

Land Use Matters provides information and insights into legal and regulatory developments, primarily at the Los Angeles City and County levels, affecting land use matters, as well as new CEQA appellate decisions.

Please visit the firm's website for additional information about our Land Use Group.

City of Los Angeles

Draft Economic Study on Affordable Housing In-Lieu Fee

Pursuant to Measure JJJ adopted by the voters at the November 2016 election, the City has prepared a <u>draft economic study</u>, which is the first step to adopting an in-lieu fee for affordable housing. Measure JJJ generally applies to residential projects that require a general plan amendment, zone change, or height district change that would intensify the proposed use on the property. The proposed in-lieu fees described in the draft study are substantial; refer to pages 26–33.

Selection of CEQA Consultants

Pursuant to City Council action, the Planning Department will be releasing requests for qualification to assist the City in preparing a prequalified list of on-call <u>environmental consultants</u> to prepare CEQA review documents for the City. Applicants seeking entitlements for development projects will be required to select a CEQA consultant from that list.

Trial Court Decisions in CEQA Cases

Trial Court Invalidates City's Hybrid Industrial Ordinance

The Los Angeles Superior Court (Judge Strobel) invalidated the City's Hybrid Industrial Live/Work Zone ordinance. This ordinance was anticipated to be applied to projects in different areas of the City, including the Arts District. The trial court ruled that the City improperly relied on a categorical exemption under CEQA when it adopted the ordinance.

Superior Court Ruling

Trial Court Invalidates Approval for 8150 Sunset Project

In a case involving a high-profile development project (slated to be designed by Frank Gehry), the Los Angeles Superior Court (Judge Hogue) invalidated the project entitlements based on the City's EIR analysis and findings concerning alternatives that would have preserved a historic building on the project site. The court found error in the City's rejection of the preservation alternatives, making the following notable holdings: (1) the comparative benefits of the project relative to an alternative is not a basis to find the alternative "infeasible" within the meaning of CEQA; (2) an alternative's inconsistency with "non-basic project objectives" is not a valid basis to reject an alternative; (3) in evaluating alternatives,

the decision-maker should consider factors "external" to the alternative (which would exclude the alternative's design and aesthetics); and (4) to find that an alternative is not economically feasible, the lead agency must determine, based on its independent judgment, that the alternative's reduced profitability is so severe to make it "impractical" to proceed with the alternative.

Superior Court Ruling

Hollywood Target Store

In the second round of litigation challenging the City's approval of a Target store in Hollywood, the Los Angeles Superior Court (Judge Fruin) once again invalidated the City's approval. Previously, the court invalidated the project approval because there was not substantial evidence supporting the variances granted for the project. The City then adopted an amendment to the Specific Plan that would permit the Target store without the need for variances. However, since the amendments to the Specific Plan went beyond the Target project site, but the additional CEQA document prepared for the amendment only evaluated the Target project, the trial court invalidated the Specific Plan amendment.

Superior Court Ruling

Land Use Matters - 2 -

Contributing Authors



Edward J. Casey Partner Environment, Land Use & Natural Resources ed.casey@alston.com



Kathleen A. Hill Planning Director Environment, Land Use & Natural Resources kathleen.hill@alston.com

This publication by Alston & Bird LLP provides a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any of the following:

Doug Arnold 404.881.7637 doug.arnold@alston.com

Paul Beard 916.498.3354 paul.beard@alston.com

Ward Benshoof 213.576.1108 ward.benshoof@alston.com

Meaghan Goodwin Boyd 404.881.7245 meaghan.boyd@alston.com

Nicki Carlsen 213.576.1128 nicki.carlsen@alston.com

Edward Casey 213.576.1005 ed.casey@alston.com

Roger Cerda 213.576.1156 roger.cerda@alston.com Skip Fulton 404.881.7152 skip.fulton@alston.com

Maureen Gorsen 916.498.3305 maureen.gorsen@alston.com

Ronnie Gosselin 404.881.7965 ronnie.gosselin@alston.com

Maya Lopez Grasse 213.576.2526 maya.grasse@alston.com

Clay Massey 404.881.4969 clay.massey@alston.com

Clynton Namuo 213.576.2671 clynton.namuo@alston.com

Elise Paeffgen 202.239.3939 elise.paeffgen@alston.com 202.239.3585 bruce.pasfield@alston.com

Bruce Pasfield

Geoffrey Rathgeber 404.881.4974 geoff.rathgeber@alston.com

Chris Roux 202.239.3113 213.576.1103 chris.roux@alston.com

Jocelyn Thompson 213.576.1104 jocelyn.thompson@alston.com

Andrea Warren 213.576.2518 andrea.warren@alston.com

Jonathan Wells 404.881.7472 jonathan.wells@alston.com

Land Use Matters - 3 -