TIME EXTENSIONS PER ORDINANCE NO. 182,106

City of Los Angeles – Department of City Planning

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: _____ Company: _____

Address: _____ Telephone: _____

_____ E-mail: _____

PROJECT ADDRESS: _____ **ENVIRONMENTAL CASE #:** _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

_____

_____

_____

Subdivision Case No. (if applicable):	Effective Date of Approval:	Original Expiration Date*:	New Expiration Date:
Approval Case No:	Effective Date of Approval:	Original Expiration Date*:	New Expiration Date:
Approval Case No:	Effective Date of Approval:	Original Expiration Date*:	New Expiration Date:
Approval Case No:	Effective Date of Approval:	Original Expiration Date*:	New Expiration Date:
Approval Case No:	Effective Date of Approval:	Original Expiration Date*:	New Expiration Date:

* may be eligible for an additional discretionary extension per LAMC

DISCLAIMER

This Time Extension does not grant a vested right to proceed. If your project has not been vested, then your project may be subject to new zoning ordinances adopted after your project was approved. A new discretionary land use approval and updated environmental documentation may be required in order to issue the necessary permits from the Department of Building and Safety.

CEQA ADEQUACY**

☐ No ☐ Yes Does the current project substantially conform to the project as approved?

☐ No ☐ Yes Did the subject discretionary approval consider significant aspects of the project?

If "Yes", which significant aspects were considered?

☐ Building Location ☐ Height ☐ Density ☐ Use ☐ Parking ☐ Access

☐ Other: _____

☐ No ☐ Yes Was the environmental documentation for the project completed in compliance with the City's CEQA Guidelines?

☐ N/A ☐ No ☐ Yes For projects **without** a Categorical Exemption, did the EIR, MND, ND, or other environmental document consider significant aspects of the project?

If "Yes", which significant aspects were considered?

☐ Building Location ☐ Height ☐ Density ☐ Use ☐ Parking ☐ Access

☐ Other: _____

If any of the four questions can be answered "No", then the prior discretionary approval and environmental review did not consider significant aspects of the approved project and the existing environmental documentation under CEQA is not adequate for the issuance of the extension.

Director's Written Finding: The prior discretionary approval and environmental review considered significant aspects of the approved project and the existing environmental documentation under CEQA is adequate for the issuance of the extension.

☐ **YES** ☐ **NO*****

Completed by:	Date:	If Director's Written Finding "YES", Stamp:

** Time Extensions for subdivisions do not need to make the CEQA adequacy finding.

*** If "NO", the Director of Planning may require additional environmental review or documentation.

If "NO", please explain why CEQA is not adequate: