

BRENTWOOD RESIDENTS COALITION

April 7, 2011

Cultural Heritage Commission
200 North Spring Street, Room 1010
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Barry Building, 11961-11991 San Vicente, ENV-2009-1065-EIR

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Wendy-Sue Rosen and I am here representing the Brentwood Residents Coalition.¹ I was Chair of the Brentwood Community Council when the Barry Building was being considered for designation as an Historic-Cultural Monument. The BCC voted not only to support the designation but to work with Friends of the Barry Building in reaching out to the community, which responded with overwhelming support for the designation. The hearings before this Commission were attended by overflow crowds of community members and prominent architects, preservationists and architectural photographers who testified in support of the designation. Famed architectural photographer Julius Shulman testified that, "There aren't many good buildings in our society that offer to a community the values that this building does, especially its central court – its centerpiece."

This Commission unanimously voted to support designation of the Barry Building as an Historic-Cultural Monument in 2007. Commission Chair Mary-Klaus Martin stated that "this is a jewel of a building . . . designed by a thoughtful, acclaimed, young architect and it has contributed over the last 50 years to the liveliness of the community. These qualities are extremely rare along San Vicente." The Barry Building was supported because it is both an excellent and rare surviving example of modern midcentury commercial architecture in Southern California and it is a place of cultural significance to the Brentwood community.

That is why it is so disappointing that the Draft EIR offers a "preservation" alternative that seems intentionally designed for failure because the proposed new structures that will be built around the Barry Building are not properly integrated with the historic structure. The Department of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, which should have been applied in crafting the Draft EIR preservation alternative, provide that any related new construction

¹ The BRC is a grass roots, non-profit advocacy group whose purposes are to preserve and enhance the environment and quality of life in Brentwood, to protect the integrity of residential neighborhoods, to assist with planning, to uphold zoning and municipal codes, to encourage traffic safety, and to educate the public on issues that affect quality of life and the environment.

BRENTWOOD RESIDENTS COALITION

within the scope of the project not destroy the features and special relationships that characterize the historic structure; that the new structures be compatible with the materials, features, size, scale and proportion of the historic structure; and that massing for the project protect the historic integrity of the structure and its environment. The BCC, in its scoping comments, asked that these standards be applied. (See attached letter.) To comply with the Department of Interior standards, the design for the preservation alternative should have been overseen by an historian who could have analyzed the visual integrity of any proposed surrounding structures to assure that they complement the preserved building. Because this was not done, the preservation alternative must be completely revised.

The developer's objectives can be achieved without destroying the Barry Building if the preservation alternative is properly described in a revised version of the Draft EIR. The developer's project calls for the same type of retail use of the property and the same courtyard-centered layout as the Barry Building. That similarity makes it far easier to preserve the Barry Building and achieve the developer's objectives than if the developer's objective was to use the property differently. If sufficient effort is dedicated to crafting a preservation alternative, as required under CEQA, the developer can achieve its objective and this designated landmark can be saved.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wendy-Sue Rosen', written in a cursive style.

Wendy-Sue Rosen

Brentwood Community Council
149 S. Barrington Ave., Box 194 Los Angeles, CA 90049

July 20, 2009

Diana Kitching
Environmental Review Coordinator
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: Brentwood Town Green Project; ENV-2009-1065-EIR
11973-75, 11977, 11981, and 11991 San Vicente Boulevard
642 and 644 Saltair Avenue**

Dear Ms. Kitching:

The Brentwood Community Council (BCC) is the broadest based Brentwood community organization, representing stakeholders of the community, including homeowner associations, business organizations, youth groups, schools, religious groups, volunteer service groups, multi-family residential dwellers, public safety and environmental organizations. The BCC submits these comments to shape the scope and content of the Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Brentwood Town Green development project.

As a preliminary matter, however, the BCC requests that the comment period remain open for an additional 30 days, to provide meaningful opportunity for the public to obtain, review and comment on the revised Project Description, which we understand was filed with the City on July 15, 2009. The BCC has not had an opportunity to review this filing and our comments in this letter are submitted without prejudice to making additional comments in response to the new filing.

A. Identification And Assessment of Feasible Alternatives To Demolition of the Barry Building, Historic-Cultural Monument # 887.

Under CEQA, an EIR must address potentially significant adverse impacts to cultural resources, including designated historical resources. See *CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G*. The EIR must therefore consider the impact of the developer's proposal to demolish the Barry Building, a designated Historic-Cultural Monument. In doing so, the EIR must consider the cultural significance of this particular building and the community's successful and tireless efforts to preserve the building as a landmark. The developer's

Brentwood Community Council

failure to do so is evidenced by his proposal to demolish the Barry Building without considering alternatives that would preserve the historic building.

