



## APPLICATIONS:

# APPEAL APPLICATION CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) Instructions and Checklist

**Related Code Section:** The Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 11.5.13 (Ord. No. 186,338) established the appeal procedure to the City Council for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determinations.

**Purpose:** *The Appeal* - A CEQA clearance can only be appealed if a non-elected decision-making body (ZA, APC, CPC, DIR) makes a determination for a project that is not further appealable. To initiate appeal of a CEQA document this form must be completely filled out with the required materials attached and filed within 15 calendar days from the final administrative decision, of the entitlement application.

### General Information

Appealable CEQA documents:

- Certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
- Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA)
- Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)
- Negative Declaration (ND)
- Categorical Exemption (CE)
- Sustainable Exemption (SE)

#### NOTE:

- Actions not appealable include an addendum, findings made pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, or an action in which the determination does not constitute a project under CEQA.
- All CEQA appeals are heard by the City Council.
- This form is only for the appeal of Department of City Planning determinations: All other CEQA appeals are filed with the City Clerk pursuant to the LAMC Section 197.01.
- 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.

### 1. Case Information

Environmental Case Number: ENV-2020-2123-CE

Related Entitlement Case Number(s): DIR-2020-2122-COA-DRB-SPP-1A

Project Address: 1122 W. 30th Street

Date of Final Entitlement Determination: 03/21/2021

The CEQA Clearance being appealed is a(n):

☐ EIR
 ☐ SCEA
 ☐ MND
 ☐ ND
 ☒ CE
 ☐ SE

### 2. Appellant Identity (check all that apply)

- ☐ Representative
 ☐ Property Owner
 ☒ Other Person
- ☐ Applicant
 ☐ Operator of the Use/Site

### 3. Appellant Information

Appellant Name: Jim Childs

Company/Organization: North University Park Community Association

Mailing Address: 2326 Scarff Street #1

City: Los Angeles

State: CA

Zip: 90007

Telephone: (213) 747-2526

E-mail: jeanjim2341@att.net

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

☒ Self ☒ Other: A

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. Appeal Justification

Attach a separate sheet providing your specific reasons for the appeal. Your reasons must state how you believe CEQA was incorrectly applied, providing a legal basis for the appeal.

#### 6. Applicant's Affidavit

I certify that the statements contained in this application are complete and true:

Appellant Signature:  Date: 3/21/2021

### ENVIRONMENTAL APPEAL FILING REQUIREMENTS

Note: City Clerk prepares mailing list for CEQA appeals per LAMC Section 11.5.13 E.

- 1. 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.

- ☐ Environmental Appeal Application (form CP-7840)
- ☐ Justification/Reason for Appeal
- ☐ Copies of the written Determination Letter, from the final appellate body, which must be a non-elected decision-making body

**2. 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. "Environmental Appeal Application.pdf", "Justification/Reason Statement.pdf", "Final Determination Letter.pdf"). No file should exceed 9.8 MB in size.

**3. Appeal Fee**

- ☐ Original Applicant - A fee equal to 85% of the original application fee of the Environmental case; provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) to calculate the fee per LAMC Section 19.01B 1.
- ☐ Other Persons - The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01B 1.

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)

## NORTH UNIVERSITY PARK COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION CEQA APPEAL FORM JUSTIFICATION AND CONTINUATION:

**ENV-2020-2123-CE, Case No. DIR-2020-2122-COA-DRB-SPP I / 1122 West 30th  
Street / CD-9**

On behalf of the North University Park Community Association (N.U.P.C.A.) and numerous other stakeholders, as aggrieved parties, we do object to and appeal the South Area Planning decision of March 17 and corrected letter of March 18, 2021 to determine that the Project is exempt from CEQA; and approving pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 11.5.7 and 12.20.3 K, and Section 2 of the North University Park Specific Plan, Ordinance 158.194 a Certificate of Appropriateness for the (COA) for the subject property at 1122 West 30th Street located in the North University Park Specific plan area.

### FAILURE TO MEET THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA

The proposed project is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and therefore does not qualify for a CE. While it meets **some** of the Standards, it fails to meet ALL the standards, removing it from the findings made in C. 12.20.3.K.4 (a) of the COA decision adopted by the SAPC.

