ORIGINAL



APPLICATIONS:

APPEAL APPLICATION

This application is to be used for any appeals authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) for discretionary actions administered by the Department of City Planning.

1.	APPELLANT BODY/CASE INFORMATION				
	Appellant Body:				
	☐ Area Planning Commission ☐ City Planning Commission ☐ City Council ☐ Director of Planning				
	Regarding Case Number: Case No. CPC-2016-2848-VZC-HD-CUB-SPR; ENV-2016-2849-EIR				
	Project Address: 6100-6116 W Hollywood Blvd, 1633-1649 N. Gower Street				
	Final Date to Appeal: 06/05/2019				
	Type of Appeal: □ Appeal by Applicant/Owner □ Appeal by a person, other than the Applicant/Owner, claiming to be aggrieved □ Appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety				
2.	APPELLANT INFORMATION				
	Appellant's name (print): Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility				
	Company:				
	Mailing Address: 4399 Santa Anita Ave., Suite 205				
	City: El Monte State: CA Zip: 91731				
	Telephone: (510) 836-4200 E-mail: richard@lozeaudrury.com				
	 Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on behalf of another party, organization or company? Self Other: 				
	● Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position? ☐ Yes ☑ No				
3.	REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION				
	Representative/Agent name (if applicable): Richard Drury				
	Company: Lozeau Drury, LLP				
	Mailing Address: 1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150				
	City: Oakland State: CA Zip: 94612				
	Tolophono: (510) 836-4200 E-mail: richard@lozeaudrupy.com				

4.	JUSTIFICATION/REASON FOR APPEAL							
	Is the entire decision, or only parts of it being appealed?	☑ Entire	☐ Part					
	Are specific conditions of approval being appealed?	☑ Yes	□ No					
	If Yes, list the condition number(s) here: All Conditions		_					
	Attach a separate sheet providing your reasons for the appeal. Your reason must state:							
The reason for the appeal								
	 Specifically the points at issue Why you believe the decision-maker erred or abused their discretion 							
5.	APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT							
0.	I certify that the statements contained in this application are of							
		Date: May 23, 2019						
	Appellant Signature:		Date.					
6. FILING REQUIREMENTS/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION								
 Eight (8) sets of the following documents are required for <u>each</u> appeal filed (1 original and 7 duplicates): Appeal Application (form CP-7769) 								
						Justification/Reason for AppealCopies of Original Determination Letter		
	 A Filing Fee must be paid at the time of filing the appeal per LAMC Section 19.01 B. 							
 Original applicants must provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) (required to contain their 85% appeal filling fee). All appeals require noticing per the applicable LAMC section(s). Original Applicants must provide notice the LAMC, pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of the receipt 								
					 Appellants filing an appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety per LAMC 			
 12.26 K are considered Original Applicants and must provide noticing per LAMC 12.26 K.7, pay mail to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of receipt. A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as represen CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC m file as an individual on behalf of self. 								
					 Appeals of Density Bonus cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants (must have documentation). 			
				 Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract (TT or VTT) by the Area Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the <u>date of the written determination</u> 				
	Commission.							
	 A CEQA document can only be appealed if a non-elected decision-making body (ZA, APC, CPC, etc.) makes a determination for a project that is not further appealable. [CA Public Resources Code ' 21151 (c)]. 							
	This Section for City Planning	g Staff Use O pty						
Ba	SE FEE. 1 99.00 Refuerred & Rubephed has		Date: 5-24-19					
D.	Deemed Complete by (Pro	ect Planner).	Date:					

☐ Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)

□ Determination authority notified

Justification/Reason for Appeal

Hollywood & Gower Project

Case No. CPC-2016-2848-VZC-HD-CUB-SPR; ENV-2016-2849-EIR

6100-6116 W. Hollywood Blvd., 1633-1649 N. Gower Street, Los Angeles, CA 90028 (Project Site)

REASON FOR THE APPEAL: The Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") prepared for the Hollywood & Gower Project (CPC-2016-2848-VZC-HD-CUB-SPR; ENV-2016-2849-EIR) ("Project") fails to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

SPECIFICALLY THE POINTS IN ISSUE: The EIR fails to adequately analyze environmental impacts of the Project, fails to adequately describe the environmental setting of the Project, and fails to propose all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce Project impacts. Specifically, the EIR found potentially significant impacts in the following categories: biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, and tribal cultural resources. It also found potentially significant impacts for one of the mandatory findings of significance required by CEQA. Appellant also believes the Project will have significant air quality impacts as well as greenhouse gas impacts. These potentially significant impacts must be analyzed in a revised EIR.

HOW YOU ARE AGGREIVED BY THE DECISION: Members of appellants Supporters Alliance for Environmental Rights ("SAFER") live in the vicinity of the proposed Project. They breathe the air, suffer traffic congestion, and will suffer other environmental impacts of the Project unless it is properly mitigated. Members of SAFER will be directly affected by soil contamination, improperly controlled construction equipment, and other risks during Project construction.

WHY YOU BELIEVE THE DECISION-MAKER ERRED OR ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION: The City Planning Commission approved the EIR, Vesting Zone Change and Height District Change, Conditional Use permit and Site Plan Review for the Project despite the fact that the EIR fails to comply with CEQA.