

APPLICATIONS

APPEAL APPLICATION Instructions and Checklist



THIS SECTION FOR CITY PLANNING STAFF USE ONLY

Base Fee: \$229

Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner): Ruben Vasquez

Case No.: CPC-2024-5534-DB-PR-VHCA-1A Date: 08/07/2026

☒ Determination authority notified

☒ Receipt Number: 200665804961

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: CPC-2024-5534-DB-PR-VHCA

APN:

Project Address: 2413 – 2499 North Silver Lake Boulevard 90039

Final Date to Appeal: August 12, 2026

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

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: Pat Hadnagy

Company/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: 2455 Silver Lake Blvd., Unit D

City: Los Angeles State: Ca Zip Code: 90039

Telephone: 323-893-4000 E-mail: pathadnagy@yahoo.com

Is the appeal being filed on 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: _____

APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

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

Appellant Signature: Pat Hadnagy Digitally signed by Pat Hadnagy
Date: 2026.08.05 19:16:04 -07'00' Date: August 5, 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.

GENERAL APPEAL FILING REQUIREMENTS

An appeal application must be submitted and paid for before 4:30 PM (PST) on the final day to appeal the determination. Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal City holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30 PM (PST) on the next succeeding working day. Appeals should be filed early to ensure the Development Services Center (DSC) staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow appellants time to submit payment. Appeals may be filed either online or in person as referenced below.

ONLINE APPEAL FILINGS THROUGH ONLINE APPLICATION SYSTEM (OAS)

Online Application System (OAS): The OAS (<https://planning.lacity.gov/oas>) allows entitlement appeals to be submitted entirely electronically by allowing an appellant to fill out and submit an appeal application online directly to City Planning's DSC, and submit fee payment by credit card or e-check.



QR Code to Online Appeal Filing

IN PERSON APPEAL FILINGS

Drop off at DSC: Appeals of this determination can be submitted in-person at the Metro or Van Nuys DSC locations, as well as the South Los Angeles DSC on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and payment can be made by credit card or check.

- a. City Planning has established drop-off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop off appeal applications.
- b. Alternatively, appeal applications can be filed with staff at DSC public counters. Appeal applications must be on the prescribed forms, and accompanied by the required fee and a copy of the determination letter. Appeal applications shall be received by the DSC public counter and paid for on or before the above date or the appeal will not be accepted.

CITY PLANNING DEVELOPMENT SERVICES CENTERS – PUBLIC COUNTERS

Office	Address	Phone Number	Email
Metro DSC	201 N. Figueroa Street 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012	(213) 482-7077	planning.figcounter@lacity.org
Van Nuys DSC	6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Suite 251 Van Nuys, CA 91401	(818) 374-5050	planning.mbc2@lacity.org
South LA DSC <i>Tuesday and Thursday Only</i>	8475 S. Vermont Avenue, 1st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90044	(213) 978-1465	planning.southla@lacity.org

City Planning staff may follow up with the appellant via email and/or phone if there are any questions or missing materials in the appeal submission, to ensure that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

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

- ☐ *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 appeals. See the Mailing Procedures Instructions ([CP13-2074](#)) for applicable requirements.
- ☐ Proof of payment or mailing must be submitted to verify that mailing fees for the appeal hearing notice have been paid by the Applicant.

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.

AP-001

SAAF Consolidated Project Review Appeal - Justification and Reasons

Appeal of Letter of Determination

Case No. CPC-2024-5534-DB-PR-VHCA

CONTROL FIELD	VALUE
Document ID	AP-001
Version	1.9
Status	FILING READY - APPELLANT CONFIRMATION REQUIRED
Effective date	August 5, 2026
Control owner	SAAF Appellate Project
Purpose	Consolidated justification and requested relief for the Project Review appeal; appellant fields intentionally blank.

CONTROL NOTICE

This is a controlled work product. Use the document ID and version shown above when citing or circulating it. Superseded versions remain in the archive and are not overwritten.

