

Communication from Public

Name: Kelly Lally

Date Submitted: 02/18/2024 07:43 PM

Council File No: 24-0124

Comments for Public Posting: I live across from the proposed development and am appealing the discretionary waivers of development standards—which, if approved, would lead to a shocking 201% density increase while adding only 5 net new affordable housing units. This project should not be given a CEQA Exemption, since this class of exemptions is not intended for projects that would result in any significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality impacts. For a proposed project to qualify, none of the following can apply: a. The project and successive projects of the same type in the same place will result in cumulative impacts; b. There are unusual circumstances creating the reasonable possibility of significant effects; This project, along with a similar development by the same representative just three parcels away on 3730-3736 South Kelton Avenue (CPC-2021-6888-CU-DB-HCA-PHP), introduces significant concerns. Both projects propose 5-story tall multifamily buildings, adding approximately 150 new residents to the block without conducting essential environmental, traffic, and noise studies to assess their impact on public health, safety, and the environment. Any reasonable person can see this will exacerbate the existing safety and infrastructure issues outlined by my neighbors. An additional burden will be place on the sensory-impaired HUD-disabled adults located next door, their caregivers, and two preschools on the immediate block. Despite these critical issues, the CPC chose to overlook them and opting instead to highlight superficial architectural features like well-maintained facades and landscaping. Additionally, I ask that PLUM not approve these entitlements with factual errors and incompleteness in the Letter of Determination issued by the CPC, such as: Section A.3 the affordable housing unit count is incorrect and confusing to the public The uppermost story is set back from the northern building facade line by an additional XX feet While we acknowledge the developer's right to take advantage of California's Density Bonus, they are not automatically entitled to extra waivers of development standards - supported by Snowball Investments vs. City of LA where the Court sided with the City in denying the developer additional units being requested. Snowball's request for a zoning change to allow higher density on their property, consistent with the general plan but exceeding the zoning's limit of 19 single-family homes, was denied by the city

due to concerns over public safety and the need for further studies. The court ruled that the HAA did not apply as the project did not align with the existing zoning, and no findings were required for disapproval. The City Council, supported by substantial public opposition, deemed the requested zoning change incompatible with good zoning practices and the surrounding area's density, highlighting significant public health and safety risks due to increased density. The developer has not proven that standard development regulations would prevent the project's realization. Since the initial request to the LA Department of City Planning, the developer scaled back the request for a waiver of floor area ratios and withdrew the request for an open space waiver, without decreasing the affordable housing units. This adjustment suggests that the previously sought waivers were not essential for the project's financial viability, casting doubt on the necessity of any remaining waivers for maintaining the proposed affordable housing levels.