

**DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

CAROLINE CHOE
VICE-PRESIDENT

HELEN CAMPBELL
JENNA HORNSTOCK
HELEN LEUNG

YVETTE LOPEZ-LEDESMA
KAREN MACK
DANA M. PERLMAN
RENEE DAKE WILSON

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA**



ERIC GARCETTI
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

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

July 20, 2022

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 CLASS 3 AND CLASS 32 CATEGORICAL EXEMPTIONS (CASE NO. ENV-2021-602-CE) FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7870-7900 GRANITO DRIVE WITHIN THE HOLLYWOOD COMMUNITY PLAN AREA (22-0326)

At its meeting on March 8, 2022, the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners approved an application to export 3,300 cubic yards of earth from the above-referenced property, subject to the conditions specified in the Department's report dated March 2, 2022, and found that the project was categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to the Notice of Exemption prepared by the Department of City Planning. Subsequent to the Department of Building and Safety Board of Commissioners action, an appeal of the decision was filed for City Council reconsideration. The Appellant claims that the Haul Route will endanger the public health, safety, and welfare; and that the project does not qualify for a Class 32 or Class 3 Categorical Exemption.

In the Appellant justification dated March 18, 2022, the Appellant claims that the project does not comply with the Continuous Paved Roadway requirements in the Municipal Code (LAMC Section 12.21. C.10(i)(3)) and that the project will require additional entitlements from the City in the form of a Zoning Administrator Determination ("ZAD") to permit roadways which are less than 20 feet in width from the project site to the base of the Hillside Area. Per the Appellant, there are portions of roadways which are insufficient, ranging in width from 19'-0" to 19'-11". The Appellant claims that the project, as previously approved, will not comply with applicable zoning regulations, and as such the use of the Class 32 Categorical Exemption was improper.

However, the Applicant has noted that there are some "pinch points" in the roadway along Granito Drive and Orange Grove Avenue, and that these roadway areas are in some instances a few inches short of 20 feet in width. The applicant has noted that these areas have been reviewed by their engineer and roadway widening in these locations will be incorporated into their existing B Permit with the Bureau of Engineering (BR004611). Therefore, the project will be in compliance with all applicable zoning requirements and the use of the Class 32 Categorical Exemption is appropriate.

The Appellant also claims that the use of the Class 3 Categorical Exemption was improper, claiming that the City has failed to analyze the biological impacts of the Project and that the site has value as habitat for Mountain lions (*Puma concolor*). The Appellant does not provide evidence to substantiate their claims, instead, they claim that a Mountain lion has been observed in the Lookout Mountain area approximately a linear mile away from the project site, claim that deer have been observed in vacant hillside areas and could be a potential food source, and claim that the site is within the Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy Eastern Santa Monica Habitat Linkage Map and identified as a “Predicated Habitat Suitability” area. These claims are not supported by evidence, data, or reports by licensed Biologists, and as such, no facts were submitted in the administrative record to conclude that the project will have an impact on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

Regardless, the Applicant has provided a revised Tree Report (dated May 3, 2022) and a new Mountain Lion Habitat Assessment Report (dated May 31, 2022) to bolster the existing environmental analysis and support the previous conclusion that the project will not have an environmental impact due to unusual circumstances. The previous Tree Report did not reference two plant species which were recently designated by the City as protected species (Mexican elderberry and Toyon), however the new Tree Report addresses both species, neither of which are on the site. As such, the project will not result in impacts to any protected tree or shrubs. Additionally, although the record does not show that the project will have any biological impacts, the Applicant is also revising their project description to incorporate a project design feature – that walls and fences will not be construction within the 15-foot rear yard setback portion of the property in order to provide unobstructed areas of the site for wildlife.

Regarding Mountain Lion habitat and suitability, according to the Mountain Lion Habitat Assessment by South Environmental, dated May 31, 2022, the project poses no risk to mountain lions and no mountain lion habitat would be impacted from the development. There is no evidence that the site is used for Mountain lion wildlife connectivity; the non-native vegetation on-site is not sufficient for hunting of prey; and there are no caves, natural cavities, or rock outcrops in the area sufficient for breeding. As such, the project will not result in a significant effect on mountain lion habitat, there are no unusual circumstances which may lead to a significant effect on the environment, and the use of the Class 3 Categorical Exemption is appropriate. A revised Notice of Exemption has been submitted to the file to incorporate the findings of the Mountain Lion Habitat Assessment report and the revised Project description.

As noted above, the Appellant has not submitted to the record any substantial evidence which validate their assertions that the Class 3 or Class 32 Categorical Exemptions are inadequate, and the Department of City Planning recommends that the revised Notice of Exemption should be incorporated in the City Council’s action.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Director of Planning

Deborah Kahen
Deborah Kahen, AICP
Senior City Planner

VPB:JC:DK:VKJ