

APPLICATIONS

APPEAL APPLICATION Instructions and Checklist



PURPOSE

This application is for the appeal of Los Angeles Department of City Planning determinations, as authorized by the LAMC. For California Environmental Quality Act Appeals, use form [CP13-7840](#). For Building and Safety Appeals and Housing Department Appeals, use form [CP13-7854](#).

RELATED CODE SECTION

Refer to the Letter of Determination (LOD) for the subject case to identify the applicable Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section for the entitlement and the appeal procedures.

APPELLATE BODY

Check only one. If unsure of the Appellate Body, check with City Planning staff before submission.

- ☐ Area Planning Commission (APC) ☐ City Planning Commission (CPC) ☒ City Council
☐ Zoning Administrator (ZA)

CASE INFORMATION

Case Number: VTT-84762-SL

APN: _____

Project Address: 4061 West Melrose Avenue (4061-4069 1/2 West Melrose Avenue)

Final Date to Appeal: March 13, 2026

APPELLANT

Check all that apply.

- ☒ Person, other than the Applicant, Owner or Operator claiming to be aggrieved
☐ Representative ☐ Property Owner ☐ Applicant ☐ Operator of the Use/Site

APPELLANT INFORMATION

Appellant Name: Stephen Webb and Dustin Cañez

Company/Organization: Long-term tenants residing at the project site (Melrose Bungalows).

Mailing Address: 4063 1/2 Melrose Avenue

City: Los Angeles **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 90029

Telephone: 2565092856 **E-mail:** smwebbwriter@gmail.com

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

☒ Self ☐ Other: _____

Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position? ☐ YES ☒ NO

REPRESENTATIVE / AGENT INFORMATION

Name: _____

Company/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____ **State:** _____ **Zip Code:** _____

Telephone: _____ **E-mail:** _____

JUSTIFICATION / REASON FOR APPEAL

Is the decision being appealed in its entirety or in part? ☒ Entire ☐ Part

Are specific Conditions of Approval being appealed? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If Yes, list the Condition Number(s) here: _____

On a separate sheet provide the following:

☒ Reason(s) for the appeal

☒ Specific points at issue

☒ How you are aggrieved by the decision

APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

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

Appellant Signature: Stephen Webb Digitally signed by Stephen Webb
Date: 2026.03.12 17:54:51 -07'00' **Date:** 03.12.2026

GENERAL NOTES

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.

The appellate body must act on the appeal within a time period specified in the LAMC Section(s) pertaining to the type of appeal being filed. Los Angeles City Planning will make its best efforts to have appeals scheduled prior to the appellate body's last day to act in order to provide due process to the appellant. If the appellate body is unable to come to a consensus or is unable to hear and consider the appeal prior to the last day to act, the appeal is automatically deemed denied, and the original decision will stand. The last day to act as defined in the LAMC may only be extended if formally agreed upon by the applicant.

THIS SECTION FOR CITY PLANNING STAFF USE ONLY

Base Fee: _____

Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner): _____

Receipt No.: _____ **Date:** _____

☐ Determination authority notified

☐ Receipt Number

GENERAL APPEAL FILING REQUIREMENTS

If dropping off an appeal at a Development Services Center (DSC), the following items are required. See also additional instructions for specific case types. To file online, visit our [Online Application System \(OAS\)](#).

APPEAL DOCUMENTS

1. Hard Copy

Provide three sets (one original, two duplicates) of the listed documents for each appeal filed.

☐ Appeal Application

☐ Justification/Reason for Appeal

- ☐ Copy of Letter of Determination (LOD) for the decision being appealed

2. Electronic Copy

- ☐ Provide an electronic copy of the appeal documents on a USB flash drive. The following items must be saved as individual PDFs and labeled accordingly (e.g., “Appeal Form”, “Justification/Reason Statement”, or “Original Determination Letter”). No file should exceed 70 MB in size.

