

# **Appendix FEIR-5**

---

Revised Design Memo

# MEMORANDUM

**Teresa Grimes | Historic Preservation**

Teresa.Grimes@icloud.com

323-868-2391

**Date:** August 28, 2023  
**For:** Brad Napientek, Eyestone Environmental  
**Project:** 1360 Vine Street Project  
**Subject:** Revised Design Residential Option

---

## Introduction

I managed and co-authored the preparation of the Historical Resource Technical Report (Technical Report) for the 1360 Vine Street Project in the Hollywood Community Plan Area of the City of Los Angeles. The Technical Report analyzed the potential impacts of the proposed Project on historical resources as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Seven of the ten properties within the Project Site are located within the Afton Square Historic District (Historic District), which is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources and therefore a historical resource. The Technical Report was used in the preparation of the Cultural Resource section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the proposed Project. The Draft EIR analyzed two options, the Office Option and the Residential Option. In response to stakeholder feedback, the Project Sponsor has redesigned the Residential Option (Revised Design) to address the adjacent buildings in the Historic District. This memorandum provides an analysis of the Revised Design's potential environmental impacts on the Historic District. The impact analysis is performed relative to the proposed design for the Residential Option (Proposed Design). For reference, the Proposed Design is described in detail on Pages II-13-28, Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

## Description

The Revised Design would be in the same location as the Proposed Design, N. Vine Street between De Longpre Avenue on the north and Afton Place on the south. The uses would also remain the same with commercial spaces on the first two levels and residential units on the upper levels. The Revised Design would be taller than the Proposed Design, but with more terracing on the south and east. The residential tower at the northern portion of the building would be 360 feet 4 inches under the Proposed Design and 388 feet 4 inches under the Revised Design, when accounting for rooftop mechanical equipment in both cases. The main difference between the Proposed Design and Revised Design is the southern portion of the building. Under the Proposed Design the shape is rectangular and the height is 9 levels with a setback on the east elevation at the third story. Under the Revised Design, there is a distinct break between the northern and southern portion of the building on the east elevation. On the west, along Vine Street, the southern portion rises to ten levels with rooftop amenities. On the east, the levels are gradually

terraced and reduced in size from the third level with 6,000 square feet of amenity space to the seventh and eighth levels with two residential units comprising a total of 1,841 square feet.

## **Analysis**

As discussed in Section IV.B. Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project involves four activities that have the potential to directly, indirectly, and cumulatively impact the Historic District: demolition, relocation, rehabilitation, and new construction.

### Direct Impacts

The Revised Design does not involve any changes with regard to the demolition activities required for the Project. Four of the commercial buildings to be demolished are outside the boundaries of the Historic District and are not historical resources. Inside the boundaries of the Historic District, only non-contributing ancillary buildings and one non-contributing residential building would be demolished. Thus, the impact from demolition activities would remain less than significant.

Likewise, the Revised Design does not involve any changes with regard the relocation or rehabilitation activities required for the Project. The six bungalows within the Historic District at 6245, 6249, 6255 Afton Place and 6254, 6256, and 6262 De Longpre Avenue would be relocated and rehabilitated within the eastern portion of the Project Site and would be used for commercial uses or as residential units. Just like the Proposed Design, the Revised Design would implement Project Design Feature CUL-PDF-1, a Preservation Plan that would identify the character-defining features, assess the conditions, and make recommendations for the treatment of each bungalow in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). No revisions to Project Design Feature CUL-PDF-1 are required based on the Revised Design. Furthermore, the Preservation Plan would include a program for monitoring during the construction process. Projects that comply with the Standards are considered mitigated to a less than significant level.

### Indirect Impacts

Under the Proposed Design, the indirect impacts from the construction of the new building on the historical resources in the vicinity would be less than significant. The identified historical resources include the Historic District as well as the building at 1313 Vine Street.

With regard to the Historic District, the indirect impact from the Revised Design would remain less than significant. The Revised Design would not negatively affect the balance of contributing and non-contributing properties and would still be located outside the boundary of the Historic District. The Revised Design would be 28 feet taller than the Proposed Design, but the Proposed Design is already incompatible with the size, scale, and design of the contributing properties within the Historic District. In some regards the Revised Design is an improvement upon the Proposed Design, at least the southern portion, because it pulls away from the Historic District.

The Revised Design and Proposed Design would both diminish the Historic District's integrity of feeling and setting to the same extent. The Revised Design would not be more impactful than the Proposed Design simply because it is slightly taller. The difference between a 360 foot and 388-foot-tall building relative to the 15 to 20 foot tall buildings in the Historic District is negligible. Furthermore, on the southern portion, the Revised Design would be shorter than the Proposed Design. Both designs would introduce a prominent new visual feature to the skyline. However, the impact would be less than significant because the larger setting along Vine Street is not a character-defining feature that conveys the significance of the Historic District. The views from the Historic District already include modern buildings. The Historic District would continue to possess the other five aspects of integrity and convey its historic significance.

Concerning the historical resource at 1313 Vine Street, there is no difference in the potential for indirect impacts between the Revised Design and Proposed Design. The impact would remain less than significant for the same reason as before; the historical resource is not on the same block as the Project Site. The broad setting is not a physical feature that conveys the significance of the historic resource and modern new construction has already occurred in the area.

#### Cumulative Impacts

The implementation of the Revised Design would have no effect on the analysis of cumulative impacts, which are no impact or less than significant impact. The cumulative impacts on the historical resources in the vicinity under Revised Design would be identical to the Proposed Design.