

Tarzana Property Owners Association, Inc.

August 10, 2012

Planning and Land Use Committee Los Angeles City Council 200 N. Main Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 Date 8/14/12
Submitted in PLUM committee
Council File No. 12-1124
Item No. 9
Deputy: Comm from Rulic

Subject: Council Action on Chapter 245 Regarding ZA 2011-2679-ELD-SPR-1A

The Tarzana Property Owners Association strongly supports the decision of the South Valley Area Planning Commission to deny the proposed Eldercare facility at 6221 North Fallbrook Avenue in the Walnut Acres neighborhood of Woodland Hills. That decision was based on a careful consideration of the specific provisions of the City Planning and Zoning Code. We request that the PLUM Committee abide by that correct decision.

In the first place, the density of the proposed development is too high and it would not conform to the City Planning and Zoning Code, as amended, in Sections 12.03, 12.04, 12.07, 12.07.1, 12.08, 12.21.1, 12.23, 12.28, 12.32, and 13.13. The plot is approximately 65,715 square feet, or approximately 1.5 acres. The Code would allow approximately 13,143 square feet of building on the RA-1 property, less than $1/3^{rd}$ the 50,289 square feet requested. These sections of the Code were amended in response to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance which was passed subsequent to the adoption of the Eldercare Ordinance and thus supersedes that ordinance.

In the second place, the Eldercare Ordinance explicitly requires that the proposed development meet ALL of the requirements detailed in the ordinance. Let's look at the specific language of the Ordinance. The bolded material is directly from the ordinance, contained in Article 4.3 of the Code. The unbolded material indicates non-compliance with the ordinance for this project.

E. Findings for Approval. In order to grant the approval, the Zoning Administrator must find that the strict application of the land use regulations on the subject property would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations. Not the case: there are other uses consistent with the General Plan, Community Plan, and zoning regulations. A number of very viable options for development of the property are possible. Conversely, there are numerous places in the Valley whose zoning would permit construction, by right, of Eldercare facilities.

The Zoning Administrator must also find that the Eldercare Facility:

1. Will not be materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area. Not the case: the viability of single family residential uses would be degraded by the project. The neighborhood is a totally viable community. Several highly respected local real estate professionals have testified that such a change would

- seriously degrade the value of adjoining properties and significantly degrade the value of nearby properties.
- 2. Will provide services to the elderly such as housing, medical services, social services, or long term care to meet the citywide demand. This is strictly speculative: it is impossible to forecast future demand. The National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, a national trade association of real estate investment companies, has indicated that there may be overbuilding in the eldercare industry due to the inability of prospective residents to afford the cost for residence at the facilities. While there is no doubt that the population is aging, we are aware of no study that shows that the increasing numbers of the aging population can afford the high cost of such facilities. A survey of four current large facilities in the South Valley indicated that the cost ranges from approximately \$3000 per month to several times that amount. A discussion with Kenneth H. Barry of Chandler Pratt and Partners, the project developer, confirmed that the monthly cost at this facility would be toward the upper end of that range. All the facilities visited in Tarzana and Reseda, including the Jewish Home for the Aging, have current vacancies.
- 3. Consists of an arrangement of buildings and structures (including height, bulk, and setbacks), off-street parking facilities, loading areas, lighting, landscaping, trash collection, and other pertinent improvements, which is or will be compatible with existing and planned future development on neighboring properties. Not the case: The neighborhood is a viable single family residential area. The intrusion of a 50,000 square foot commercial/institutional structure in an area of single family homes that are predominantly in the 2000-3000 square foot range is certainly not compatible with current or planned future development. A multiplicative factor of 25 difference in bulk is not compatible with existing or planned future development.
- 4. **Is in conformance with any applicable provision of the General Plan**. Not the case: The General Plan designates the property, and surrounding area, as Very Low Residential or Low Residential. All of the properties in the immediate neighborhood are so zoned and developed.

The South Valley Area Planning Commission, which upheld the appeal against the project, obviously paid attention to the specific requirements contained in the Code. Let's abide by the law, as detailed in the Los Angeles City Planning and Zoning Code. If it is the desire of the City to modify the requirements for Eldercare facilities, then I suggest a study quantifying the percentage of the aging population that would want, and could afford, the \$5-6000 per month cost of a new facility. If the findings indicate additional need, then modifications of the current code could be initiated, with full public participation.

David R. Garfinkle

President, Tarzana Property Owners Association



Paul Shively & Associates, Inc.