Revision history

Version	Date	Status	Change summary
1.0	August 3, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT FIELDS OPEN	Substantive appeal finalized; appellant identity, aggrievement and certification reserved for filer completion.
1.1	August 3, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT FIELDS OPEN	Added client-reported approximately 84 sq. ft. parking-area storage loss; retained verification qualification.
1.2	August 3, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT	Specified mandatory compensation framework, direct-expense categories, automatic payment,

		FIELDS OPEN	deadlines, duration, documentation and enforcement.
1.3	August 4, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT FIELDS OPEN	Added tenant approval, agency oversight, protective default schedule, renewed-approval and individual-consent safeguards for compensation formulas.
1.4	August 4, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT FIELDS OPEN	Added preservation language requesting consideration of timely supplemental tenant evidence, hearing testimony and tenant materials already in the administrative record.
1.5	August 4, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT FIELDS OPEN	Added qualified tenant-retaliation concerns, present construction-related displacement pressure, privacy protections, independent reporting and anti-displacement monitoring.
1.6	August 5, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT CONFIRMATI ON REQUIRED	Added record-supported tenant aggrievement facts and cited public-record tenant evidence.
1.7	August 5, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT CONFIRMATI ON REQUIRED	Made Section I a complete collective appellants' statement; removed the individualized-facts blank and added the reported window-entry and repair account.
1.8	August 5, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT CONFIRMATI ON REQUIRED	Added attributed tenant complaints concerning rent and RSO charges, LAHD credits, move-out offers, trash/vermin, treatment and onsite management; linked the record to independent oversight.
1.9	August 5, 2026	FILING READY - APPELLANT CONFIRMATI ON REQUIRED	Defined Findings 3(a)-3(c), clarified ground order and added remaining material public-record complaints relevant to management reliability.

Review and approval

Role	Name	Date	Disposition
Prepared by	SAAF Project Team	August 3, 2026	Issued for review
Reviewed by	SAAF Project Team	August 4, 2026	_____
Approved by	SAAF Project Team	August 5, 2026	_____

Filer completion block

Field	Entry
Appellant legal name	Pat Hadnagy
Appellant mailing address	2455 Silver Lake Blvd., Unit D Los Angeles, CA 90039
Telephone / email	323-893-4000 / pathadnagy@yahoo.com
Appellant status	Person(s) aggrieved by the Project Review decision
How appellant is aggrieved	See the complete collective appellants' statement in Section I; each appellant must confirm its truth as applied to that appellant. No additional individualized narrative is required by this document.
Representative, if any	None
Decision appealed	Project Review approval and Findings 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c) only
Not appealed	Density Bonus Off-Menu Incentive and Waivers of Development Standards
Final appeal date	August 12, 2026, 4:30 p.m. PT

Completion status: The substantive appeal grounds and collective, record-supported tenant aggrievement statement are complete. Appellant names, contact information, signatures and filing-date confirmations remain blank. Before submission, each named appellant must confirm current tenant status, review the collective statement in Section I for truthfulness as applied to that appellant, complete the required identity and certification fields, and certify the filing. The appeal does not depend on adding individualized narrative to Section I.

Executive summary

The appellant appeals the City Planning Commission's Project Review approval for the proposed addition of 76 units to the occupied Silver Lake Garden Apartments. The appeal does not challenge the separately approved Density Bonus incentive or waivers. It challenges whether substantial evidence supports the three findings required for Project Review when the approved project is evaluated as a whole and in the context of 48 retained, occupied Rent Stabilization Ordinance units.

The determination relies on housing-production benefits, general design descriptions, future agency review and applicant commitments. But the record shows that critical construction phasing, Tenant Habitability Plan protections, temporary services, schedule assumptions, monitoring, compensation,

relocation and corrective mechanisms remained preliminary or deferred. The same record contains extensive evidence concerning occupied excavation and shoring, deteriorated windows, dust and noise pathways, fire and pedestrian access, parking, storage and laundry losses, utility interruptions, prolonged disruption, management dependence and cumulative displacement pressure. Public correspondence already in the administrative record includes tenant communications and community-presented tenant reports describing defective windows, overflowing trash and rats, poorly maintained landscaping and common areas, nonfunctional or unsanitary shared barbecue areas, inadequate project communication, diminished light and views, fear of retaliation, inability to work from home during construction, loss of rear fire exits, and concern that multi-year construction will drive tenants from their homes.