3. Appeal Fee

- ☐ *Original Applicant.* The fee charged shall be in accordance with [LAMC Section 19.01 B.1\(a\) of Chapter 1](#) or [LAMC Section 15.1.1.F.1.a. \(Appeal Fees\) of Chapter 1A](#) as applicable, or a fee equal to 85% of the original base application fee. Provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) to calculate the fee.
- ☐ *Aggrieved Party.* The fee charged shall be in accordance with [LAMC Section 19.01 B.1\(b\) of Chapter 1](#) or [LAMC Section 15.1.1.F.1.b. \(Appeal Fees\) of Chapter 1A](#) as applicable

4. Noticing Requirements (Applicant Appeals Only)

- ☐ *Copy of Mailing Labels.* All appeals require noticing of the appeal hearing per the applicable LAMC Section(s). Original Applicants must provide noticing per the LAMC for all Applicant appeals. See the Mailing Procedures Instructions ([CP13-2074](#)) for applicable requirements.

SPECIFIC CASE TYPES

ADDITIONAL APPEAL FILING REQUIREMENTS AND / OR LIMITATIONS

DENSITY BONUS (DB) / TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITIES (TOC)

Appeal procedures for DB/TOC cases are pursuant to [LAMC Section 13B.2.5. \(Director Determination\) of Chapter 1A](#) or [LAMC Section 13B.2.3. \(Class 3 Conditional Use\) of Chapter 1A](#) as applicable.

- Off-Menu Incentives or Waiver of Development Standards are not appealable.
- Appeals of On-Menu Density Bonus or Additional Incentives for TOC cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants and is appealable to the City Planning Commission.

- ☐ Provide documentation confirming adjacent owner or tenant status is required (e.g., a lease agreement, rent receipt, utility bill, property tax bill, ZIMAS, driver's license, bill statement).

WAIVER OF DEDICATION AND / OR IMPROVEMENT

Procedures for appeals of Waiver of Dedication and/or Improvements (WDIs) are pursuant to [LAMC Section 12.37 I of Chapter 1](#) or [LAMC Section 10.1.10. \(Waiver and Appeals\) of Chapter 1A](#) as applicable.

- WDIs for by-right projects can only be appealed by the Property Owner.
- If the WDI is part of a larger discretionary project, the applicant may appeal pursuant to the procedures which govern the main entitlement.

[VESTING] TENTATIVE TRACT MAP

Procedures for appeals of [Vesting] Tentative Tract Maps are pursuant [LAMC Section 13B.7.3.G. of Chapter 1A](#).

- Appeals must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of the decision-maker.

NUISANCE ABATEMENT / REVOCATIONS

Appeal procedures for Nuisance Abatement/Revocations are pursuant to [LAMC Section 13B.6.2.G. of Chapter 1A](#). Nuisance Abatement/Revocations cases are only appealable to the City Council.

Appeal Fee

- ☐ *Applicant (Owner/Operator)*. The fee charged shall be in accordance with the [LAMC Section 19.01 B.1\(a\) of Chapter 1](#) or [LAMC Section 15.1.1.F.1.a. \(Appeal Fees\) of Chapter 1A](#) as applicable.

For appeals filed by the property owner and/or business owner/operator, or any individuals/agents/representatives/associates affiliated with the property and business, who files the appeal on behalf of the property owner and/or business owner/operator, appeal application fees listed under [LAMC Section 19.01 B.1\(a\) of Chapter 1](#) shall be paid, at the time the appeal application is submitted, or the appeal application will not be accepted.

- ☐ *Aggrieved Party*. The fee charged shall be in accordance with the [LAMC Section 19.01 B.1\(b\) of Chapter 1](#) or [LAMC Section 15.1.1.F.1.b. \(Appeal Fees\) of Chapter 1A](#) as applicable.

Appeal of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. VTT-84762-SL

Grounds for Appeal (Final Filing Version)

Appellant: Stephen Webb

Project: Melrose Bungalows, 4061 West Melrose Avenue (4061-4069 1/2 West Melrose Avenue)

Appellate Body: Area Planning Commission

Statement of Standing

Appellant is a long-term tenant residing at the project site known as the Melrose Bungalows.

