

ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

520 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 350
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4721

TEL: (916) 444-6201
FAX: (916) 444-6209

kcarmichael@adamsbroadwell.com

SO. SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000
SO. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

TEL: (650) 589-1660
FAX: (650) 589-5062

KEVIN T. CARMICHAEL
CHRISTINA M. CARO
THOMAS A. ENSLOW
KELILAH D. FEDERMAN
RICHARD M. FRANCO
ANDREW J. GRAF
TANYA A. GULESSERIAN
DARIEN K. KEY
RACHAEL E. KOSS
AIDAN P. MARSHALL
TARA C. RENGIFO
MICHAEL R. SEVILLE

Of Counsel
MARC D. JOSEPH
DANIEL L. CARDOZO

May 13, 2022

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

City of Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Samantha Millman, President
c/o, Cecilia Lamas, Commission Executive Assistant
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street, Suite 525
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Email: cpc@lacity.org
Online Portal: <https://plncts.lacity.org/oas>

VIA EMAIL

Michelle Carter, Planner (michelle.carter@lacity.org)

Re: Appeal of Advisory Agency Approval of the CEQA Categorical Exemption and Vesting Tentative Tract Map for Bronson Residential Tower Project (VTT-83510-CN-HCA, ENV-2021-6887-CE; Related Case: CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA)

Dear President Millman, Commissioners, and Ms. Carter:

On behalf of the **Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development Los Angeles (“CREED LA”)**, we submit this appeal of the City of Los Angeles Deputy Advisory Agency’s (“Advisory Agency”) approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map (“VTTM”) and certification of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) ¹ Class 32 Categorical Exemption (“Categorical Exemption”) for the Bronson Residential Tower Project Case No. VTT-83510-CN-HCA, CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA, ENV-2021-6887-CE (“Project”), proposed by 1717 Bronson LLC (“Applicant”).²

¹ Pub. Resources Code (“PRC”) §§ 21000 et seq.; 14 Cal. Code Regs. (“CCR” or “CEQA Guidelines”) §§ 15000 et seq.

² City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/-MjQ5OTYx0.LG058-004acp>

May 13, 2022

Page 2

On March 23, 2022, CREED LA submitted comments to the Hearing Officer to address the City's Categorical Exemption Document³ ("Categorical Exemption") which incorrectly proposes to exempt the Project from environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Our March 23, 2022 comments are attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

The Project's VTTM and Categorical Exemption were considered by the Advisory Agency on behalf of the City Planning Commission ("CPC") at the March 23, 2022 joint meeting of the Deputy Advisory Agency and Hearing Officer.⁴ Following the hearing, the Advisory Agency took the Project under advisement.

On May 5, 2022, the Advisory Agency issued a Letter of Determination⁵ ("LOD") adopting the Categorical Exemption, approving the Vesting Tentative Tract Map for the Project and making related findings under CEQA and the Subdivision Map Act. The LOD indicates that the appeal period for the determination ends on May 16, 2022.

This letter supplements CREED LA's Appeal Application, filed concurrently herewith. In accordance with City requirements, this appeal is accompanied by an appeal filing fee of \$158. This appeal is based on each of the reasons set forth herein and in the attached and referenced exhibits.

For the reasons discussed our March 23 comments and herein, we urge the Planning Commission to find that the Project does not comply with CEQA or the Subdivision Map Act, and does not qualify for the Categorical Exemption approved by the City. CREED LA respectfully requests that the City Planning Commission ("CPC") remand the Project to Staff to prepare a legally adequate environmental impact report ("EIR") to fully disclose and mitigate the Project's potentially significant environmental impacts.

³ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Categorical Exemption, Bronson Residential Tower Project, Case Number: ENV-2021-6887-EAF (February 2022).

⁴ City of Los Angeles, Notice of Public Hearing, 1715-1739 North Bronson Avenue (March 23, 2022) <https://planning.lacity.org/dcpapi/meetings/document/71659>

⁵ City of Los Angeles, Letter of Determination, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 83510-CN 1715 - 1739 North Bronson Avenue Hollywood Community Plan Related Case: CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDIHCA (May 5, 2022) <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/document/MjE4NTA0/1823a-02c-5d95-4003-95c4-258347c32f18/pdd>

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

CREED LA is an unincorporated association of individuals and labor organizations that may be adversely affected by the potential public and worker health and safety hazards, and the environmental and public service impacts of the Project. The coalition includes the Sheet Metal Workers Local 105, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 11, Southern California Pipe Trades District Council 16, and District Council of Iron Workers of the State of California, along with their members, their families, and other individuals who live and work in the City of Los Angeles.

