



Silvia Saucedo, Principal
Silvia@SaucedoGroup.com
www.SaucedoGroup.com
323.243.4556

May 10, 2023

Via E-mail Only: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org

Planning and Land Use Committee
Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street, Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attention: Candy Rosales, Deputy City Clerk, Planning and Land Use Management Committee

Regarding: 15526 and 15544 West Plummer Street
ENV-2022-5866-MND
CPC-2022-5865-CU-SPR-1A

Dear Honorable Members of the PLUM Committee:

I represent Bright Star Schools ("Applicant" or "Bright Star") in connection with its application for a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review approval for the development of a free public Charter Elementary School for Transitional Kindergarten to Fourth grades ("Project" or "School") at 15526-15544 West Plummer, in the North Hills area of Los Angeles.

On February 23, 2023, the Los Angeles City Planning Commission ("CPC") found that with the imposition of mitigation measures the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND"). The Commissioners also found that the Project enhances the built environment and provides an essential service, that its significant features and pertinent improvements are compatible with the neighborhood, and that it substantially conforms with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, thus meeting the Municipal Code's required findings for the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Approval.

During the CPC hearing, approximately 15 speakers spoke in support of the Project and close to 80 patiently waited their turn to express their support. The Commissioners graciously acknowledged the presence of all supporters, even the ones unable to provide public comment due to time limitations, and thanked them for their efforts.

Two appeals have been filed against the Project challenging the CPC's adoption of the MND and requesting the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"). One appeal is from Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development of Los Angeles ("CREED"). The Applicant, through their environmental consultant, Rincon Consultant's ("Rincon"), has fully addressed all of CREED's comments. Rincon's letters dated February 9, 2023 and February 23, 2023ⁱ, responded to CREED's concerns prior to and at the CPC hearing. The concerns were heard at Planning Commission and found to be without merit by Planning Staff and CPC. CREED's appeal does not raise any new issues. Nonetheless, Rincon has provided a response, please see attached letter dated May 9, 2023.

The other appeal is from Charles Johnson. Some of Mr. Johnson's concerns are similar to those raised by CREED, which have been found to be without merit; the others are also without merit and fail to provide substantial evidence of any significant impacts. Rincon has also provided a response to Mr. Johnson's appeal, please see attached letter dated May 9, 2023.

Both appeals fail to demonstrate how CPC erred or abused its discretion in adopting the MND. The appellants do not provide substantial evidence of any significant impacts that will be caused by the Project with the imposition of the mitigation measures. There is no basis in law or fact to support the appellants' claims. The MND fully complies with CEQA. Accordingly, we respectfully request that PLUM recommends that City Council uphold the determination of CPC and deny the appeals.

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS

We appreciate the opportunity to submit the following attached documents:

- Rincon's Letter dated May 9, 2023, addressing both appeals and relevant attachments.

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me directly at 323-243-4556.

Sincerely,

Silvia Saucedo

Silvia Saucedo

ⁱ Rincon's letters dated February 23, 2023, both Executive Summary and Full Letter Response versions, were in response to CREED's comment letter dated February 21, 2023. Rincon's letter dated February 9, 2023, was in response to CREED's comment letter dated December 14, 2022. These letters are attached to Rincon's response to appellants.