The Commission therefore could not reasonably conclude—without a final, phase-specific and enforceable framework—that the project substantially conforms with the plans as a whole, is compatible with adjacent and neighboring development, and provides amenities and protections that improve habitability while minimizing impacts. The appellant requests that the City Council grant the appeal and set aside or remand the Project Review approval for adequate findings, evidence and enforceable protections.

I. Scope, standing and preservation

- The appeal is limited to the Project Review decision under LAMC Chapter 1 Section 16.05 and Chapter 1A Section 13B.2.4, as identified by the determination. For readability, this appeal uses the determination's three Project Review labels throughout: Finding 3(a) addresses substantial conformance with the General Plan and applicable plans; Finding 3(b) addresses compatibility with adjacent and neighboring development; and Finding 3(c) addresses residential amenities, habitability and minimization of impacts on neighboring properties. Ground One addresses Finding 3(c) first because the immediate effects on the occupied RSO tenants are central to the appeal; Grounds Two and Three then address Findings 3(a) and 3(b).
- The appellants are current tenants at Silver Lake Garden Apartments and are directly and personally aggrieved because the Project Review approval authorizes prolonged, tenant-affecting construction around the occupied RSO homes in which they live. The approval exposes the appellants to concrete risks affecting safe access to and use of their homes and their ability to preserve their tenancies, including excavation and shoring beside occupied 1949 buildings; heavy equipment and materials near windows; dust, silica, lead, asbestos and construction off-gases entering through building-envelope pathways, including windows reported not to close properly; sustained noise and interference with working from home; and changes or losses involving assigned parking, carport storage, laundry, utilities, common areas and rear fire exits, together with unresolved temporary-relocation, compensation, monitoring and enforcement protections.

These concerns are not abstract. Public correspondence in the administrative record includes a tenant's February 2026 exchange showing that the Tenant Habitability Plan memorandum had not been directly distributed to that tenant and the owner's statement that detailed answers concerning parking, laundry, windows and compensation would be developed later. The record also presents tenant reports of overflowing trash and rats, poorly maintained landscaping and

shared spaces, defective windows, lack of project communication and fear of landlord retaliation. One reported incident involved unauthorized entry through a deteriorated or nonsecure window; the public-record account states that the window did not close properly and describes the owner's response as dismissive. The affected tenant further reports that the resulting replacement or repair was ill-fitting and did not adequately resolve the condition. A 30-year tenant's written public comment further alleges that long-term tenants were offered \$10,000 to move when the current owner assumed control; that tenants were subjected to unlawful pandemic-period rent increases, disputed RSO charges supported by allegedly false invoices, and water charges contrary to lease terms; and that the tenant received credits for overcharges after repeatedly reporting the matters to LAHD. The tenant also reports reduced garbage-bin capacity and increased vermin, verbally abusive treatment, prolonged absence of an effective onsite manager, and senior tenants incurring locksmith costs when no manager was available. The public record separately reports 26 code-enforcement complaints and 34 rent complaints categorized to include illegal eviction, illegal rent increases, service reductions and harassment. The owner acknowledged that rent increases occurred during the COVID restriction period but stated that all cases were corrected; tenants report that correction or reimbursement occurred only after affected tenants complained. These competing accounts and the documented complaint history materially support the appellants' lack of trust in management-controlled future protections and the need for independent oversight, automatic remedies and enforcement outside the landlord's control. The record also identifies anticipated loss of assigned parking, carport storage and laundry, years of excavation next to tenant windows, inability to work from home, and loss of rear fire exits. These approval-enabled conditions and unresolved protections create present and particularized threats to the appellants, including diminished habitability, safety, services and quiet enjoyment; interference with access to and use of their homes; out-of-pocket expense; and construction-related pressure affecting their ability to remain in their tenancies. This collective statement is complete and does not depend on the appellants adding further individualized facts to establish the stated grounds of aggrievement.