Individual members of CREED LA and its member organizations, including John Ferruccio, Jorge L. Aceves, John P. Bustos, Gerry Kennon and Chris S. Macias live, work, recreate and raise their families in the City of Los Angeles and surrounding communities. Accordingly, they would be directly affected by the Project's environmental and health and safety impacts. Individual members may also work on the Project itself. They will be first in line to be exposed to any health and safety hazards that exist onsite.

In addition, CREED LA has an interest in enforcing environmental laws that encourage sustainable development and ensure a safe working environment for its members. Environmentally detrimental projects can jeopardize future jobs by making it more difficult and more expensive for business and industry to expand in the region, and by making the area less desirable for new businesses and new residents. Indeed, continued environmental degradation can, and has, caused construction moratoriums and other restrictions on growth that, in turn, reduce future employment opportunities.

II. REASONS FOR APPEAL

CREED LA hereby appeals all actions taken by the Advisory Agency and described in the LOD dated May 5, 2022. The reasons for this appeal are set forth in the attached comments and exhibits, including CREED LA's March 23, 2022 comment letter to the Advisory Agency, as well as the comments of air quality experts James Clark, Ph.D., acoustics expert Derek Watry and transportation expert Daniel Smith.⁶ Reasons include violations of CEQA, local land use codes, and of the Subdivision Map Act. We incorporate by reference all comments included in

⁶ Attached as Exhibit 1.
LG058-004acp

May 13, 2022

Page 4

the expert letters, as well as our earlier comments to the Advisory Agency, which are in the City's record of proceedings for the Project.

The LOD states that the Advisory Agency determined that the Project is exempt from CEQA and adopted the Categorical Exemption pursuant to CEQA, despite the fact that the City has not approved the Project's remaining entitlements. It would be premature and improper for the City to adopt the Categorical Exemption for the Project at this time because the Project has not been fully approved. The remaining entitlements required for the Project are part of the Project, and must be considered and acted upon before the City can make a final CEQA determination for the Project.

Additionally, our attached comments conclude that the Project's construction air quality impacts, operational air quality impacts, construction noise impacts and transportation impacts were not analyzed, in violation of CEQA. As a result, the City failed to accurately disclose the severity of these impacts and failed to mitigate them by relying on an inapplicable CEQA exemption to approve the Project.

Finally, the City improperly approved the VTTM for the Project notwithstanding the Project's significant air quality, noise, transportation and cumulative effects, which should have precluded the City from making the findings required under the Subdivision Map Act to approve the VTTM.⁷

A. The Advisory Agency's Exemption Determination Was Premature and Unsupported

It is well-settled that a CEQA document cannot be approved before the underlying project has been approved.⁸ An agency decision to approve a project is not final if it may be reviewed by appealing the decision to a higher administrative body.⁹ Accordingly, approval cannot occur until all administrative appeals have

⁷ Gov Code §§66473.5, 66474(a), (b), (e), (f), (g).

⁸ See, e.g., *County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 931, 963; *Coalition for an Equitable Westlake/Macarthur Park v. City of Los Angeles* (2020) 47 Cal.App.5th 368, 379; *Stockton Citizens for Sensible Planning v. City of Stockton*, 48 Cal. 4th 481, 489; *Coalition for Clean Air v. City of Visalia* (2012) 209 Cal.App.4th 408, 418-25.

⁹ *Alta Loma School Dist. V. San Bernardino County Comm. On Sch. Dist. Reorganization* (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 542 (CEQA action against county committee challenging school reorganization plan was premature because final decision to approve plan and decide CEQA issues must be made by State Bd. Of Equalization).

May 13, 2022

Page 5

been exhausted.¹⁰ This is consistent with CEQA's requirement that a lead agency consider the "whole of an action."¹¹ This includes all phases of a project that are reasonably foreseeable.¹² As the courts have held, "[t]he purpose of CEQA is to inform the public of plans, so that the public can help guide decision makers about environmental choices. It is not the purpose of CEQA to foment prophylactic litigation."¹³

The Advisory Agency circumvented these basic CEQA requirements by approving the VTTM and making factual findings that the Project is exempt from CEQA before the CPC considered the Project's remaining entitlements. The Advisory Agency conducted a single hearing for the Project on March 23, 2022, at which it considered all of the Project's entitlements, including the VTTM. Following the hearing, the Agency made a recommendation to the CPC to approve the Project's principal entitlements, including: a density bonus pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(c)(1); Site Plan Review pursuant to LAMC Section 16.05; an on-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(8); an off-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(3); a waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1); a waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1); a maximum required parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(p)(2)(A); and a waiver of dedications and improvements (WDIs) pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I.¹⁴ The City has scheduled these entitlements to be heard by the CPC on June 23, 2022.