The BCC joined with the Cultural Heritage Commission, the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, the Office of Historic Resources, the LA Conservancy, the Brentwood Historical Society, prominent architects, preservationist, and architectural photographers, and hundreds of community members in supporting the designation of the Barry Building as an Historic-Cultural Monument. (The BCC's letters in support of the designation are attached.) At the hearing before the Cultural Heritage Commission, the BCC's representatives spoke in favor of the designation. In response to the developer's disparagement of the building as unworthy of this landmark-status designation, Julius Shulman, the world's preeminent architectural photographer of mid-20th century modern architecture in Southern California, appeared before the Commission at age 96 for the first time ever to speak in favor of designating a building that he passionately believed merited preservation. Mr. Shulman's photographs of the Barry Building, which he submitted to the Commission, clearly supported his expert opinion that the building stands as one of the few remaining architecturally significant specimens of mid-20th Century commercial architecture in Southern California. Mr. Shulman's expert opinion on the topic is, of course, unassailable given his preeminence in the field. See <http://www.latimes.com/news/obituaries/la-me-julius-shulman17-2009jul17,0,1393680.story> (attached).

The Cultural Heritage Commission voted unanimously in favor of the designation in July 2007. The Commission's Chair, Mary Klaus-Martin, made the following statement in support of the Commission's designation:

I'd like to point out that at the time this architect [Milton Caughey] received four AIA [American Institute of Architecture] awards, awards were not being given out. This past AIA awards ceremony they gave out 50. At the time he received his, he was being honored as a major architect. . . . He not only received his AIA awards at a time when they were very difficult to be received, he was published by John Entenza¹ from Arts & Architecture. I mean this was international. He was knighted by John Entenza. He was published by Architectural Record, Architectural Forum. I mean these

¹ John Entenza (1903 – 1984), one of the pivotal figures in the growth of modernism in California, championed the emerging mid-century modernist architecture in Southern California while editor of the influential magazine, Arts & Architecture. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Entenza

Brentwood Community Council

were the taste makers at the time. I think this is a jewel of a building. I think it was designed by a thoughtful, acclaimed, young architect. And it has contributed over the last 50 years to the liveliness of the Community. *These qualities are extremely rare along San Vicente.*”

She closed with the following message to the developer: *“I would hope that this building would be restored to its original splendor so that future generations can really enjoy it and use it as a study.”*

The designation of the Barry Building as a landmark necessitates EIR consideration of at least two additional project alternatives related to that designation, one that would preserve the building and another that would provide for its rehabilitation. The EIR must consider the feasibility of both preservation and rehabilitation in light of the project’s objectives. In doing so, the EIR must apply the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

The developer has characterized as an act of “preservation” his plan to demolish the Barry Building and replace it with a building that is similar in size, scale, function, and shape to the Barry Building. The developer’s document states that “in greater Los Angeles historic preservation is sometimes wisely caused in the demolition-and-replace mode that Applicants plan to use.” Project Description Plus Owners’ Statement of Intent (“Project Description”), p. 23. According to the developer, his plan to demolish the Barry Building and replace it with a bigger structure with similar characteristics provides “more” preservation than would any restoration of the building because the new building would exemplify the “architectural mode” in a structure that would be “greatly expanding its size.” *Id.* By that logic, the most effective method for restoring a priceless Ming Vase would be to smash it and purchase a replica at Pier One Imports, with extra “preservation” points earned if the replica is oversized.

Contrary to the developer’s analysis, however, demolition and replacement of a standing (in this case functioning) landmark building is not an act of preservation. It is a violation of the first principle of preservation: “Important historic properties cannot be replaced if they are destroyed.” See Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation, http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/standguide/preserve/preserve_standards.htm

The preservation and rehabilitation alternatives that shall be described in the EIR must account for the fact that the developer’s favored proposal calls for construction of a structure that is remarkably similar to the Barry Building in size, scale, function, and shape. This similarity between the Barry Building and the proposed new building indicates that the developer’s objectives can likely be achieved without demolishing the

Brentwood Community Council

Barry Building. Preservation architects will need to be consulted to provide guidance on the feasibility of these preservation/rehabilitation alternatives in the EIR.

Preservation focuses on “the maintenance and repair of existing historical materials and retention of a property’s form as it has evolved over time.” Preservation alternatives in the EIR must comply with Department of Interior Standards and any proposed deviation from those standards must be based on a finding of infeasibility that is fully analyzed in the EIR. The EIR must therefore describe precisely how the preservation alternatives comply with the following Department of Interior Standards:

Dept. of Interior Standards For Preservation

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Similarly, rehabilitation alternatives must comply with the Department of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation, sometimes referred to as adaptive reuse, acknowledges the need to alter or add to an historic property to meet continuing or

Brentwood Community Council

changing uses while retaining the property's historic character. The EIR must therefore describe precisely how the adaptive reuse alternatives comply with the following Department of Interior Standards:

Dept. of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Brentwood Community Council

The EIR must therefore apply these Department of Interior Standards in identifying reasonable preservation and rehabilitation alternatives and analyzing their feasibility.

