buildings that are modest and charming and were built in 1941. Just like the property up for demolition, these buildings have a lot of historical character and fit in perfectly with the surrounding neighborhood. There are no other buildings on Beverly Drive south of Alcott that are taller than 4 stories. This plan for a 6 story building is extremely excessive in its scope and height, will drastically alter the look and feel of the neighborhood, and will block the sun and sky, especially from my home's point of view. This type of modern development will provide absolutely no benefit to the community here. It's short-sided, excessive, it's not what the community wants or deserves, and is not the way LA should be developing it's charming and historical neighborhoods. This is purely being done for the greedy quick profit of the developers who are oil and gas moguls and have no ties to the community here whatsoever. The parking will be a total mess, the strain on resources and the environment is extreme, and it realistically will mainly only create rental units that are far more expensive than what was there before, displacing people like myself who live and work in the area and are already paying way too much for rent at the current prices. Also, the demolition and construction will be a massive and prolonged noise and area nuisance, possibly going on for many, many months, or even years, right at time when working from home is still happening and encouraged due to the pandemic, and rightfully having a quiet and peaceful home is the most important thing for this community at this trying and stressful time. I am for conscious and needed development for the community as long as it's up to the standards of government LAMC code, provides a real benefit to the community, and fits in

appropriately with the adjoining architecture and vibe, this project clearly does not and doesn't have the community's best interest in its plans.

Communication from Public

Name: Kevin

Date Submitted: 09/21/2021 01:52 PM

Council File No: 21-0646

Comments for Public Posting: Good afternoon, Committee members. My name is Kevin. I live in one of the buildings immediately adjacent to the site of the proposed project. I join in, and affirm, Alison Block's appeal on my behalf. In further support of the appeal, I have two additional points. 1. CPC had no authority to approve a 13-unit project in lieu of the 15-unit project which was described in the applicant's CUP/density bonus application and which was presented for approval during the CPC meeting in February. "Any determination [of a density bonus application] ... shall be based on the development project at the time the application is deemed complete." Gov. Code §65915(a)(a)(3)(D)(ii). The applicant's completed CUP/density bonus application requested approval of a 15-unit project, "with 20% of the base density set aside for Very Low Income Households," as well as four separate "incentives" involving side setbacks, Floor Area Ratio, height and open space. As support for the application, the applicant submitted architectural plans for a 15-unit building, and DCP staff recommended approval of those plans based on the applicant's agreement to set aside two units for VLI households. After DCP staff realized that the applicant's proposal to set aside two VLI units was insufficient under the City's density bonus rules, LAMC §12.22-A,25 et seq., DCP staff unilaterally prepared, and CPC staff signed, a "corrected" LOD which falsely states that CPC actually considered and approved a 13-unit project during the February CPC meeting. That never happened. No plans or proposal for a 13-unit project was presented in this case at any time. But even so, CPC could not approve any 13-unit project in the absence of a "completed" application for the project, including completed architectural plans and all other documents required to present the project for CPC's review and determination under the statutory and regulatory rules for density bonus applications. 2. Although the applicant sought to modify four different "development standards" listed on the City's "Menu of Incentives", LAMC §12.22-A,25(f), the applicant and CPC describe two of these incentives (reduced side setbacks and Increased height) to be "Off-Menu" incentives. The obvious purpose of attempting to reclassify these two "On-Menu" incentives as "Off-Menu" is to avoid the express restrictions on modification of these development standards under subsection (f) of the density bonus

rules, and to prevent any appeal from CPC's disregard of these standards. Despite their semantic games, the applicant and DCP staff know that any increase in height, and any reduction in setbacks, must comply with the restrictions set out in subsection (f) of the City's density bonus rules, and may not be circumvented under in the discretion of CPC of DCP staff under subsection (g)(3). Under subsection (g)(3), an "Off-Menu" incentive may be allowed for "any development standard(s) that is NOT included on the Menu of Incentives in [subsection (f)]." See LAMC §12.22-A,25(g)(3)(C)(i)). Because setbacks and height are "development standards," see Gov. Code §65915(o)(1)), and these development standards are included in the City's "Menu of Incentives" in LAMC §12.22-A,25(f), modification of either of them must comply with the restrictions expressly stated in subsection (f), and they may not be modified or "waived" under subsection (g)(3). Because the "corrected" LODs "approve" modifications to setbacks and height that are expressly prohibited under LAMC §12.22-A,25, CPC's 2nd Corrected LOD must be set aside.

Communication from Public

Name: Phillip Mcconnell

Date Submitted: 09/21/2021 08:16 AM

Council File No: 21-0646

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to oppose the construction of a very dense, 6-story high apartment complex built on the corner of S. Beverly drive and Alcott. I wasn't aware of the construction until my neighbor informed me this morning. The apartment will not have enough parking for its residents impacting available street parking for those of us who have lived here for some time. The existing building is a beautiful duplex that has history and to see it removed to build a large apartment complex that is too large for the space and not fitting with the existing neighborhood would be a terrible decision. I live right next door to where the proposed building would be constructed and a 6 building would totally block all views and sunlight to my building. Also, the construction that it's going to take to build such a massive project 5-7 days a week for months/years would cause so much loud noise and chaos in a typically quiet and peaceful neighborhood. Please reconsider building this large scale building elsewhere.