- References to approved height, setbacks, passageways, parking or other waiver-produced geometry describe the actual project when testing Project Review findings; they do not seek appellate reversal of the waivers.
- The appellant preserves all timely jurisdictional, procedural, evidentiary and legal objections within the permissible Project Review appeal scope.

Authority / record: AR-001 PDF pp. 1-3; AR-010 PDF pp. 15-18, 35, 50, 68-71.

II. Ground One - Project Review Finding 3(c): Habitability and impact protections lack substantial evidentiary support

Required finding: A residential project must provide recreational and service amenities to improve habitability for residents and minimize impacts on neighboring properties.

The determination relies principally on end-state open space and general construction ordinances and concludes that Condition 27 will address existing-tenant habitability. That conclusion does not resolve

whether 48 occupied RSO units can remain safely and practically habitable through the project's full tenant-impact period.

A. Approval preceded a sufficiently final protection framework.

The record describes future LAHD coordination and multiple protections to be worked out during design development. Material decisions concerning dust, parking, utilities, access, temporary relocation, concessions and communications were not fixed in the approval-stage record. The owner's February 2026 communication reproduced in the public record states that detailed engineering had not started and that how to reroute parking, relocate laundry, address windows and compensate tenants would be determined later, after Project Review approval.

B. Occupied-construction feasibility was not demonstrated.

Major excavation, shoring, subterranean garages, utility work and direct improvements to existing buildings will occur beside occupied 1949 structures. The record lacks an integrated phase plan showing safe routes, work zones, temporary services, building-envelope sequencing and household suitability.

C. Conditions and monitoring are incomplete.

General compliance, notices and contacts do not supply objective interior thresholds, inspection hold points, independent stop-work authority, correction deadlines, relocation triggers, compensation formulas or remedies for repeated failure.

D. Temporary services are not shown equivalent.

Parking site control, security, coverage and contingency remain unresolved. The public record identifies anticipated loss of assigned parking, carport storage and laundry during construction, including conflicts with construction staging. Demolition of the parking structures also removes client-reported storage consisting of approximately 48 square feet of locked storage plus 36 square feet of open storage—about 84 square feet total—with no identified replacement plan. Moving that volume into occupied apartments is not equivalent replacement and may materially reduce usable residential space. The precise number of affected allocations and whether these dimensions apply to each allocation should be confirmed, but the record does not supply a secure replacement-storage plan. Project-wide laundry count may rise while immediate choice, concurrent use and outage redundancy decline. Utilities, trash, AC and common-area continuity likewise lack complete operational and compensation terms.

E. The 18-month construction estimate is unvalidated.

The applicant labels the estimate preliminary and identifies approximately four preceding months of site preparation. No controlled critical-path schedule, contractor validation, schedule-risk analysis or anti-rushing system demonstrates safe completion within the face-value approximately 22-month tenant-impact period.