Professional Services

6303 Owensmouth Ave, 10th floor. Woodland Hills,

Tel: 800-841-6057 FAX: 866-843-8963

Submitted in

Committee

Council File No

Item No:

Deputy: Comm from Rubli

August 13,2012

TO: City of Los Angeles PLUM Committee:

RE: ZA-2011-2679-ELD-SPR 6221 N Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills CA 91367, Eldercare Facility.

Dear Honorable Committee Members:

In an era where we are once again are learning the value of work and live communities it becomes even more important that we keep our elderly in the communities where they spent several generations. Where they worked, lived and now are living out their final years.

This very facility that has become such a point of debate and controversy is for the very people who are fighting its existence.

The developer, understanding the impact upon the community has made numerous changes to the facility, including eliminating resident windows facing the home behind it. Developed a landscape barrier as well as positioning the structure as a barrier to activities of the facility.

The community has been greatly misinformed over the potential of traffic impact as it should be much less when the property was utilized as a school. There will be three periods of traffic as the shift changes take place. And with traffic being routed on to Fallbrook, the community behind the facility will more than likely not even realize that a shift change took place.

As a resident and business owner in Woodland Hills, I find that the project will not only enhance the community but has the potential to become an icon of a community that lacks sufficient senior housing projects.

From: "Aaron Levinson" <aaron@levinsonhouse.com>

Subject: Support for Assisted Living project on Fallbrook Avenue

Date: August 10, 2012 9:21:32 PM PDT

To: <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>

Cc: <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>,

<councilmember.zine@lacity.org>, <pol@klenners.com>, "Aaron Levinson"

<aaron@levinsonhouse.com>, <brad@raa-inc.com>

Reply-To: "Aaron Levinson" <aaron@levinsonhouse.com>

Councilman Reyes,

I have previously written a letter of support for the proposed assisted living facility on Fallbrook Avenue in Woodland Hills. I am unable to attend the PLUM meeting on August 14, so I felt I should reiterate my support and explain why I support the project.

First, I think it is important to note that the neighborhood is not unanimously opposed to the project. Since I am not opposed—and I know of at least one other resident who is not opposed and who has written a letter of support—obviously there is not unanimous opposition. I believe that most of the neighborhood is unaware of the project or is apathetic about it, and that there is a very vocal minority expressing opposition (not unlike similar proposed developments that come before the city for approval). The fact that others purport to speak for me (and the entire neighborhood) is interesting, but it does not dilute the fact that I am supportive of this project and, if others were educated about it, they might agree.

One reason I support this project is that it would fit into the neighborhood well. By neighborhood, I refer mainly to Fallbrook Avenue. While it is true that the property is at the intersection of Erwin Street (where I also reside, by the way) which is residential, the traffic flow would be on Fallbrook, already a main thoroughfare. If the neighbors find that parking becomes an issue on Erwin Street after the facility is operational, it would not be difficult to remedy this with residential parking permits for Erwin Street near Fallbrook.

Should this project be rejected, other projects would likely be proposed that would be much worse for that site. At least this proposed project is residential for seniors, which is very needed in our community, and is less of a commercial purpose than a strip mall. There would be much less traffic and noise than when the school previously occupied the site. (And, by the way, I never noticed an issue with the traffic flow when the school occupied the site, and I drive by that intersection at least 10 times per week since 1997.) Further, the site as it is has become an eyesore since the school vacated, and it has attracted vandalism. It begs for something to be done.

Professionally I am a fundraiser for the Los Angeles Jewish Home for the Aging in Reseda (though I need to be clear that I am writing this as a private citizen and not as a representative of the Jewish Home). From my professional experience, I can attest that this facility is very small compared to some other senior assisted living centers. This is hardly a massive project. And, even though the Jewish Home where I work actually is very, very large (the largest single senior care provider in the State), there is relatively little traffic, even with shift changes and deliveries. One only needs to visit for an hour or two to see how little traffic such a facility actually attracts (and how little noise it creates).

Moreover, the developers have made strides to make the project fit into the character of the neighborhood and I believe they are doing all they can to work with the community and be good neighbors.

Some people have expressed that if this project is approved, then other similar projects will be approved within the actual residential portions of our communities (i.e. off the main thoroughfares and on smaller residential streets). These individuals point to a proposed project in Tarzana, though my understanding is that that project was ultimately blocked (and rightly so). One cannot compare this project on Fallbrook to a possible future project on Erwin Street closer to Woodlake Avenue, for example. The two are simply not comperable, and I believe the City Council would recognize this.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Aaron Levinson 23390 Erwin Street (818) 300-5056

Committee

lam No.:

Dophury: Comm from Public

PAMELA S. ARONOFF

August 14, 2012

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

> 6221 Fallbrook Avenue Re:

Case No: ZA 2011-2679 (ELD)(SPR)-1A

Dear Planning and Land Use Committee Members:

I am writing to express my support for the proposed Eldercare project at 6211 Fallbrook Avenue in Woodland Hills.