B. The Proposed Rezoning Of Two Residential Lots To Commercial.

The developer is seeking a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change for the purpose of changing the zoning on the two Saltair Ave. properties from RS-1-0, a Low Density Residential designation, to a Commercial designation, (Q)C4-1VL-0. The developer contends that this Residential-to-Commercial zone change is necessary because subterranean parking for commercial use is not permitted in an RS zone.

The EIR must identify and assess the purported benefit achieved by allowing parking under the residential lots and the detriment to the community resulting from the imposition of commercial parking under residential lots.

- What is the minimum number of parking spaces required under each project alternative?
- What benefit, if any, would be achieved by increasing parking capacity above the required level on the project site?
- Would increased parking as provided in the proposal encourage future expansion on the project site?
- Would increased parking capacity as provided in the proposal be used by those visiting businesses on other properties?
- Would increased parking capacity as proposed induce more traffic into the area?

The EIR must consider whether a zone change would have any potentially adverse environmental impacts.

- Would precedent established by the rezoning of residential property on Saltair Ave. potentially facilitate further commercial encroachment into the residentially-zoned area?
- Would it potentially aid or induce efforts to rezone other properties from residential to commercial?
- Would it potentially facilitate other growth-inducing actions that might have significant, adverse impacts on the local environment?

Brentwood Community Council

While the developer is proposing an “alternative” whereby the residential properties on Saltair Ave. would be rezoned commercial, the EIR must *also* consider reasonable *no-zone-change* alternatives. This would require *at least* two no-zone-change alternatives – one providing code required parking on the property already zoned for commercial and parking uses. Another alternative that must be considered should provide the developer’s desired volume of parking (or close to the desired volume) without providing parking beneath either of the two residential properties. This alternative (or alternatives) would require some changes to the proposed configuration to locate the desired parking volume on the non-residentially zoned properties. The developer should also consider a no-zone-change alternative or alternatives that would provide the requisite volume of parking under a plan calling for the restoration of the Barry Building and another under a plan calling for the rehabilitation of the Barry Building.

The EIR must also assess the veracity of the developer’s assumption that a zone change is the only mechanism for allowing parking under the residential lots. The EIR should consider whether alternative mechanisms exist that would allow parking under the residential lots and whether the alternative mechanism may provide greater protection against commercialization of the Saltair Ave. residential area. Specifically, the EIR should analyze whether the developer may seek a zone variance to allow subterranean parking beneath the residentially-zoned properties. Would a variance provide the residential community greater protection against commercial encroachment than a “Q” condition on a commercial zone designation? What procedures would be required for removing such a Q condition should a future property owner desire to avoid this restriction? If the residential properties are rezoned commercial (with the Q condition), would it be possible for the property owner to provide above-ground parking on the rezoned property? Would retaining the RS-1 designation provide the community with greater protection against commercial encroachment than the proposed change of zone with a Q condition? Can the RS-1 lots be reconfigured to maintain the integrity of the residential zone facing Saltair and provide additional parking on the back residential lot, while also maintaining the residential zoning?

C. Transportation Issues.

The developer proposes a very traffic-intensive project in an area that is already overburdened with traffic. The EIR must therefore contain project alternatives that are much-less traffic intensive. The EIR must also consider the issues raised below, which arise from the project as described by the developer.

Brentwood Community Council

1. The proposed development is a high-impact “destination” site – not a humble venue for merely local-servicing retailers.

The developer’s proposal grossly understates the project’s likely adverse impact on traffic in the already-gridlocked area. He does so by characterizing the project as featuring local-servicing retailers. But the project proposal describes a *destination site*, with two high-end restaurants serving alcohol and open from 9 am until 2 am, which will attract visitors from throughout the region. Indeed, in meetings with BCC representatives and other members of the community, the developer said that his plan is to create a smaller version of the Grove, perhaps the most successful destination shopping center in Southern California. The developer’s proposal is consistent with his desire to create a Grove-like attraction. This is antithetical to the convenient but misleading characterization of the project as a site for so-called local-servicing retailers. The impact on traffic within the quiet but gridlocked residential neighborhood will be devastating.