F. Cumulative habitability and displacement pressure were not evaluated.

Noise, dust, defective windows, access restrictions, service changes, outages, direct unit work, inability to work from home, complaint burden and duration can interact. Public-record tenant material reports insufficient trash capacity, weekly overflowing trash and rats; poorly maintained landscaping and fountain areas; dirty or nonfunctional shared barbecue areas; defective windows, including a window that allegedly did not close securely; anticipated loss of light and views; lack of direct notice and meaningful consultation about the project and Tenant Habitability Plan; loss of assigned parking, carport storage, laundry and rear fire exits; hazardous-material and construction off-gas exposure through windows; and years of heavy excavation, foundation and retaining-wall work near occupied units. The record also contains allegations and cited complaint categories involving reduced services, harassment, illegal eviction or rent practices, lack of effective onsite management and maintenance failures. A particularly relevant public comment from a 30-year tenant alleges \$10,000 move-out offers to long-term residents; unlawful pandemic-period rent increases; false invoices used to increase RSO charges; water charges contrary to lease terms; credits obtained after repeated LAHD reports; reduced garbage capacity and worsening vermin; verbal abuse; and the absence or unavailability of an effective onsite manager, including when senior tenants needed assistance. The owner separately acknowledged that rent increases occurred during the COVID restriction period, while asserting that all cases were corrected. Tenants report that credits or reimbursements were provided only after individual complaints. Other public submissions report or attach evidence of numerous recent housing-code violations, including alleged missing fire extinguishers and smoke or carbon-monoxide alarms; rotted window frames, broken glass, peeling paint and rusting gates; longstanding maintenance decline; and management responses that commenters regarded as dismissive or blame-shifting. These materials also report that tenants supplied photographs of rats, overflowing trash and property conditions, and that some tenants were afraid to be identified because of retaliation concerns. The record's competing accounts do not require the appellate body to adjudicate every historical dispute, but they do require it to explain why future safeguards left to the same management structure can be considered reliable without independent administration, verification and automatic relief. These reported conditions do not independently prove every allegation, but they materially reinforce the need to test whether management-dependent future protections will be reliable and enforceable. Formal retention of units does not itself prevent foreseeable pressure to leave; intent to displace need not be alleged. Tenants report that some residents are reluctant to become named appellants, provide declarations or publicly criticize the project because they fear retaliation based on prior experiences or observed management practices. The number of publicly identified participants therefore may understate the level of tenant concern and should not be treated as evidence of consent or lack of anticipated impact. Tenants further report that the pending project, its uncertain duration, anticipated construction conditions, potential service and amenity losses, and concern about remaining safely housed are already contributing to decisions to leave or consider leaving. The appellants do not contend, without further evidence, that every departure was caused solely by the project or that the applicant intended each departure; the reports nevertheless support evaluation of present construction-related displacement pressure and the risk that the existing tenant community will not remain intact.

Authority / record: AR-001 PDF pp. 5-14, 25; AR-003 PDF pp. 11-12; AR-004; AR-005 PDF pp. 8, 13-19; AR-010 PDF pp. 15-18, 35, 50, 68-71; SE-001; SE-002; AFM-H-1 through AFM-H-11.

III. Ground Two - Project Review Finding 3(a): Substantial plan conformance was not established

The finding identifies legitimate housing, infill, affordability and proximity-to-services policies. It does not adequately reconcile those benefits with equally applicable policies concerning conservation of stable neighborhoods, differentiated scale and character, safe pedestrian access, healthy building and construction, resilience, and a safe, secure and high-quality residential environment.

- Retention of the 48 RSO units is treated as proof of conservation without testing their condition, occupied-construction environment, access, services or cumulative habitability.
- The finding acknowledges typical Neighborhood District one- and two-story scale but resolves the approved four- and five-story relationship principally through the Density Bonus, not a project-specific scale-and-character analysis.
- Walkability and reduced-trip conclusions do not materially address four driveways, limited transit concerns, pedestrian conflicts, construction routes or emergency access.
- The Health Element analysis emphasizes end-state open space and trees while omitting prolonged dust, noise, heat/AC, utility, access and vulnerable-household evidence.
- The decision does not explain how contrary evidence was weighed or why deferred future controls establish present substantial conformance.

Authority / record: AR-001 PDF pp. 19-23; AR-002 PDF pp. 30-33, 38-39; AFM-3A; AFM-H-5 through H-11.

IV. Ground Three - Project Review Finding 3(b): Compatibility was not established

The compatibility finding describes FAR, approved waivers, parking, lighting, landscaping, trash and materials, but provides little comparative analysis of the actual approved arrangement against the retained garden apartments, adjacent properties, neighboring development and public realm.