Rather than make a recommendation on the VTTM, the Advisory Agency approved the VTTM (subject to the appeal provisions of the LAMC), and made specific findings of fact that the Project is exempt from CEQA under the Class 32 Infill Exemption and that the "proposed project and potential impacts were analyzed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines."¹⁵ Because the Project's remaining entitlements are yet to be

¹⁰ See *Sea and Sage Audubon Society, Inc. v. Planning Comm'n of City of Anaheim* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 412.

¹¹ 14 CCR § 15378; *Habitat & Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz* (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 1277, 1297.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (1997) 63 Cal.App.4th 227, 242.

¹⁴ CE, p. 1.

¹⁵ LOD, p. 12.

considered by the CPC on June 23, 2022, the Advisory Agency's Categorical Exemption findings were premature and piecemealed, as the whole of the action was not before it and the VTTM is subject to administrative appeal to higher decision making bodies within the City.

The CPC should vacate the Advisory Agency's premature CEQA findings related to the VTTM and the Project.

B. The Project is Not Exempt From CEQA

As discussed in our prior comments, the City's findings that the Project is categorically exempt fail to comply with CEQA. To date, the City has failed to address or resolve the issues CREED LA raised in its March 23, 2022 comments. The Categorical Exemption document failed to adequately analyze the Project's impacts related to air quality, noise impacts, transportation impacts, and adverse effects on public health and safety, and failed to disclose that the Project has potentially significant impacts, which render exemptions inapplicable. As a result of the unsupported exemption findings, the City also failed to adopt mitigation measures capable of reducing the Project's potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels, leaving major Project impacts significant and unmitigated. As a result of these ongoing impacts, the Project is not exempt from CEQA and the City cannot make the findings required under State and City laws to issue the Project's land use entitlements.

Furthermore, categorical exemptions necessarily include an implied finding that the project has no significant effect on the environment. Public agencies utilizing such exemptions must support their determination with substantial evidence.¹⁶ The City lacks substantial evidence to support a conclusion that the Project meets the Class 32 exemption requirements and is not subject to any exceptions to categorical exemptions. Rather, the record shows that the Project is likely to result in potentially significant impacts that were not disclosed or analyzed by the City before it concluded that the Project is exempt from CEQA review. An EIR is required to analyze and mitigate these impacts.

¹⁶ PRC § 21168.5.
LG058-004acp

1. The City Failed to Analyze the Health Risk Impacts of Project Construction to On-Site Workers and Nearby Sensitive Receptors

We previously provided comments detailing that the City failed to complete a quantified health risk analysis (“HRA”) which is commonly conducted to determine if a Project’s construction hazardous air pollutant (“HAP”) emissions would cause a significant health impact.¹⁷ The HRA is based on pollutants other than conventional air quality pollutants; that is, other than ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, and SO₂.

Construction equipment emits diesel particulate matter (“DPM”), which is a HAP and a potent carcinogen.¹⁸ Construction workers and nearby residents and sensitive receptors will be exposed to DPM emissions during Project construction.

In addition to failing to measure the impacts to nearby residents and construction workers, the City failed to quantify the health risks to the future residents of the Project due to the Project’s proximity to the 101 Freeway. An EIR must be prepared which adequately links the Project’s air quality effects to human health consequences.¹⁹

2. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Noise Impacts

We previously provided substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project has potentially significant noise impacts and that the Categorical Exemption document failed to support is construction noise reference levels with substantial

¹⁷ Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment, February 2015; may be requested at <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf>.