The project describes a total of *nine* restaurants on site, covering 13.5 thousand square feet of the 40 thousand square foot shopping center. The San Vicente Business District already has more than 30 restaurants. There is no necessity for additional restaurants to serve purely local needs. The obvious purpose of the two alcohol-serving restaurants is to bring people into the community for commercial purposes. The innovation of the project is to push destination dining further west on San Vicente, on the north side of the street – on the border of the long-established Saltair residential neighborhood. The notion that the remaining retail businesses on the site will be local-servicing retailers, as opposed to businesses that will cater to visitors drawn from across the region by the destination restaurants, is unrealistic and completely unsupported by the project description. The destination restaurants will encourage destination retail shops – further increasing the traffic load. In short, the developer is proposing a project that would bring far more people and vehicles into Brentwood than would otherwise be drawn to the area, dramatically increasing traffic gridlock. This explains the developers desire for additional parking. He plans on attracting far more visitors than would be expected for local-servicing retailers, and cannot succeed in doing so unless he can service more drivers than is required under the applicable laws.

The EIR must analyze the project without assuming the veracity of the developer’s characterization of the project as providing for local-servicing retailers. This project envisions a high-end, destination shopping mall with restaurants and retailers that will greatly increase traffic in the area. This is significant because traffic on San Vicente is already at a standstill during peak hours.

Brentwood Community Council

2. The baseline traffic conditions on San Vicente are already intolerable.

The EIR must analyze the project's impact on traffic in the area. The project, and its location, create a "perfect storm" of traffic deficiencies that would substantially degrade an already intolerable traffic situation. San Vicente is gridlocked during peak traffic hours. The street, a designated scenic secondary highway, features the distinctive Coral Tree-lined median, which separates eastbound and westbound traffic adjacent to the project site. Any attempt to mitigate traffic by cutting a path through the historic median would destroy the aesthetic and cultural value of the median and destroy/endanger Coral Trees. While a U-Turn can be made just west of the project site, at Saltair Ave., this U-Turn is already the cause of traffic congestion. Another complication is that the exit for CVS/Pharmacy just east of the project site is only a few feet away from the proposed exit from the project site, creating both a road hazard and bottleneck. Finally, Saltair Ave., which would provide an escape route from gridlocked San Vicente Blvd. immediately west of the project site, is a substandard residential street that cannot safely accommodate cut-through traffic and, even if it could, the traffic flow would degrade the residential character of the neighborhood.

The existing traffic conditions, in conjunction with the significant increase in traffic that must be expected, raise many questions about the viability of the project.

- How will the increased westbound traffic volume be mitigated?
- How will the residents of the Saltair neighborhood be protected against cut-through traffic?
- How will those exiting the project site seeking to travel eastbound on San Vicente be accommodated?
- What will be the impact on aesthetics and the historic/culturally significant Coral Trees and San Vicente median – and how will such impacts be mitigated? (In assessing this, the EIR must consider that the San Vicente Coral Trees are a designated Cultural Monument.)
- What are the safety hazards created by the location of the entrance and exit driveways and how will they be mitigated?
- What will be the impact of increased traffic on emergency response in the area and on the project site?
- How will the increased traffic congestion impact local intersections, including San Vicente and Saltair, San Vicente and Montana, San Vicente and Barrington, and San Vicente and Bundy?
- What will be the impact on Bus Routes?

Brentwood Community Council

3. Cumulative impacts must be considered.

CEQA requires that cumulative impacts be considered in the EIR. The City of Los Angeles has recently approved a 10,000 square foot mini-shopping mall project across the street from the project site, at 11906-11920 San Vicente Blvd., with 4,200 square feet of restaurant space. The EIR must also consider other projects planned for the San Vicente Business District.

An important issue that must be considered in the EIR is whether the area is over-saturated with destination restaurants and retail stores given the very limited transportation infrastructure to support such operations. The Brentwood community, and San Vicente Blvd. in particular, was not designed to accommodate so many destination businesses. Over-saturation of the business district with destination businesses is evidenced by the *increasing* traffic gridlock, cut-through traffic, and parking on residential streets. How will the two *new* destination centers, both to be located on San Vicente Blvd. between Montana and Saltair, impact traffic and related quality of life degradations in this already over-saturated area? Can the impacts be mitigated and if so how? Or has the area simply become too saturated for the developer's proposed project?

4. Traffic impacts on air quality.

The EIR must also consider the impacts that traffic will have on air quality. The EIR must consider the air quality impacts due to the increased traffic volume. Additionally, the EIR must consider the adverse impacts that increased traffic gridlock will have on air quality given the exponentially greater pollution caused by idling motor vehicles. In assessing the air quality impacts, the EIR must also consider the impacts on the local school children and residents. The EIR must consider mitigation measures.