- FAR is not a substitute for three-dimensional analysis of height, wall length, perceived mass, daylight, privacy, courtyards and ten-foot interfaces.
- Reduced building separations and passageways are not analyzed for light, ventilation, privacy, pedestrian use, fire access or effects on retained buildings.
- Four Silver Lake Boulevard driveways are described but not assessed cumulatively for visibility, queuing, loading, pedestrians, service vehicles, evacuation or construction conflicts.
- The finding omits the operational compatibility of 35,600 cubic yards of soil export, shoring and excavation next to occupied buildings.
- Tree counts and screening promises do not establish mature screening, survival, maintenance, privacy or interim construction conditions.
- Trash conclusions do not analyze collection routes, noise, odor, pests, sidewalk adjacency, windows or temporary relocation of service.

Authority / record: AR-001 PDF pp. 1, 23-25; AR-002 PDF pp. 34-36, 38-39; AR-003; AR-010; AFM-3B.

V. Requested relief

1. Grant the appeal and set aside the Project Review approval because Findings 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c) are not supported by adequate project-specific analysis and substantial evidence.
2. Alternatively, remand the Project Review for revised findings based on a final phase-specific construction, habitability and compatibility record.
3. Require, before tenant-affecting work, an approved Construction Management Plan, final Tenant Habitability Plan, resource-loaded schedule, phase/site-logistics plans and household-specific suitability process.
4. Require independent monitoring, objective thresholds, inspection hold points, transparent reporting, correction deadlines and stop-work authority.
5. Require continuous equivalent parking, secure storage, laundry, utilities, HVAC, trash, access and other services, with automatic backup. Where equivalent replacement is unavailable or a service or amenity is materially reduced, require a written compensation and expense-payment framework established before tenant-affecting work. The framework must define eligibility; covered losses and direct-expense categories, including parking, storage, moving, laundry, transportation, food, cooling, lodging, utilities and property protection; payment amounts or objective formulas; commencement before the loss and continuation through verified restoration; advance or automatic payment for foreseeable costs; reimbursement documentation and deadlines; treatment of partial, repeated and extended losses; escalation and dispute procedures; enforcement and correction remedies; and a prohibition on requiring tenants to waive lease, RSO, accommodation, complaint or other rights to receive payment. Require the payment amounts and formulas to be developed through documented tenant consultation and approved, before implementation, by a majority of affected tenant households voting after reasonable notice, or by an elected tenant committee formally authorized by those households, together with independent review and approval by LAHD or the deciding City body. Any later reduction or material adverse change must receive renewed tenant and agency approval. If agreement or approval is not completed by the required date, a City-approved protective default schedule must apply automatically and may not provide less than documented direct expenses or any greater minimum protection required by law. Any household-specific settlement must require that tenant's informed written consent and may not waive or release lease, RSO, relocation, accommodation, reimbursement, complaint, retaliation-protection or other legal rights as a condition of payment.
6. Require objective temporary-relocation triggers, suitable fully funded placement, disability/language accommodations, preservation of lease and RSO rights, enforceable nonretaliation and guaranteed return. Prohibit adverse treatment based on appeal participation, organizing, complaints or testimony; provide an independent complaint channel outside landlord control and privacy protections to the extent permitted by law; and require transparent monitoring of vacancies, move-outs, buyout offers, eviction notices and material service reductions during the project, with investigation and corrective remedies for reported retaliation or construction-related displacement pressure.
7. Prohibit acceleration, resequencing or substitutions that reduce safety, workmanship, inspections, testing, cure time, notice, access or tenant protections.

8. Require comparative plan, section, circulation, driveway, trash, landscape, privacy/daylight and construction-interface evidence sufficient to support Findings 3(a) and 3(b).
9. Grant such further relief within the City Council's Project Review appellate authority as is necessary to protect tenants and neighboring properties.

VI. Supplemental tenant evidence and preservation

Because of the limited appeal period, the appellants have not yet completed the collection, organization and redaction of tenant photographs; landlord and management communications; text messages; emails; repair records; declarations; and related materials supporting the concerns identified in this appeal. The appellants respectfully request a reasonable opportunity to submit those materials by the deadline established for the appellate hearing and request that the appellate decision-maker consider all timely supplemental written evidence and tenant testimony.