I. Improper Removal of Rent Stabilization Ordinance Protections

The Advisory Agency erred in approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. VTT-84762-SL because the project results in the effective removal of Rent Stabilization Ordinance protections from the Melrose Bungalows, a 1923 bungalow court consisting of eight bungalows and one duplex that has long functioned as a rent-stabilized community in East Hollywood. Several residents have lived at the property for more than two decades, and for many tenants this is not simply housing but a long-established community built over many years.

The project does not create new housing units or preserve affordability. Instead, it subdivides a unified rent-stabilized property into individually saleable lots under the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance, fundamentally changing the legal status of the homes that currently exist. While the structures may remain, the protections that allow tenants to remain in place do not.

Although several long-delayed repairs were finally addressed after the City became involved following the September 2025 hearing, that work came only after prolonged tenant complaints and outside intervention. At the same time, vacant units have continued to receive significant upgrades, while many tenants remain reluctant to engage with management after years of inconsistent maintenance and limited communication.

For those of us who live here, approval means the disappearance of rent-stabilized housing without demolition, replacement, or meaningful tenant protection. The Advisory Agency failed to fully analyze this practical loss of protected housing.

II. Misapplication of the Housing Crisis Act (SB 8)

The Advisory Agency erred by treating the Melrose Bungalows as though this were a routine subdivision with no loss of protected housing simply because the buildings themselves remain standing. The Melrose Bungalows are eight bungalows and one duplex containing rent-stabilized homes, several inhabited by tenants who have built their lives around the protections afforded by the Rent Stabilization Ordinance.

SB 8 protects housing that has been subject to rent control within the previous five years because loss of those protections can trigger displacement even when no structure is demolished. Here, approval of VTT-84762-SL allows the bungalow court to be legally transformed from protected rental housing into individually subdivided lots, stripping away the conditions that currently allow tenants to remain in place.

No replacement housing is created. No affordability is preserved. The structures remain, but the protected housing does not. By focusing only on whether walls are removed, rather than whether protected housing is functionally lost, the Advisory Agency applied SB 8 too narrowly.

III. Inconsistency with the City of Los Angeles Housing Element

The approval of VTT-84762-SL is inconsistent with the City of Los Angeles Housing Element, which

identifies preservation of existing affordable housing as essential to addressing displacement. The Melrose Bungalows already provide that housing: a long-standing rent-stabilized community where residents have remained because rents stayed within reach.

This project does not add affordable housing, rehabilitate occupied units for existing tenants, or improve housing access. It instead converts an existing protected community into subdivided lots, making future displacement more likely and directly undermining the City's adopted housing goals.

IV. Failure to Make Required Findings Under LAMC Section 12.95.2

The Determination does not contain substantial evidence supporting the findings required under Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.95.2. In particular, there is no meaningful analysis of whether existing tenants could realistically purchase subdivided units, despite public claims by the applicant that subdivision could create ownership opportunities.

None of the tenants at the Melrose Bungalows have ever been approached with such an opportunity, nor have the owners met with tenants to discuss ownership in any practical or financial terms. For working tenants in a rent-stabilized property, many of whom have remained because these units are among the few affordable homes left available to them, such claims do not reflect financial reality.

The record also lacks meaningful analysis of cumulative impacts on similar bungalow courts facing the same strategy, despite the fact that the Melrose Bungalows are already the second known property in Los Angeles where this method is being pursued.

V. Abuse of Discretion and Precedent-Setting Harm

By approving this tract map as a routine subdivision, the Advisory Agency failed to account for what this decision signals beyond one property. The Melrose Bungalows are the second known bungalow court in Los Angeles where subdivision is being used in this way following the Scott Avenue Court case.

If allowed to stand, this approval signals that rent-stabilized bungalow courts across Los Angeles may be converted into individually subdivided lots without preserving tenant protections. That precedent threatens affordable housing far beyond this property and encourages similar displacement elsewhere.

Requested Action

For the reasons stated above, Appellant respectfully requests that the Area Planning Commission overturn the Advisory Agency's approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. VTT-84762-SL in its entirety.