

Communication from Public

Name: Citizens for a Better Los Angeles/Casey Maddren
Date Submitted: 08/06/2026 10:57 AM
Council File No: 21-1404
Comments for Public Posting: Citizens for a Better Los Angeles submits the following comments in reply to City Planning's response to the appeal.



Citizens for a Better Los Angeles

August 6, 2026

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

Re: 6417 Selma Appeal, ENV-2018-7559-CE, ZA-2013-3504-ZV-PA1-1A
CF 21-1404
Responses to City Planning Re Enforcement & Environmental Review

Members of the PLUM Committee,

Citizens for a Better Los Angeles submits the following comments in answer to the Department of City Planning's June 4, 2026 response to our appeal.

Enforcement

We are both surprised and baffled by the comments regarding enforcement in June 4, 2026 appeal response. On page 4 we find the following:

The action to dismiss does not negate the applicant's responsibility to pursue more appropriate entitlement requests to consider the additional square-footage resulting from the conversion of the parking area into other uses. Until an entitlement is granted to allow for the additional square footage, the applicant is prohibited from utilizing the space at issue for any other unapproved use. [Emphasis added.]

And this is followed on page 5 by:

The provision of required bicycle parking and electric vehicle charging

stations are matters of enforcement by the Department of Building & Safety and are not appropriate for consideration in this appeal.

We have to wonder how City Planning staff could state that the applicant is “prohibited from utilizing the space at issue for any other unapproved use,” when City Planning has been well aware since 2017 that the applicant has been using said space for unapproved uses. Has City Planning made any effort to enforce the conditions of the 2014 determination? Apparently not. Their response to the applicant's illegal conversion was to grant yet another entitlement.

And we can only shake our heads at the assertion that “The provision of required bicycle parking and electric vehicle charging stations are matters of enforcement by the Department of Building & Safety [....]” We have submitted complaints to LADBS regarding the failure to build the required parking, the failure to include the required bicycle parking and the failure to include the loading dock required by LAMC Sec. 12.21.C.6.a. In each case we received no follow-up response from LADBS, and it was only by investigating further that we found that each case had been closed with no action taken.

Complaint Re Failure to Build Required Vehicle Parking

Customer Service Request No.: 438838

Date: January 30, 2019

Complaint Re Failure to Include Required Bicycle Parking & Loading Dock

Customer Service Request No.: 554825

Date: July 28, 2023

To reiterate, in each case we received no communication regarding the resolution of the complaint, and after investigating further found that no action was taken. Far from fulfilling their duty to enforce the law, it appears that both LA City Planning and the LA Department of Building & Safety have worked to shield the applicant from enforcement.

CEQA Compliance

The applicant's representative claims that the Class 1 CEQA exemption is appropriate, but going beyond the question of whether the amount of square footage exceeds that permitted by a Class 1 exemption, the current approval being appealed is only the latest in a long string of modifications to the project, making it substantially different from the project analyzed in the 2008 MND.

In 2014, the City approved FIVE variances to the project, including: an increase from 120 hotel rooms to 182; an increase from 9 stories to 10; permission to

move SOME of the required parking off-site; and the introduction of bicycle parking in exchange for a reduction in vehicle parking. When the hotel opened in 2017, it became clear that, without seeking approval from the Department of City Planning, the developer chose to convert ALL of the approved parking area to other uses and to omit the required bicycle parking.

The supplemental environmental analysis prepared in 2020 is inadequate, and fails to analyze important aspects of the revised project. Most importantly, its analysis of emissions, including PM 10, PM 2.5 and CO2, fails to cover emissions over the three preceding years when vehicles were being moved back and forth from the hotel to an off-site parking lot. As the analysis notes, air quality in the area already fails to meet existing State standards, and the unnecessary choice to locate all parking off-site could only exacerbate air quality issues.

Under Air Quality, the supplemental analysis responds to the following questions...

Would the project:

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*
- b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard*
- c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

...by saying that there would be a less than significant impact.

But, in violation of the conditions of the 2014 determination letter, the applicant chose to move all parking off-site, chose to omit required bike parking, chose to omit parking for an employee vanpool, and chose to omit electric vehicle charging stations.

All these actions are in conflict with SB 375, CA Gov. Code. Sec. 65080(b) et seq., California's landmark law which was adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The project also clearly causes a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants because it is just one of three hotel projects near the intersection of Selma and Wilcox that were constructed and owned by the applicant at the time of the 2021 determination. CBLA has already presented ample evidence of this, and will simply refer committee members to one document submitted in 2023.

April 12, 2023 Comments from CBLA

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/online/docs/2021/21-1404_PC_PM_04-12-2023.pdf

The project also has, and will continue to, expose sensitive receptors to

substantial pollutant concentrations. There are residential uses within 500 feet of the project site, and Selma Avenue Elementary is just down the street.

These problems also apply to the supplemental analysis sections regarding GHG emissions, transportation and noise.

And again, there are cumulative impacts from multiple projects of the same type being constructed in a short period in the same neighborhood. The Dream is just one of three projects, the others being The Thompson and the tommie, which were all constructed over a seven-year period near the intersection of Selma and Wilcox.

Based on the above, we ask that the PLUM Committee grant our appeal. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Casey Maddren
Citizens for a Better Los Angeles