Evidence collection is also affected by reported fear of retaliation. Some tenants have declined or hesitated to be publicly identified, join the appeal or provide materials because of prior experiences or observed management practices. The City should not infer consent, indifference or lack of impact from a tenant's decision not to be named. The appellants request procedures allowing representative, aggregated or appropriately redacted tenant evidence and protection of names, unit numbers, contact information, medical information and other sensitive details to the extent permitted by applicable law and City procedure.

The additional materials are expected to corroborate, among other matters, existing building-envelope and window conditions; dust and noise pathways; prior repair and contractor-management practices; parking, storage, laundry and service losses; communications concerning construction and tenant protections; and household-specific habitability or accommodation concerns. This appeal identifies those issues now and does not waive them through the inability to attach every supporting item at initial filing.

The appellants also request that the City review and consider relevant tenant testimony, public correspondence and written submissions already contained in the administrative record. If the City determines that supplemental material must be submitted by a particular date, format or method, the appellants request prompt written notice of those requirements.

VII. Conclusion

The appeal supports housing production and does not seek review of the nonappealable Density Bonus approvals. It asks the City to apply the independent Project Review findings to the actual project and the complete record. The benefits of additional housing do not eliminate the need for substantial evidence, reasoned findings and enforceable protection of the occupied RSO community and neighboring properties. The City Council should grant the appeal and set aside or remand the Project Review approval.

Citation and exhibit key

Citation	Source
AR-001	Signed Letter of Determination, Conditions and Findings
AR-002	Staff Report
AR-003	Architectural, Landscape and Irrigation Plans
AR-004	Preliminary Tenant Habitability Plan memorandum
AR-005	Applicant Presentation
AR-006	Staff Presentation
AR-007	Maps
AR-008	CEQA materials
AR-009	Department Comment Letters
AR-010	Public Correspondence
SE-001 / SE-002	Controlled Finding 3(c) source extracts
AFM series	Internal analytical work products; cite underlying AR/SE sources in filed version

Finalization rule: The filed justification should cite the administrative record directly. AFM documents are drafting aids unless intentionally submitted and procedurally permissible.

Applicant Copy

Office: Downtown

Application Invoice No: 110415



68001110415

City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning**City Planning Request**

NOTICE: The staff of the Planning Department will analyze your request and accord the same full and impartial consideration to your application, regardless of whether or not you obtain the services of anyone to represent you.

This filing fee is required by Chapter 1, Article 9, L.A.M.C.

If you have questions about this invoice, please contact the planner assigned to this case. To identify the assigned planner, please the assigned planner, please visit <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/> and enter the Case Number.

Payment Info: \$288.54 was paid on 08/06/2026 with receipt number 200665804961

Applicant: Pat Hadnagay
Representative:
Project Address: 2413 N SILVER LAKE BLVD, 90039

NOTES:

CPC-2024-5534-DB-PR-VHCA-1A			
Item	Fee	%	Charged Fee
Appeal by Person Other Than The Applicant	\$229.00	100 %	\$229.00
Case Total			\$229.00
* Fees Subject to Surcharges			\$229.00
Fees Not Subject to Surcharges			\$0.00
Plan & Land Use Fees Total			\$0.00
Expediting Fee			\$0.00
Development Services Center Surcharge (3%)			\$6.87
City Planning Systems Development Surcharge (6%)			\$13.74
Operating Surcharge (7%)			\$16.03
General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (10%)			\$22.90

* Fees Subject to Surcharges	\$229.00
Fees Not Subject to Surcharges	\$0.00
Plan & Land Use Fees Total	\$0.00
Expediting Fee	\$0.00
Development Services Center Surcharge (3%)	\$6.87
City Planning Systems Dev. Surcharge (6%)	\$13.74
Operating Surcharge (7%)	\$16.03
General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (10%)	\$22.90
Grand Total	\$288.54
Total Overpayment Amount	\$0.00
Total Paid (amount must equal sum of all checks)	\$288.54

Council District:

Plan Area:

Processed by RUBEN VASQUEZ on 8/6/2026

Signature: _____