¹⁸ Cal/EPA OEHHA and American Lung Association of California, Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust; <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/calenviroscreen/indicators/diesel4-02.pdf>. See also OEHHA, Appendix A: Hot Spots Unit Risk and Cancer Potency Values, p. 1 (DPM unit risk = 3 E-4); <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/CPFs042909.pdf> and OEHHA, Diesel Exhaust Particulate; [https://oehha.ca.gov/chemicals/diesel-exhaust-particulate#:~:text=Cancer%20Potency%20Information&text=Listed%20as%20Particulate%20Emissions%20from,\(ug%2Fm3\)%20D1](https://oehha.ca.gov/chemicals/diesel-exhaust-particulate#:~:text=Cancer%20Potency%20Information&text=Listed%20as%20Particulate%20Emissions%20from,(ug%2Fm3)%20D1).

¹⁹ *Sierra Club v. County of Fresno* (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 519; *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield* (2004) 134 Cal.App.4th 1184, 1220 (“After reading the EIRs, the public would have no idea of the health consequences that result when more pollutants are added to a nonattainment basin. On remand, the health impacts resulting from the adverse air quality impacts must be identified and analyzed in the new EIRs.”).

evidence. Our comments detailed that construction noise levels from the Project will result in an increase of between 9.6 dBA and 17.1 dBA at the receptors nearest to the Project site, resulting in a significant impact.

This issue renders the Project inapplicable for a CEQA exemption, remains unresolved, and the Project's construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors remain unmitigated, in violation of CEQA.

3. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Impacts from Transportation

We previously provided substantial evidence showing that the Project's contribution to transportation impacts is potentially significant. Additionally, CREED LA proposed feasible mitigation measures that could lessen the Project's impacts. The City failed to address the Project's transportation impacts and they remain significant and unmitigated.

4. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Cumulative Impacts

As discussed in our previous comments, the Project is likely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment.²⁰ Project construction will require the use of heavy equipment and heavy-duty trucks diesel powered. Diesel exhaust contains TACs that would represent a potential hazard to workers on site and to the surrounding community.²¹

Additionally, the City failed to properly analyze the Project's contribution to the deterioration of levels of service ("LOS") at nearby intersections. As demonstrated in our comments there is clearly a significant cumulative impact resulting from the Project plus other concurrent projects in the area.

The Project's cumulative air quality and transportation impacts constitute an exception to a Class 32 Categorical Exemption under CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2(b). The City must prepare an EIR to evaluate the Project's cumulative transportation impacts.

²⁰ CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

²¹ Clark Comments, p. 4.

May 13, 2022

Page 9

C. The City Improperly Approved the Project Under the Subdivision Map Act

The Subdivision Map Act requires a lead agency to make findings that a proposed subdivision is consistent with the general plan/specific plan, and does not have any detrimental environmental or public health effects. The City is unable to make these mandatory findings because the Project has unmitigated, adverse impacts in each of these areas. Moreover, the Categorical Exemption and LOD fail to provide substantial evidence to meet either of these legal standards.

As discussed in our previous comments, the Project will conflict with the City's adopted Mobility Plan which is an element of the City's General Plan. Additionally, there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project will result in significant impacts related to air quality, public health, noise, and transportation that the City has not analyzed or mitigated. The threats to public health posed by the Project cannot be ignored and necessarily contravene the findings required to approve the Project under the Map Act.

The City must prepare an EIR that analyzes the Projects potentially significant impacts and implement mitigation to address those impacts before it is able to make the findings required under the Map Act.

III. CONCLUSION

CREED LA respectfully requests that the City set a hearing on this appeal, and that the Planning Commission uphold this appeal and vacate the Advisory Agency's CEQA and Subdivision Map Act findings, as well as its adoption of the Categorical Exemption and the Vesting Tentative Tract Map.

Sincerely,



Kevin Carmichael

Attachment

KTC:acp

L6058-004acp



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: VTT-83510-CN

Project Address: 1715 - 1739 North Bronson Avenue

Final Date to Appeal: 05/16/2022

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
Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility

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: Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility

Company/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: 4399 Santa Anita Avenue, Ste 2005

City: El Monte State: CA Zip: 91731

Telephone: (510) 836-4200 E-mail: richard@lozeaudrury.com

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

- Self Other: CREED LA

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

4. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION

Representative/Agent name (if applicable): Amalia Bowley Fuentes

Company: Lozeau Drury LLP

Mailing Address: 1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150

City: Oakland State: CA Zip: 94612

Telephone: (510) 836-4200 E-mail: amalia@lozeaudrury.com

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: All Conditions

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: *Kevin P. ...* Date: May 13, 2022

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 COMMUNITES (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:	Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner):	Date:
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)