

COUNTY CLERK'S USE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
200 NORTH SPRING STREET, ROOM 395  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT  
**NOTICE OF EXEMPTION**  
(PRC Section 21152; CEQA Guidelines Section 15062)

Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21152(b) and CEQA Guidelines § 15062, the notice should be posted with the County Clerk by mailing the form and posting fee payment to the following address: Los Angeles County Clerk/Recorder, Environmental Notices, P.O. Box 1208, Norwalk, CA 90650. Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21167 (d), the posting of this notice starts a 35-day statute of limitations on court challenges to reliance on an exemption for the project. Failure to file this notice as provided above, results in the statute of limitations being extended to 180 days.

PARENT CASE NUMBER(S) / REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS  
VTT-82416 / Vesting Tentative Tract Map

SCH NUMBER

LEAD CITY AGENCY  
**City of Los Angeles (Department of City Planning)**

CASE NUMBER  
ENV-2018-7453-CE

PROJECT TITLE  
**Cazador/Carlyle**

COUNCIL DISTRICT  
1 - Hernandez

PROJECT LOCATION (Street Address and Cross Streets and/or Attached Map)  Map attached.  
**2242-2252 North Cazador Drive; 2231-2245 North Carlyle Place; 2236 North/East Carlyle Place**

**REVISED** PROJECT DESCRIPTION:  Additional page(s) attached.  
Subdivision of five (5) lots into 10 lots and adjustment to reduce lot width by less than 20 percent. The proposed project also includes the removal of four (4) Protected Trees.

NAME OF APPLICANT / OWNER:  
**Greentek Investments II LLC and Heiko Flores LLC**

CONTACT PERSON (If different from Applicant/Owner above)  
**Dan Zacharias**

(AREA CODE) TELEPHONE NUMBER | EXT.  
(323) 229-2782

EXEMPT STATUS: (Check all boxes, and include all exemptions, that apply and provide relevant citations.)  
STATE CEQA STATUTE & GUIDELINES

- STATUTORY EXEMPTION(S)  
Public Resources Code Section(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION(S) (State CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15301-15333 / Class 1-Class 33)  
CEQA Guideline Section(s) / Class(es) 15332 / Class 32
- OTHER BASIS FOR EXEMPTION (E.g., CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) or (b)(4) or Section 15378(b) )  
\_\_\_\_\_

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT EXEMPTION:  Additional page(s) attached

Class 32 consists of projects characterized as in-fill development meeting the conditions described in this section.

None of the exceptions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 to the categorical exemption(s) apply to the Project.  
 The project is identified in one or more of the list of activities in the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines as cited in the justification.

IF FILED BY APPLICANT, ATTACH CERTIFIED DOCUMENT ISSUED BY THE CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STATING THAT THE DEPARTMENT HAS FOUND THE PROJECT TO BE EXEMPT.  
If different from the applicant, the identity of the person undertaking the project.

**CITY STAFF USE ONLY:**

CITY STAFF NAME AND SIGNATURE  
Linda Lou  3/11/25

STAFF TITLE  
City Planner

ENTITLEMENTS APPROVED  
Vesting Tentative Tract Map

**DEPARTMENT OF  
CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE  
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

MONIQUE LAWSHE  
PRESIDENT

MICHAEL R. NEWHOUSE  
VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIA CABILDO

CAROLINE CHOE

MARTINA DIAZ

PHYLLIS KLEIN

KAREN MACK

JACOB SAITMAN

ELIZABETH ZAMORA

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CALIFORNIA**



KAREN BASS  
MAYOR

**EXECUTIVE OFFICES**

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801  
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP  
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

# REVISED JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT EXEMPTION CASE NO. ENV-2018-7453-CE

---

The Planning Department determined that the City of Los Angeles Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 and the State CEQA Guidelines designate the subject project as Categorical Exempt under Article 19, Section 15332, Class 32.

A project qualifies for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption if it is developed on an infill site and meets the following criteria:

- (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with the applicable zoning designation and regulations;
- (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses;
- (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species;
- (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and
- (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

The project is the subdivision of five (5) lots into 10 lots for the construction, use, and maintenance of seven (7) existing dwelling units and 13 new dwelling units. The proposed project also includes the removal of four (4) of the eight (8) Protected Trees that exist on-site. As a subdivision, and a project which is characterized as in-fill development, the project qualifies for the Class 32 Categorical Exemption.