Standard #9,

*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and **spatial relationships that characterize the property**. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing that protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*




Figure 1: Yellow shows the 3-story addition behind the historic building

Nothing in the decision evaluates the setting and spatial relationships in which the historic building is set which contributes to and is part of its character defining features. With the new proposed construction, the new 3 story duplex towers over the historic building and places new construction within 12 feet and 10, 5 feet of the historic property. Accessory buildings are supposed to be subservient to the historic building. This new construction is not.



It is an acknowledged basic tenet of the Standards that an addition or accessory building should remain subservient to the historic structure, an opinion often expressed by Lambert Giessinger, architect planner to the Cultural Heritage Commission.



As explained in section 8.9 of the **University Park Preservation Plan**, which is based on and *interprets* the Standards, which guides development north of the project site:

It is entirely possible that the renovation of the main building would meet the requirements of a Class 31 exemption if this alone were the scope of work before us. While a portion of the project may qualify under Class 31, the whole of the project does not fall under this Class of exemption. CEQA requires that the whole of the project be reviewed and in assessing the impacts of the whole of the project, a CE is not justifiable.

*Class 31 consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*

2



*with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* (1995), Weeks and Grimmer.

*To be considered eligible under this Class, a project must be clearly defined by the project proponent as a rehabilitation that is consistent with the Secretary's Standards.*

### **Class 32 Exemption/Exceptions pursuant to 15300.2**

The project fails to qualify under Class 32 Infill as it qualifies for an exception to the exemption pursuant to Section 15300.2.

**(c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2. Exceptions)**

According to the CEQA Guidelines, substantial evidence means *"enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached."*

Substantial evidence, which is defined in the CEQA statute to mean "facts, reasonable assumptions *predicated on facts, and expert opinion supported by facts*" (14 CCR § 15064.7(b)).

The Class 32 "Infill" Categorical Exemption (CEQA Guideline Section 15332), hereafter referred to as the Class 32 Exemption, exempts infill development within urbanized areas if it meets certain criteria. The class consists of environmentally benign infill projects that are consistent with the General Plan and Zoning requirements. This class is not intended for projects that would result in any significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality impacts.

A CE should not be issued when there are unusual circumstances creating the reasonable possibility of significant effects; The project may result in damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within an officially designated scenic highway.

A categorical exemption should not be issued when there are sensitive issues, and the project fails to comply with the south community stated objectives. To permit a CE in this case would cause irreparable and irreversible harm to the environment.

As the Title 14. California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act states:

*(a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located -- a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.*

*(b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.*

*(c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. (State CEQA Guidelines 15300.2 Exceptions)*

And

*(f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.*

That there are both unusual circumstances and sensitive issues present in this project is clear; that the area requires further the “*the purpose of such Specific Plan is to designate qualitative and quantitative standards to **regulate floor area ratios, the use of land and buildings, height and bulk of buildings**, architectural and landscape treatment, signs, and vehicular and pedestrian circulation.*” The Specific Plan was created because of the unusual circumstances and sensitive issues in the area, which the SAPC determination so completely ignores.

### **Failure to Comply with Adopted Plans**

The Specific Plan also was to serve the purposes of the South Community Plan. This decision is contrary to the expressed principles of the South Community plan which requires:

*LU2.1 Quality Design. Seek a high degree of architectural compatibility and landscaping for new infill development, as well as for additions to existing structures, in order to protect the character and scale of existing single family residential neighborhoods.*

*LU4-1 Architectural Compatibility. Seek a high degree of architectural compatibility and landscaping for new infill development to protect the historical and architectural character and scale of existing residential neighborhoods, including front yard fence location, design, and materials.*

A third unusual circumstance is the requirements of the Neighborhood Stabilization Ordinance which was adopted due to the over intensification of use for student housing of both new and existing housing stock: its objective is:

*(A) promote well planned housing to meet the needs of a college/university student housing, and the needs of the community.*

*(B) address impacts of multiple-habitable room projects which may be incompatible with surrounding development.*

*(C) encourage well-planned neighborhoods with adequate parking and to individually review proposed large multiple-habitable room projects.*

*(D) assure that the project provides adequate on-site parking.*

*(E) address a concentration of campus-serving housing in the vicinity.*

(LA City Ordinance 180218.)