5. Construction impacts on traffic.

- How will the construction phase impact traffic?
- What mechanisms will be utilized to alleviate traffic congestion due to construction?
- Will there be any street or sidewalk closures during construction?
- How will the haul route impact San Vicente Blvd. and the residential streets surrounding the project?
- Where will staging take place?
- Where will construction materials be loaded and unloaded?

Brentwood Community Council

D. The EIR Must Assess The Developer's Plans For The Saltair Terrace Property.

The developer owns a residential property behind the project site, on Saltair Terrace, which is situated behind the project site's parking area. While the developer has informally told community members that he plans to build a house on the residential site, the property has been vacant for the past several years. The EIR must disclose the developer's plans for the Saltair Terrace property.

Significantly, a project is defined, under CEQA, to encompass "the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in a physical change in the environment, directly or ultimately." CEQA Guidelines, Section 15378(a). The purpose of this broad definition is to prevent developers from piece-mealing their projects, and thereby evading meaningful public notice and comment on the entire development plan. In this situation, the developer's ownership of the Saltair Terrace property raises concern that the property will later be incorporated into the project – whether by providing rear-access to the project site or for any other reason. The impact on the Saltair Ave. and Saltair Terrace neighborhoods of any such plans is potentially devastating. For that reason, the EIR must carefully consider the developer's Saltair Terrace property.

E. Aesthetic Impacts.

Although the developer characterizes the project as an effort to revitalize the project site, the proposal would apparently transform the bedroom community of Brentwood into something that it has never before been – a center for nightlife. The proposal is to bring onto the project site two alcohol-serving restaurants and a bar, open until 2 am, and a high-end liquor market, which will presumably be accompanied by complementary retail establishments. This open-air nightlife entertainment center would be located next door to a previously-quiet residential neighborhood.

The EIR must consider the following potential impacts and mitigations to them: (1) Would the project increase noise from automobiles of those entering and exiting the project site; parking within the project site on street level or entering/exiting the underground parking; parking on neighboring streets, including employees of businesses on the project site; (2) Would the project increase noise from the on-site businesses, including restaurants and bars and those leaving/entering such establishments; (3) Would illumination from the project site shine into or impair views of those residing in close proximity to the project site; (4) Would the selling of alcohol on the project site have any adverse impacts, including traffic, noise or safety related impacts and how would such

Brentwood Community Council

impacts be mitigated; (5) What impact would the selling of alcohol have given the close proximity of schools, churches, and residences?

The height of the project raises another aesthetic concern that must be considered in the EIR. The EIR must consider the views from the surrounding residential communities and methods for mitigating those impacts. Moreover, the project is designed to feature a removable roof at an elevation of *50-feet* above ground, in violation of zoning restrictions. While the developer has recently chosen to call this roof or awning a “skylight,” to fall within an exception for skylights, it is not a skylight. It is a roof or awning – and the aesthetic impact on the surrounding neighbors is no different than a roof or awning, which the height limitations were designed to control. The EIR must therefore consider whether the tactic of labeling the retractable roof a “skylight” is sufficient to evade the rule.

The noise impacts of the project must also be considered in relation to the neighbors on Saltair Ave. and Saltair Terrace. The project calls for parking behind the retail structures, just behind residential homes. The entry and exit ramps to the parking garage are also next to the residential properties. The aesthetic impacts, including noise, must be considered and reasonable mitigation methods adopted.

F. Construction Impacts.

The EIR must consider the construction impacts of the project on issues such as traffic congestion, dust, air pollution, construction hours, noise in residential neighborhoods, safety risks created by construction and traffic-related impacts, sidewalk closures, the availability of parking, parking in residential neighborhoods, impacts related to haul routes, construction-related parking plans and traffic routes. What mitigation measures will be necessary to eliminate or alleviate the likely adverse impacts? How will these impacts and mitigation measures impact peak-hour traffic, local residents, local businesses, and local traffic?

* * * *

Brentwood Community Council

The current project description is grossly inadequate because it fails to consider reasonable alternatives to the developer's currently favored project. The EIR must, however, consider reasonable alternatives that would have less significant environmental impacts, including alternatives that would restore and rehabilitate the Barry Building, no-zone-change alternatives, and less traffic-intensive alternatives. The EIR must also take a more realistic, fact-based perspective and not replace careful analysis with characterizations like "local-serving retailers."

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W.S. Rosen', with a stylized, cursive script.

Wendy-Sue Rosen
Land Use Committee Chair
Brentwood Community Council

cc: Councilmember Bill Rosendahl

Brentwood Community Council
149 S. Barrington Ave., Box 194 Los Angeles, CA 90049

April 24, 2007

Cultural Heritage Commission
200 North Spring Street, Room 667
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Support for Historic-Cultural Status for Barry Building

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing on behalf of the Brentwood Community Council (BCC), the broadest based Brentwood community organization representing the stakeholders of the community, including homeowner associations, business organizations, youth groups, schools, religious groups, volunteer service groups, multi-family residential dwellers, public safety and environmental organizations.

