

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Citizens for a Better Los Angeles/Casey Maddren  
**Date Submitted:** 06/05/2026 08:32 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-1404  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Citizens for a Better Los Angeles submits the attached document outlining additional CEQA issues in support of our appeal.



Citizens for a Better Los Angeles

June 5, 2026

Planning & Land Use Management Committee  
Los Angeles City Hall  
200 N. Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 6417 Selma Appeal, ENV-2018-7559-CE  
ZA-2013-3504-ZV-PA1-1A  
CEQA Appeal, Additional CEQA Issues

Members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee,

In reviewing documents related to this case, Citizens for a Better Los Angeles has discovered additional CEQA issues which are outlined below.

### **ADDITIONAL CEQA ISSUES**

#### **Piecemealing**

The 2021 determination letter that approved the removal of parking to an off-site location was just one more in a long series of piecemealed entitlements requested by and granted to the developer, Relevant. According to documents produced by Relevant, the Dream Hotel was just the first part of a massive hotel/restaurant/nightlife campus that in its initial iteration included Tao Restaurant, Beauty & Essex (an adjacent nightclub), 1605 Cahuenga (an adjacent bar/club), and the Dream 2 (approved but not completed). This hotel/restaurant/nightlife campus expanded to include the Thompson Hotel, the tommie hotel, and the Citizen News event space. While Relevant and the City of LA claimed that these were all independent, autonomous projects and approved each through separate CEQA clearances, the 2021 determination makes clear that the off-site parking for the Dream Hotel was to be accommodated by either the Thompson or the tommie. In addition, documents submitted by CBLA showed that all of these venues shared staff and facilities. Also, around 2020, Relevant formed Ten Five Hospitality, a subdivision which had the stated purpose of managing all food and beverage facilities associated with the three hotels. The piecemealed approvals for this massive hotel/restaurant/nightlife complex are a violation of CEQA.

### **2008 Environmental Analysis Does Not Reflect the Project that Was Built**

When the Dream Hotel was initially approved in 2008, it relied on a Mitigated Negative Declaration that analyzed a 9-story hotel with 120 rooms, restaurant, banquet facility, and two bars, with rooftop uses, and a minimum of 107 parking spaces. Live entertainment and music were approved for the banquet hall. But the project was modified, and a 2014 determination approved a 10-story hotel, with 182 rooms, 77 on-site parking spaces, 14 off-site parking spaces by lease, a first floor lobby, and a tenth floor rooftop deck with a swimming pool. In this version the banquet hall was removed.

#### **Air Quality, GHG Emissions, Parking, Traffic**

The removal of the required on-site parking to another location, along with the illegal removal of required employee carpool/vanpool parking, and the failure to provide any of the required 64 bicycle parking spaces, eviscerates the TDM program which the 2008 MND relied on for its analysis of air quality, GHG emissions, parking and traffic.

#### **Noise**

The 2008 determination allowed live music and dancing in the banquet room, not the rooftop deck. But even though the banquet room was removed from the approved project, the applicant held events with live music and dancing on the rooftop deck. The conditions of approval were never modified to allow this. While the rooftop was approved for dining and drinking, the applicant operated the rooftop area as an illegal nightclub. The rooftop area, operating as the Highlight Room, charged \$500 for a VIP table, \$1,000 for a cabana, and provided "bottle service", all of which appear to violate the conditions of approval and/or the LAMC. Illegal queueing was also observed.

The 2008 determination stated that "Music, sound or noise emitted which is under the control of the applicant shall comply with Section 116.01 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code and with any other applicable regulations of the City's noise ordinance." But during the summer season the applicant repeatedly violated Section 116.01 by playing music on the rooftop, loud enough that it has traveled to hillside neighborhoods a half mile away. Repeated complaints to the management of the hotel, the LAPD and LA City Planning did not result in meaningful enforcement.

The 2008 MND's analysis of air quality, GHG emissions, traffic and noise must be considered invalid because the project it reviewed has been substantially changed. The 2019 supplemental environmental documents are incomplete and invalid, and do not fulfill the requirements of CEQA.

### **OTHER ISSUES**

#### **No Evidence of Covenant or Lease for Parking**

The 2021 determination letter proposed moving the required parking to either the Thompson or the tommie hotel, which at the time of the request were owned by the applicant. Since then, through a loan default, the applicant lost possession of both of those properties and they do not appear to be viable sites for off-site parking. The 2021 determination required that the applicant provide off-site parking by lease in lieu of covenant, but no lease is referenced on the COO and we have never seen any evidence that a lease has been executed.

**LADBS Illegally Issued Permit for Substantial Changes that Were Not Reviewed or Approved by LA City Planning**

The 2021 determination cites LADBS Permit No. 13010-10007-03647, issued in 2017, to convert the first and second stories to retail, fitness center, storage, utility rooms, etc.. While LADBS has the authority to make some necessary modifications to a project, it does not have the authority to add 14,000 square feet of occupiable space and to remove all required on-site parking. LADBS abused its authority by issuing this illegal permit.

Because the removal of required parking to an off-site location is one more in a long line of substantial modifications to the project, a categorical exemption does not apply. In addition to the other reasons stated in our previous submissions, it must be considered a continuation of a series of piecemealed approvals, and the 2008 MND's analysis did not analyze the project as it currently exists. For this reason, CBLA asks that you grant our appeal of the categorical exemption.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Casey Maddren  
Citizens for a Better Los Angeles