The renovation of the existing historic building needs to comply with the NSO and nothing in the record indicates that it does so; another reason a CE ought not to be applied.

The failure of the Design Review Board to establish a quorum at its noticed meeting left a gaping hole in the process of fact finding resulting in the flawed COA. Not only was the board voice therefore absent, but those stakeholders also who attended the called meeting were unable to express their thoughts on this case. There were numerous stakeholders at the noticed Board meeting whose voice was never considered. Absent this, there was no "Directors Meeting" to receive public comment which may have helped guide and ameliorate this decision.

This placed the burden of scheduling a public hearing on the stakeholders who appealed to the South Area Planning Commission. One of the Commissioners found the appeal compelling and voted to sustain the appeal. We ask you to do so.

The SAPC Determination ignored lack of compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the South Community Plan, and nothing in the record shows compliance under the Neighborhood Stabilization Ordinance. Therefore, since there are clearly unusual circumstances, a CE is not adequate, and this project clearly falls under an Exception to the Exemption.

Even if the Project did fit within the Class 32 exemption, the exemption would be inapplicable because several exceptions to categorical exemptions apply (CEQA Guidelines § 15300.2.) "A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource." (CEQA Guidelines § 15300.2(f).) Under this exception, a categorical exemption cannot be relied upon if there is a fair argument supported by substantial evidence that the project may have a significant adverse impact on an historic resource. The specific plan area itself is a historic resource and the infill parcel cannot be separated from their context and justified at their present massing, scale, and design.

### **The District is the Resource, Not its Individual Parts.**

Designated historic districts are significant as a collective whole and must be considered as such and protected in their entirety. This is a primary, overarching principle. New construction must respond to and protect the integrity of the overall historic district in much the same way as an addition does to a historic building.

The City Cannot Rely upon a Categorical Exemption When Mitigation is required.

"An agency should decide whether a project is eligible for a categorical exemption as part of its preliminary review of the project (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15060 and 15061), not in the second phase [of review] when mitigation measures are evaluated." (Azusa Land Reclamation Co. v. Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 1165, 1199-1201; City of Pasadena v. State of California (I 993) 14 Cal.App.4th 810, 820, [determination of "applicability of an exemption must be made before ... [the] formal environmental evaluation..."].) By definition, a project does not qualify for a categorical exemption unless the agency has determined environmental impacts cannot occur and mitigation measures are unnecessary. An agency may not "evade these standards by evaluating proposed mitigation measures in connection with the significant effect exception to a categorical exemption." (Azusa Land, supra, 52 Cal.App.4th at 1201.) "Reliance upon mitigation measures (whether included in the application or later adopted) involves an evaluative process of assessing those mitigation measures and weighing



them against potential environmental impacts, and that process must be conducted under established CEQA.

### **In Conclusion**

That the City has issued now a CE is not permissible under CEQA. CEQA sets a very low threshold for not permitting a Categorical Exemption, namely that it should not be used where there is a reasonable possibility of the activity having a significant effect. The District Infill buildings should relate to and strengthen the core characteristics of the district. New construction should build upon the story of the district through its design, landscape, use, cultural expression, and associated interpretive displays. An understanding of the character and significance of the district should predicate any design or development activities.

Here the City ignored the SISG, ignored all the factual data at its hand, and approved a project that has severe environmental impacts. The addition is far too big, has serious impacts on historic resources and we ask that the City begin environmental review and sustain the appeal.



## SOUTH LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

200 North Spring Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, California, 90012-4801, (213) 978-1300

[www.planning.lacity.org](http://www.planning.lacity.org)

### \*CORRECTED LETTER OF DETERMINATION

MAILING DATE: **MAR 18 2021**

Case No. DIR-2020-2122-COA-DRB-SPP-1A

Council District: 9 – Price

CEQA: ENV-2020-2123-CE

Plan Area: South Los Angeles

Project Site: 1122 West 30<sup>th</sup> Street

Applicant: Jeff Zbikowski, JZA Architecture

Appellant: James Childs, North University Park Community Association

At its meeting of **March 2, 2021**, the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission took the actions below in conjunction with the approval of the following Project:


Construction of an approximately 3,037 square-foot, three-story duplex with ground floor interior parking for six cars, landscaping and hardscaping, and restoration work to the existing historic primary structure at the front of the lot.

1. **Determined** based on the whole of the administrative record, the Project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15303, Class 3, Section 15331, Class 31, and Section 105332, Class 32 (infill), and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a Categorical Exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies;
2. **Denied** the appeal and **sustain** the Planning Director's determination dated January 7, 2021;
3. **Approved**, pursuant to Sections 11.5.7 and 12.20.3 K of the Los Angeles Municipal Code and Section 2 of the North University Park Specific Plan, Ordinance 158,194, a Certificate of Appropriateness and Project Permit Compliance, for the construction of an approximately 3,037 square foot, three story duplex with ground floor interior parking for six cars, landscaping and hardscaping, and restoration work to the existing historic primary structure at the front of the lot;
4. **Adopted** the attached modified Conditions of Approval; and
5. **Adopted** the Findings.

This action was taken by the following vote:

Moved:	Orozco
Seconded:	Willis
Ayes:	Bates
Nays:	Stern
Absent:	Anderson

**\*Vote: 3 – 1**



Etta Armstrong, Commission Executive Assistant I  
South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission

Fiscal Impact Statement: There is no General Fund impact as administrative costs are recovered through fees.

**Effective Date/Appeals:** The decision of the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission is final upon the mailing date of this letter, and it is not further appealable.

Notice: An appeal of the CEQA clearance for the Project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21151(c) is only available if the Determination of the non-elected decision-making body (e.g., ZA, AA, APC, CPC) **is not further appealable and the decision is final.**

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Attachments: Modified Conditions of Approval, Interim Appeal Procedures

c: Shannon Ryan, Senior City Planner  
Daniel Mata, Planning Assistant



**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**  
**(As modified by the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission on March 2, 2021)**

1. The use and development of the subject property shall be in substantial conformance with this approval and the plans submitted by the applicant, signed and dated by staff and attached to the case file as **Exhibit A**. Any changes to the project or these plans shall be approved by the Director of Planning and may require additional review by the HPOZ Board. Each change shall be identified and justified in writing. Modified plans shall be signed and dated by staff and attached to the case file as **Modified Exhibit A**, etc.
2. New and replacement sidewalk shall have a diamond pattern to match the original pattern of sidewalks in the area and shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the Bureau of Engineering.
3. Any fencing shall be screened from the pedestrian level of any adjoining lot or street by landscaping such as pyracantha, natal plum, Texas Ligustrum, raphiolepis, or tecomaria capensis.
4. *Prior to the issuance of a building permit*, the applicant shall submit the two final sets of architectural/construction drawings that have been reviewed by LADBS plan check engineers, as well as two additional sets of architectural drawings for final review and approval by Department of City Planning staff (four sets of plans total). Final drawings shall substantially resemble the Approved Exhibit (or any subsequent Modified Exhibits) and shall be stamped and dated by staff and attached to the case file as **Final Plans**.
5. *Prior to the issuance of a building permit*, the following statement shall be imprinted on the site plan, floor plan, elevations and any architectural detail sheets of any construction drawings submitted to the Department of Building and Safety:

NOTE TO PLAN CHECKER AND BUILDING INSPECTOR - These plans, including conditions of approval, shall be complied with and the height, size, shape, location, texture, color, or material shall not differ from what the Director of Planning has approved under DIR-2020-2122-COA-DRB-SPP. Any change to the project shall require review by the Director of Planning and may require additional review by the DRB Board. A request for variation shall be submitted in writing and include a specific notation of the variation(s) requested. Should any change be required by a public agency then such requirement shall be documented in writing.