At our April 10, 2007 meeting, the BCC passed a motion to support the designation of the Barry Building on San Vicente Boulevard in Brentwood as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument. The Barry Building is one of the very few modern commercial buildings remaining in the Brentwood area. It is a living piece of Brentwood architectural history, with a functional plant-filled courtyard that has long served as the home of the much-loved Dutton's Books.

For those reasons, the BCC believes that the Barry Building deserves to be designated as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument.

Sincerely,



Wendy-Sue Rosen, Chairwoman
Brentwood Community Council

cc: City Councilmember Bill Rosendahl

Brentwood Community Council
149 S. Barrington Ave., Box 194 Los Angeles, CA 90049

September 10, 2007

Councilmember Bill Rosendahl
1645 Corinth Avenue, Room 201
West Los Angeles, CA 90025

Re: Support for Historic-Cultural Monument Status for Barry Building

Dear Councilmember Rosendahl:

I am writing on behalf of the Brentwood Community Council (BCC), the broadest based Brentwood community organization representing approximately 35,000 stakeholders of the community, including homeowner associations, business organizations, youth groups, schools, religious groups, volunteer service groups, multi-family residential dwellers, public safety and environmental organizations.

The Brentwood Community Council joins the Cultural Heritage Commission, the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources, prominent architects, preservationists, architectural photographers, the LA Conservancy, the Brentwood Historical Society, and hundreds of individual community members in supporting Historic-Cultural Monument Status for the Barry Building.

The Brentwood Community Council enthusiastically supports the designation of the Barry Building as an Historic-Cultural Monument for two reasons. First, the Barry Building is an architecturally significant specimen of mid-20th century modern architecture in Southern California, as wonderfully depicted in the Julius Shulman photographs that were presented to the Cultural Heritage Commission. Second, the Building stands as the cultural center of the Brentwood Community, serving as a local gathering place for generations of area residents.

Mary Klaus-Martin, Chairwoman of the Cultural Heritage Commission made the following statement at the July 12, 2007 Cultural Heritage Commission hearing:

"I'd like to point out that at the time that this architect [Milton Caughey] received four AIA awards, awards were not being given out. This past AIA awards ceremony they gave out 50. At the time he received his, he was being honored as a major architect. Master architect -- I don't even know what that is. AIA doesn't even have a category for master architect. But he was a very good architect. He not only received his AIA awards at the time when they were very difficult to be received, he was published by John Entenza from Art

Wendy-Sue Rosen, Chairwoman
310.476-1383 • *phone* 310.476-2604 • *fax* rosenfree@aol.com • *e-mail*

Brentwood Community Council

and Architecture. I mean this was international. He was knighted by John Entenza. He was published by Architectural Record, Architectural Forum. I mean these were the taste-makers at the time. I think this is a jewel of a building. I think it was designed by a thoughtful, acclaimed, young architect. And it has contributed over the last 50 years to the liveliness of the Community. These qualities are extremely rare along San Vicente."

"I would hope that this building would be restored to its original splendor so that future generations can really enjoy it and use it as a study."

The BCC agrees that the Barry Building is an historic jewel and we support its designation as an Historic-Cultural Monument.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Rosen', with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

Wendy-Sue Rosen, Chairwoman
Brentwood Community Council

cc: Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Ed Reyes
Councilmember Jack Weiss
Diane Caughey, Friends of the Barry Building

<http://www.latimes.com/news/obituaries/la-me-julius-shulman17-2009jul17,0,1393680.story>
From the Los Angeles Times



Los Angeles Times
Architectural photographer Julius Shulman in his Laurel Canyon home in 1999.

Julius Shulman dies at 98; celebrated photographer of modernist architecture

His mission was to use his photography to build the reputation of architects who were bringing innovative design to the West. His clients included Frank Lloyd Wright and Rudolf M. Schindler.

By Claudia Luther

July 17, 2009

Julius Shulman, whose luminous photographs of homes and buildings brought fame to a number of mid-20th century modernist architects and made him a household name in the architectural world, has died. He was 98.

Shulman, who had been in declining health, died Wednesday night at his home in Los Angeles, according to his daughter Judy McKee.

Starting with Richard Neutra in 1936, Shulman's roster of clients read like a who's who of pioneering contemporary architecture: Rudolf M. Schindler, Gregory Ain, Frank Lloyd Wright, Charles Eames, Raphael S. Soriano, John Lautner, Eero Saarinen, Albert Frey, Pierre Koenig, Harwell Harris and many others. His work was contained in virtually every book published on modernist architects.