I served as Vice Chair of the Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council (WHWCNC) from approximately November 1st 2011 until April 30th, 2012 when I resigned. During that period, the issue concerning building an Eldercare facility at 6221 Fallbrook Avenue came before the Planning, Land Use and Mobility Committee of the WHWCNC at least four times, and before the full council for a vote twice. In my capacity as Vice Chair, I was present at all of the PLUM hearings and at both of the full council hearings. At these hearings, both the developer and representatives from the neighborhood adjacent to the proposed development were allowed extensive opportunities to express their points of view. At these hearings, the group representing the neighbor hood clearly, and repeatedly, stated that there was nothing that the developer could do to make the project acceptable to them. They simply did not want this project built in their community.

Fallbrook Avenue, at this location, is a major through street with a mix of uses ranging from commercial to single family homes. The project would serve as a buffer protecting the residences behind it from the noise and traffic along Fallbrook Avenue. The City of Los Angeles has recognized the need for Eldercare in our communities and had made a commitment to facilitate the building of Eldercare housing. This project is sensitively designed and furthers the goals of the City with respect to Eldercare.

Fifty percent of the WHWCNC agreed that this is a good project and appropriate to its proposed location. Those representing the neighborhood of the proposed facility threatened a number of board members with reprisals, should they attend and vote their support of the proposed project. I believe that the acrimony from the representatives of the group opposing this project continues to have an impact on those who had previously strongly supported this project.

Again, I support the Eldercare project proposed for 6221 Fallbrook and hope that the Planning and Land Use Committee Members will do so as well. Los Angeles desperately needs quality Eldercare facilities adjacent to our neighborhoods.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Pamela S. Aronoff

Council File No:

August 9th th , 2012.		T ()	Date: 8/14/12
The Los Angeles City Council Attn: City Clerk	RE* ##	1 11 17	Submitted in Via US Mai Committee
200 N. Spring St Los Angeles, CA., 90012	2012 AUG 4 F		Council File No: 12-1126 Item No.: 9 PLUM mtg
C.C., Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committe	e OITV ~		Deputy: Conun from Public
John L. Sundahl 22 843 Erwin St.	BY 		Fallbrook Eldercare ut Acres

22 843 Erwin St. Woodland Hills,91367

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am writing this letter of appeal based on the complete disregard of the rights of property owners and citizens of Los Angeles by our Lame Duck City Councilman. The Los Angeles County Zoning Administrator recently had approved this case for construction of a commercial eldercare facility, located at 6221 North Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, and in Judicial Action, this finding was overturned by the South Valley Appeals Board.

The original finding by the ZA was almost verbatim of the presentation by the developer and ignored the 5 findings which must all be satisfied

The project is definitely incompatible with this RA neighborhood and a lack of respect and consideration for the homeowners of the area who like the quiet environment and plan to live in the area for long term like myself. I am appealing to you to turn down the application to build this project which will grossly effect our neighborhood

- 1. Increased Traffic, Noise and air pollution
 - There will be a large obvious increase in Traffic due to the trucks, ambulances, residents, employees due to 100 people and their needs which will impact our residential neighborhood. The additional noise of required door alarms, ambulances and the backup claxons on all delivery trucks as they must all backup.
- 2. Lack of parking spaces in the facility: This commercial enterprise does not have sufficient parking spaces as compared to the others that have been surveyed. The developer stated that perhaps the majority of these employees will use public transportation or will not drive. On the days of their required inservice education, all the personnel will be present at the same time, the proposed facility do not have sufficient parking spaces for all of their employees. As we all know, if the business is to be successful, onsite parking spaces are usually insufficient. Parking will spill over onto Erwin St and others increasing congestion and affecting the character of the neighborhood.
- 3. Problems with transient cars parked in front of our houses: This insufficient parking at this proposed facility for their employees, private caregivers, family and friend visitors, and volunteers creates a situation that these people will be parking their cars on our neighborhood streets, in front of our houses. One of the developers had mentioned that one of his children parks his car regularly in front of his (the developer) house. Our visitors, our service people and ourselves will not have street space in front of our houses to park when on occasion, we need some extra space. My personal experience was that some of these transient people from this location where this commercial enterprise will be built is unsafe for our neighborhood, particularly in the aspect of petty theft.
- 4. Decisions made by the nonresident of this RA zoned area: It is obvious that neither the Councilman, Zoning Administrator nor the developer lives in the neighborhood of Walnut Acres, and they purposely disregard the law and ignore the overwhelming neighborhood opposition to this project. The Developer and his consultants have donated thousands of dollars in this "Pay for Play" situation.

