

From: M Kramer <flaminda25@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: July 31, 2010 1:47:34 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: M Kramer

Email: flaminda25@yahoo.com

Address: 619 1/2 North Sycamore Ave.

Date: 7-31-10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Dan Hildebrand <baldydan@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: August 2, 2010 9:22:35 AM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Dan Hildebrand

Email: baldydan@yahoo.com

Address: PO Box 4098 Hollywood Ca 90078

Date: 8/2/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: "Edward M. Johnson" <flink@webtv.net>
Subject: **Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision**
Date: July 27, 2010 10:32:41 AM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Edward M. Johnson

Email: flink@webtv.net

Address: 534 - B No. Sycamore Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90036

Date: July 27, 2010

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: "Gerard O'Brien" <gerard@reform-modern.com>
Subject: **Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision**
Date: July 27, 2010 1:10:30 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Gerard O'Brien

Email: gerard@reform-modern.com

Address: 601 N. La Brea Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90036

Date: 7/27/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Hana Choe <hanachoe74@gmail.com>
Subject: **Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision**
Date: July 31, 2010 3:15:57 PM PDT
To: clintoniabrea@gmail.com

Name: Hana Choe

Email: hanachoe74@gmail.com

Address: 1930 N. Bronson Ave. #6, Los Angeles, CA 90068

Date: 07/31/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) it's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: holly silber <hollyjoy1@aol.com>
Subject: **Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision**
Date: July 31, 2010 3:13:41 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: holly silber

Email: hollyjoy1@aol.com

Address: 6621 de longpre ave los angeles

Date: 7/31/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Jerome Langer <jeronimoe@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: **Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision**
Date: July 30, 2010 5:54:59 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Jerome Langer

Email: jeronimoe@sbcglobal.net

Address: 444 N Detroit St

Date: 7/30/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a] It's an existing school, b] that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Peter Rubi <peterrubi@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: July 27, 2010 11:05:35 AM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Peter Rubi

Email: peterrubi@hotmail.com

Address: 540 N Detroit St, Los Angeles, CA 90036

Date: 7/27/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) it's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: rob damage <damageeffect@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: July 31, 2010 3:32:58 PM PDT
To: clintoniabrea@gmail.com

Name: rob damage

Email: damageeffect@yahoo.com

Address: 356 N. Flores St.

Date: 7/31/2010

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a] It's an existing school, b] that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: sally mcdermott <sallymcde@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: July 28, 2010 11:12:32 AM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: sally mcdermott

Email: sallymcde@gmail.com

Address: 617 n sycamore ave

Date: july 28th 2010

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a] It's an existing school, b] that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Sarah Shackleton <missbasildon@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: July 31, 2010 6:55:28 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Sarah Shackleton

Email: missbasildon@hotmail.com

Address: PO Box 4098, Hollywood, CA 90078

Date: July 31st, 2010

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Shani Levi <shanlevi@yahoo.com>
Subject: **Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision**
Date: July 31, 2010 3:54:38 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Shani Levi

Email: shanlevi@yahoo.com

Address: 1476 Morton Pl

Date: July 31, 2010

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Sheri Langer <arthealer@sbcgbal.net>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: August 1, 2010 1:35:29 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Sheri Langer

Email: arthealer@sbcgbal.net

Address: 444 North Detroit Street

Date: 8/1/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: Stephen Tao <stephen.tao@gmail.com>
Subject: **Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision**
Date: August 1, 2010 12:58:07 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: Stephen Tao

Email: stephen.tao@gmail.com

Address: 528 N Detroit Street

Date: 31 July 2010

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a) It's an existing school, b) that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.

From: whitney <whitcritt@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: CPC-2008-5028-CU Letter supporting appeal to reverse decision
Date: August 1, 2010 11:09:30 PM PDT
To: clintonlabrea@gmail.com

Name: whitney

Email: whitcritt@hotmail.com

Address: 29 breeze ave. apt #1 Venice CA 90291

Date: 8/1/10

Letter: VIA Email

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 350
Los Angeles CA 90012

COUNCIL FILE 10-0960

Re: SUPPORT FOR APPEAL TO REVERSE DECISION in Case No. CPC-2008-5028-CU

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Council members:

I am writing to support the Appeal to Reverse the Planning Commission decision to create a new school on residential Sycamore Ave. I oppose the new school on a number of grounds and ask that you please consider each of these objections with diligence in your deliberation on this matter:

1. The decision was based on the existence of a school currently located there - this is false - the current location is a Daycare [ref lic: 197403540] Dept. Social Services Child Care licensing Division. Also see Certificate of Occupancy LA 73047/83, it confirms Daycare is the ONLY authorized use.
2. The decision is inconsistent with the General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan and Municipal Code concerning Conditional Use. The establishing of a new private school in an RD1.5 zone is not supported anywhere in relevant code or city planning text. In fact, the General Plan is explicit in it's policy to protect and maintain multi-family residential neighborhoods.
3. The decision was based on the idea that 150, and then 120 was the current enrollment at the location - false, the location is licensed for ONLY 76 children - Daycare only - Applicant said they were not increasing enrollment when 120 actually represents a 57% increase.
4. A 1990 determination letter by DOT required a full traffic study should total possible enrollment rise above 1030 for all school facilities - A 1992 zoning ordinance [167-607] increased enrollment to 1125 thereby triggering a required study that was not undertaken - Congestion in the area was adequately demonstrated by members of the public to the Planning Officer and the Commission - as was the liability faced by the city in having alleys BLOCKED and inaccessible by Fire and Safety services. The decision further exacerbates the congestion AND possible liability for the city in the event of an emergency requiring access to the Alley.
5. The traffic assessment used in the initial report / MND was flawed on many points, including but not limited to, which locations were considered in the count.
6. Existing and ongoing violations of CUP's and CO's at all properties by applicant... even since the hearing! Parking spaces used as playgrounds, excessive noise etc. The applicant should not receive further relief because of these 'unclean hands'.
7. The decision was based on misrepresentations and/or inaccuracies presented to Planning Office and Planning Commission by applicant who further stated, in both presentation and public testimony, during the hearing that: a] It's an existing school, b] that 120 represented no increase in enrollment.
8. There is an apparent Conflict of Interests by Planning Commissioner Roschen. It appears, according to his own website and Department of Building and Safety records, that the applicant is, or has been, a personal client of the Commissioner. It is simply outrageous that an appointed official in a judicial role can hear a case where the applicant is, or has been, a client.
9. It has come to my attention that the applicant changed certain aspects of the project after the initial public hearing in January. As a result of those changes, not made public to me, my right to due process in this matter has been denied. Further, that the Planning Department originally 'noticed' this project as a 'change to a school building', instead of correctly identifying a daycare in a residential street, I was not served proper information on which to base my decisions to comment or examine. To have my Due Process so severely ravaged as result of these inconsistencies must certainly invalidate the decision and call into question the very functioning of the Conditional Use process.