"He has a sense of visual bravura of composition," wrote the late Robert Sobieszek, photography curator at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, "so that he can take a rather mundane house and make it look exciting, and take a spectacular house and make it look triply spectacular."

Shulman had "a profound effect on the writing and teaching of architectural history and understanding architecture, especially Southern California modernism," Thomas Hines, UCLA professor emeritus of architecture and urban design, once said.

And Newsweek magazine's Cathleen McGuigan wrote that some of Shulman's photographs of modern glass houses in Palm Springs and Los Angeles "are so redolent of the era in which they were built you can practically hear the Sinatra tunes wafting in the air and the ice clinking in the cocktail glasses."

After the Depression, Shulman's studio was one of three in the United States to which Arts & Architecture, Architectural Forum and other magazines turned to document the exciting new work being done in architecture.

Shulman's 1960 photograph of Koenig's Case Study House No. 22 -- a glass-walled, cantilevered structure hovering above the lights of Los Angeles, became one of the most famous architectural pictures ever taken in the United States. It was, as architecture critic Paul Goldberger wrote in the New York Times, "one of those singular images that sum up an entire city at a moment in time."

But Shulman's work went well beyond merely taking beautiful pictures of houses and buildings. His mission was to use his photography to build the reputation of the architects who were bringing innovative design to the West. Indeed, his photographs were, by and large, all that most people would ever see of noted architects' works, many of which were later destroyed.

Neutra, whose association with Shulman lasted 34 years until the architect's death in 1970, acknowledged this.

"Film [is] stronger, and good glossy prints are easier [to] ship than brute concrete, stainless steel or even ideas," Neutra said.

Shulman was born Oct. 10, 1910, in Brooklyn, N.Y., the son of Russian Jewish immigrants. The family moved to a farm in Connecticut, where Shulman first developed a love of nature that, he said, awakened him to light and shadow and influenced his life's course.

When Julius was 10, his father moved the family to the Boyle Heights neighborhood of Los Angeles, which at that time was predominantly Jewish, and opened the New York Dry Goods Store. His father died of tuberculosis in 1923, leaving Julius' mother to run the business and raise five children.

After graduating from Roosevelt High School -- where he took what would be his only course in photography -- Shulman spent seven years as what he called an "academic drifter," auditing geology, philosophy and other courses at UCLA and UC Berkeley. He returned to Los Angeles without a degree and still unsure what he wanted to do.

He was by then, however, earning rent money from pictures he took at Berkeley with an Eastman box camera. And one photograph of the 6th Street Bridge over the L.A. River had won first prize in a national magazine competition.

It was a chance meeting with Neutra in March 1936 -- two weeks after Shulman left Berkeley -- that would open up the possibility of becoming an architectural photographer. A man who was

renting a room from Shulman's sister, and who was working as a draftsman for Neutra, invited Shulman along one day to see Neutra's Kun house, which was under construction near Fairfax Avenue and Hollywood Boulevard.

As was his habit by then, Shulman took along a vest-pocket camera that was equipped with a bellows that unfolded.

"I had never seen a modern house before," Shulman said. It "intrigued me with its strange forms -- beyond any previous identity of a house in my experience."

Shulman developed a few of the pictures and sent them to the draftsman, who showed them to Neutra. The architect, then in his mid-40s, sent for young Shulman and ordered up more prints.

With Neutra's invitation to photograph other projects, Shulman was suddenly a professional architecture photographer.

"He had an eye for different angles," Neutra's son, Dion, told *The Times* in 2003. "My dad immediately saw that and mentored him into the field."

Shulman throughout his life would refer to this turn in the road as "fate" or "karma."

"I was lucky to be doing the right thing at the right place at the right time," he told *The Times* in 1994. "So any time anybody wanted a photograph of a modern house, Uncle Julius provided the picture."

Through Neutra, Shulman met other prominent architects of the time, including Schindler and Soriano, from whom he would learn his craft. Schindler, for example, taught Shulman about lighting photographs when he asked him, "Why on your interiors is the lighting equal in intensity on adjacent walls?"

"What a lesson!" Shulman said. "In my use of floodlights it had not occurred to me that illumination need not be uniform."

His sense of light became instinctual; he stopped working with a light meter a year after he started taking photos for Neutra.

Shulman spent two years in the Army during World War II taking photographs -- mostly of surgical procedures -- before returning to his business in 1945 to find himself in even greater demand.

It was during the postwar housing boom that John Entenza's *Arts & Architecture* magazine launched its Case Study housing program, hoping to promote good quality, low-cost housing in the modernist idiom.