In closing, I urge you to listen to and consider the neighborhood opposition to this project and disapprove this project immediately. Over 60 of the 120 neighbors in the 500 foot circle have signed letters and Petitions opposing this project and we have several hundred supporters who are very disturbed that this method of over-riding the Judicial process has occurred. This is a large commercial "for Profit Facility" charging \$5,000 to \$8,000 per month

John and Gisela Sundahl

August 9thth, 2012.

The Los Angeles City Council
Attn: City Clerk
200 N. Spring St
Los Angeles, CA., 90012
C.C., Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee

John L. Sundahl 22 843 Erwin St. Woodland Hills,91367 6221 Fallbrook Eldercare Walnut Acres

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am writing this letter of appeal based on the complete disregard of the rights of property owners and citizens of Los Angeles by our Lame Duck City Councilman. The Los Angeles County Zoning Administrator recently had approved this case for construction of a commercial eldercare facility, located at 6221 North Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, and in Judicial Action, this finding was overturned by the South Valley Appeals Board.

The original finding by the ZA was almost verbatim of the presentation by the developer and ignored the 5 findings which must all be satisfied

The project is definitely incompatible with this RA neighborhood and a lack of respect and consideration for the homeowners of the area who like the quiet environment and plan to live in the area for long term like myself. I am appealing to you to turn down the application to build this project which will grossly effect our neighborhood

- 1. Increased Traffic, Noise and air pollution
 - There will be a large obvious increase in Traffic due to the trucks, ambulances, residents, employees due to 100 people and their needs which will impact our residential neighborhood. The additional noise of required door alarms, ambulances and the backup claxons on all delivery trucks as they must all backup.
- 2. Lack of parking spaces in the facility: This commercial enterprise does not have sufficient parking spaces as compared to the others that have been surveyed. The developer stated that perhaps the majority of these employees will use public transportation or will not drive. On the days of their required inservice education, all the personnel will be present at the same time, the proposed facility do not have sufficient parking spaces for all of their employees. As we all know, if the business is to be successful, onsite parking spaces are usually insufficient. Parking will spill over onto Erwin St and others increasing congestion and affecting the character of the neighborhood.
- 3. **Problems with transient cars parked in front of our houses**: This insufficient parking at this proposed facility for their employees, private caregivers, family and friend visitors, and volunteers creates a situation that these people will be parking their cars on our neighborhood streets, in front of our houses. One of the developers had mentioned that one of his children parks his car regularly in front of his (the developer) house. Our visitors, our service people and ourselves will not have street space in front of our houses to park when on occasion, we need some extra space. My personal experience was that some of these transient people from this location where this commercial enterprise will be built is unsafe for our neighborhood, particularly in the aspect of petty theft.
- 4. **Decisions made by the nonresident of this RA zoned area**: It is obvious that neither the Councilman, Zoning Administrator nor the developer lives in the neighborhood of Walnut Acres, and they purposely disregard the law and ignore the overwhelming neighborhood opposition to this project. The Developer and his consultants have donated thousands of dollars in this "Pay for Play" situation.

In closing, I urge you to listen to and consider the neighborhood opposition to this project and disapprove this project immediately. Over 60 of the 120 neighbors in the 500 foot circle have signed letters and Petitions opposing this project and we have several hundred supporters who are very disturbed that this method of over-riding the Judicial process has occurred. This is a large commercial "for Profit Facility" charging \$5,000 to \$8,000 per month

John and Gisela Sundahl

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

On June 28, 2012, the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) heard the pros and cons of constructing a 50,000+ square foot eldercare facility on the approximately 1.5 acre lot listed above. Many neighbors of the property and the surrounding Walnut Acre/Woodland Hills neighborhoods made their opinions and concerns known to the commissioners. After thorough consideration of the issues presented, the SVAPC granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's determination that granted the construction, use and maintenance of an eldercare facility: 12, 2012

The requirements and prerequisites for granting an eldercare facility and site plan review by the Los Angeles Municipal Code had not been established. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties with up to 36-foot high rooftops The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood: Walley Area Planning Franciscope (SVAPC) heard

the proThe majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project and it does not meet all the five findings required in the Los Angeles City "Eldercare Facility Ordinance." In a paternalist action, Councilman Dennis Zinend discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVARC by having the LA City Council take jurisdiction of the issue and Administrator's

determined Please support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVARC by voting against the proposed development on RA-zoned property. It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you my and site plan

review by the Los Angeles Municipal Code had not been established. The massive

commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on Derek and Dana Weaver