6. *Prior to the issuance of a building permit*, these Conditions of Approval shall be printed on the cover sheet of all four sets of drawings submitted for review as Final Plans.
7. The granting of this determination by the Director of Planning does not in any way indicate compliance with applicable provisions of LAMC Chapter IX (Building Code). Any corrections and/or modifications to plans made subsequent to this determination by a Department of Building and Safety Plan Check Engineer that affect any part of the exterior design or appearance of the project as approved by the Director, and which are deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety for Building Code compliance, shall require a referral of the revised plans back to the Department of City Planning for additional review and sign-off prior to the issuance of any permit in connection with those plans.
8. Approval, Verification and Submittals. Copies of any approvals, guarantees or verification of consultations, review or approval, plans, etc., as may be required by the subject conditions, shall be provided to the Department of City Planning for placement in the subject file.
9. Code Compliance. All area, height and use regulations of the zone classification for the subject property shall be complied with.

10. Definition. Any agencies, public officials or legislation referenced in these conditions shall mean those agencies, public officials, legislation or their successors, designees, or amendment to any legislation.
11. Enforcement. Compliance with these conditions and the intent of these conditions shall be to the satisfaction of the Planning Department and any designated agency, or the agency's successor and in accordance with any stated laws or regulations, or any amendment thereto.
12. Indemnification and Reimbursement of Litigation Costs.  
Applicant shall do all of the following:
- (i) Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of this entitlement, including but not limited to, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void, or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions, or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.
  - (ii) Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney's fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.
  - (iii) Submit an initial deposit for the City's litigation costs to the City within 10 days' notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney's Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than \$50,000. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
  - (iv) Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City's interests. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
  - (v) If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.

"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute

resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.



# COVID-19 UPDATE

## Interim Appeal Filing Procedures

Fall 2020



Consistent with Mayor Eric Garcetti's "Safer At Home" directives to help slow the spread of COVID-19, City Planning has implemented new procedures for the filing of appeals for non-applicants that eliminate or minimize in-person interaction.

### OPTION 1: Online Appeal Portal

([planning.lacity.org/development-services/appeal-application-online](https://planning.lacity.org/development-services/appeal-application-online))

Entitlement and CEQA appeals can be submitted online and payment can be made by credit card or e-check. The online appeal portal allows appellants to fill out and submit the appeal application directly to the Development Services Center (DSC). Once the appeal is accepted, the portal allows for appellants to submit a credit card payment, enabling the appeal and payment to be submitted entirely electronically. A 2.7% credit card processing service fee will be charged - there is no charge for paying online by e-check.

**Appeals should be filed early to ensure DSC staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow Appellants time to submit payment.** On the final day to file an appeal, the application must be submitted and paid for by 4:30PM (PT). Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30PM (PT) on the next succeeding working day. Building and Safety appeals (LAMC Section 12.26K) can only be filed using Option 2 below.

### OPTION 2: Drop off at DSC

An appellant may continue to submit an appeal application and payment at any of the three Development Services Center (DSC) locations. City Planning established drop off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop.

#### **Metro DSC**

(213) 482-7077  
201 N. Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

#### **Van Nuys DSC**

(818) 374-5050  
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard  
Van Nuys, CA 91401

#### **West Los Angeles DSC**

(310) 231-2901  
1828 Sawtelle Boulevard  
West Los Angeles, CA 90025

City Planning staff will follow up with the Appellant via email and/or phone to:

- Confirm that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions
- Provide a receipt for payment

**Applicant Copy**  
Office: Downtown  
Application Invoice No: 71010

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: 220321EC0-2582244F-51C9-4FE2-81E8-9CF8DEC9371B, Amount: \$109.47, Paid Date: 03/22/2021**

Applicant: NUPCA - CHILDS, JIM ( 213-7472526 )
Representative:
Project Address: 1122 W 30TH ST, 90007

### NOTES:

ENV-2020-2123-CE-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: 9  
Plan Area: South Los Angeles  
Processed by VIDAL, ANNA on 03/22/2021

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:220321EC0-2582244F-51C9-4FE2-81E8-9CF8DEC9371B, Amount:\$109.47, Paid Date:03/22/2021

Applicant: NUPCA - CHILDS, JIM ( 213-7472526 )
Representative:
Project Address: 1122 W 30TH ST, 90007

### NOTES:

ENV-2020-2123-CE-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: 9  
Plan Area: South Los Angeles  
Processed by VIDAL, ANNA on 03/22/2021

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