Of the two dozen Case Study homes designed by such architects as Charles Eames, Craig Ellwood, A. Quincy Jones, Koenig, Neutra and Soriano, Shulman took photographs of 18.

But the image that would secure Shulman's reputation was of Koenig's Case Study House No. 22, a glass and steel-frame home built for [Carlotta and Buck Stahl](#) in the Hollywood Hills. Shulman shot the photo as the sun was setting May 9, 1960.

The black-and-white photograph is taken from outside the cantilevered house, shooting through glass walls to the grid of sparkling city lights below. In the living room are two pretty women dressed for a special night out but, for the moment, sitting quietly and chatting. The strong horizontal pattern of the ceiling over their heads extends outside to the house's overhang.

The effect, though Hollywood gorgeous, is casual, a snapshot of the good life.

But, as with all of Shulman's work, nothing about taking this photograph was casual.

"He was doing a rush job of shooting the house the day before it was to have its debut," said Philip Ethington, a USC professor of history who interviewed Shulman extensively for an oral history. "He turned around and saw this scene."

To capture the image in the camera, however, Shulman had to essentially take two photographs at once -- one of the vista below, which required a time exposure, and one of the house, which required a flash.

Working quickly and without a light meter, Shulman shot a 7½-minute exposure of the city lights with his 4-by-5 camera.

"Then, when I felt I had given enough time for the exposure, and I wanted to flash the interior, I called to the girls," Shulman told Taina Rikala De Noriega for the Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution. "I said, 'Girls, sit up now and look pleasant. Look toward each other as if you're talking and hold still for just a second and the flash will go off.' I pressed the release. All this time the shutter was open and the flash illuminated the interior."

The result is, as UCLA's Hines said, a photograph that is both time-specific and timeless. With its scenic setting, romantic sensibility and strong perspective, it seems to capture the best of modernism.

"Modernism really was about a belief in a promising future, a belief that our problems could be solved easily by progress," said Craig Krull, whose gallery at Bergamot Station in Santa Monica represents Shulman's work. Krull said he saw the uplifting diagonal of Shulman's photograph, much like the fins on 1950s cars, as having an "optimistic flair."

Others, including Ethington, have seen something darker.

While conceding that the photo is both "comfortable and thrilling," he said it also has a "portentous feel of white, well-to-do women encased in a glass box above a dark and teeming city."

Shulman knew he had taken a great picture, but he could not have known how enduring it would be. First published on the cover of the Sunday Pictorial section of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner two months after it was taken, it would make architectural stars of both Shulman and Koenig. It has been reproduced countless times in books, magazines and newspapers.

"And suddenly Pierre Koenig becomes a hero, based on one picture," Shulman said of the photo he called "one of my masterpieces."

In time, the scene-stealing fame that came to Shulman with the picture grew to rankle the architect, who later became a professor at USC's School of Architecture and who died in April 2003.

"It's not just a photograph, it's the house too," said Koenig, who said he very consciously designed the house so its horizontal lines would echo the city's grid below.

Shulman's photographs were not without controversy. Some believed he made the structures look *too* beautiful.

He rearranged furniture to suit his perspective, brought in props and posed models in the frame. Sometimes he used filters or infrared film to make his photos look more dramatic and full of contrast.

He also would shoot through cut branches or pots of nursery plants to give the impression that a newly completed home was more fully landscaped.

Shulman was unapologetic about these tactics, saying he wasn't just taking pictures, he was "selling modernism."

"I sell architecture better and more directly and more vividly than the architect does," he said.

In his later years, the value of Shulman's photographs increased dramatically. Photos that in the past he had sold for \$35 or \$50 apiece began fetching, on the art market, \$2,000 to \$20,000 each.

Always generous with what he knew about his profession, Shulman for decades conducted seminars in photography at USC, UCLA and other universities. He was awarded the American Institute of Architecture's Gold Medal for architectural photography in 1969.

Shulman's home in the Hollywood Hills, designed by Soriano, was designated a monument by the L.A. Cultural Heritage Commission in 1987 as the only remaining unaltered steel-frame structure by the architect.

Though his shooting slowed down in his later years, Shulman continued taking assignments, working with his collaborator, Juergen Nogai, into his late 90s.

In 2005, the Getty Center announced that it had acquired [Shulman's archive](#) of 260,000 negatives, prints and transparencies.

Shulman's first wife, Emma, died in 1973, and his second, Olga, died in 1999. He is survived by his daughter and a grandson, Timothy, both of Santa Barbara.

Services are pending. His family suggests donations to the [Los Angeles Conservancy](#) or the [Friends of the Los Angeles River](#).

Luther is a former Times staff writer.

news.obits@latimes.com