The site is zoned R2-1-HCR and has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Medium I Residential. As shown in the case file, the project is consistent with the applicable Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan designation and policies and all applicable zoning designations and regulations. The subject site is wholly within the City of Los Angeles, on a site that is approximately 1.81 acres. Lots adjacent to the subject site are developed with mainly low- to medium-density residential uses. The site is previously disturbed and surrounded by development and therefore is not, and has no value as, a habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species. As identified in the Tree Report prepared by John K. Innes, ASLA, ISA Landscape Architect on August 8, 2024, there are eight (8) existing Protected Trees and Shrubs that exist on-site. There are five (5) California black walnuts, two (2) Coast live oaks, and one (1) Toyon shrub. Four (4) of the Protected Trees are proposed for removal (three (3) protected black walnut trees and one (1)

protected live oak tree) and are proposed to be replaced at a 4:1 ratio. The previous Tree Report prepared by John K. Innes on February 13, 2024, identified five (5) existing Protected Trees and Shrubs that exist on site and two Protected Trees were proposed for removal with a 4:1 tree replacement ratio. The new August 8, 2024, Tree Report stamped by the Urban Forestry Division on February 20, 2025, supersedes the Tree Report prepared by John K. Innes on February 13, 2024, and stamped by the Urban Forestry Division on April 29, 2024. As identified in the previous Tree Report prepared by John Oblinger, ISA Certified Arborist WE-6820-A on October 18, 2018, there are also 13 non-Protected Significant Trees (pursuant to the Mt. Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan) on-site. Seven (7) of these Significant Trees are proposed to be removed from the subject site; they will be replaced with seven (7) 24-inch box trees. The project will be subject to Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs), which require compliance with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance, pollutant discharge, dewatering, stormwater mitigations; and Best Management Practices for stormwater runoff. These RCMs will ensure the project will not have significant impacts on noise and water. Furthermore, the project does not exceed the threshold criteria established by LADOT for preparing a traffic study. Therefore, the project will not have any significant impacts to traffic. Interim thresholds were developed by DCP staff based on CalEEMod model runs relying on reasonable assumptions, consulting with AQMD staff, and surveying published air quality studies for which criteria air pollutants did not exceed the established SCAQMD construction and operational thresholds. The project site will be adequately served by all public utilities and services given that the subdivision will be on a site which has been previously developed and is consistent with the General Plan. Therefore, the project meets all of the Criteria for the Class 32.

#### Exceptions Narrative for Class 32 Categorical Exemption

There are five (5) Exceptions which the City is required to consider before finding a project exempt under Class 15332: (a) Cumulative Impacts; (b) Significant Effect; (c) Scenic Highways; (d) Hazardous Waste Sites; and (e) Historical Resources.

There is not a succession of known projects of the same type and in the same place as the subject project. As mentioned, the project proposes the subdivision of five (5) lots into ten (10) lots for the construction, use and maintenance of 20 dwelling units (seven (7) existing) in an area zoned and designated for such development. All adjacent lots are developed with single-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings, and the subject site is of a similar size and slope to nearby properties. The project's proposed Floor Area Ratio and size will comply with and be regulated through the Specific Plan for each proposed development. Thus, there are no unusual circumstances which may lead to a significant effect on the environment. Additionally, the only State Scenic Highway within the City of Los Angeles is the Topanga Canyon State Scenic Highway, State Route 27, which travels through a portion of Topanga State Park. The project site is located about 20 miles east of this State Scenic Highway. Therefore, the subject site will not create any impacts within a designated as a state scenic highway. Furthermore, according to Envirostor, the State of California's database of Hazardous Waste Sites, neither the subject site, nor any site in the vicinity, is identified as a hazardous waste site. The project site has not been identified as a historic resource by local or state agencies, and the project site has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register; and was not found to be a potential historic resource based on the City's HistoricPlacesLA website or SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles. Finally, the City does not choose to treat the site as a historic resource. Based on this, the project will not result in a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historic resource and this exception does not apply.