Woodland Hills, CA 91367 ming resident

The SVAFC found meeths scope, dense, inappropriate for the neighborhood

 The majority of neighbors surrounding the property project and it does not meet all the five units

·森林德维亚亚亚亚亚亚 (1977年)

designated the reserve

"明报知,只是"数"

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

On June 28, 2012, the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) heard the pros and cons of constructing a 50,000+ square foot eldercare facility on the approximately 1.5 acre lot listed above. Many neighbors of the property and the surrounding Walnut Acre/Woodland Hills neighborhoods made their opinions and concerns known to the commissioners. After thorough consideration of the issues presented, the SVAPC granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's determination that granted the construction, use and maintenance of an eldercare facility: 12, 2012

The requirements and prerequisites for granting an eldercare facility and site plan review by the Los Angeles Municipal Code had not been established. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties with up to 36-foot high rooftops. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood.

The proThe majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project and it does not meet all the five findings required in the Los Angeles City. "Eldercare Facility Ordinance." In a paternalist action, Councilman Dennis Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City/Council take jurisdiction of the issue.

determined the support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVARC by voting against the proposed development on RA-zoned property. It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you and site plan

review by the Los Angelies Municipal Lode Fact consecretable basistic and constitutions. The coassive complement elderoune project with computations of coasting development on

Derek and Dana Weaver 22914 Sylvan Street

Woodland Hills/CA 91367 ining residential properties with up to 36 foot high rooftops.

The SVAPO tours! that he scupe, density, and seals of the proposed facility are inappropriate to: the desphisphood

The majority of neighbors surfacilities properly are opposed to the proposed policy and it does not meet all the five findings required in the box angeles City.

Derek and Dana Weaver 22914 Sylvan Street Woodland Hills; CA 91367

August 12, 2012

Re. Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

takkan falika kalanga tangga balan sa tangga balan sa tangga balan balan balan balan balan balan balan balan b

and the same of the spikeling

On June 28, 2012, the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) heard the pros and cons of constructing a 50,000+ square foot eldercare facility on the approximately 1.5 acre lot listed above. Many neighbors of the property and the surrounding Walnut Acre/Woodland Hills neighborhoods made their opinions and concerns known to the commissioners. After thorough consideration of the issues presented, the SVAPC granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's determination that granted the construction, use and maintenance of an eldercare facility: 12, 2012

The requirements and prerequisites for granting an eldercare facility and site plan review by the Los Angeles Municipal Code had not been established. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties with up to 36-foot high rooftops The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhoods Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) heard the proThe majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project and it does not meet all the five findings required in the Los Angeles City **"Eldercare Facility Ordinance**" In a paternalist action, Councilman Dennis Zinend discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVARC by having the LA City/Council take jurisdiction of the issue he Zoning Administrator's determPlease support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVARC by voting against the proposed development on RA-zoned property. It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you littly and site plan raview by the Los Anueles Wantelpat Code had not been established. The massive commercial addercare project is not compatible with existing development on " Derek and Dana Weaver he proposed design would be materially detrimental because it Woodland Hills: CA 9/136/pining residential properties with up to 36 foot high rooftops. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are $^{\odot}$

The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project and it does not meet all the five findings required in the Los Angeles City

inappropriate for the neighborhood

August 13, 2012

City Council Planning and Land Use Management Committee Los Angeles, CA

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File # 12-1126

Letter of Opposition to Councilman Zine's Motion

I reside at 22712 Erwin St, Woodland Hills, CA, and am just outside of the 500 foot radius from the proposed Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave.

I have many concerns regarding the negative impact that this project would have on our neighborhood, both immediate and long-term. In reviewing the Findings for Approval in the Eldercare Ordinance, it seems that this project "would result in practical difficulties AND unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations." I must, therefore, ask that the Los Angeles PLUM Committee reject this proposed project.

Specifically it appears that Findings for Approval, Item 3 and 4 are NOT met. As you are aware, Item 3 states that for approval the project "Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood."

- This project has only a small, 30-space parking area planned
- Re Eider The project allows for one driveway into and out of the property. The small parking lot will not accommodate both cars and large delivery vehicles at the Letter of Opposame time. Therefore is incerthere will always be cars in the parking area, the delivery vehicles will have to park in the street on busy Fallbrook Ave, creating reside at 227 unsafe conditions for other motorists, pedestrians, and the delivery drivers as the proposed they load/unload their supplies of Ave.
- The delivery vehicles will block the site-line of motorists attempting to make I have many coturns out of Enwin Street, anto busy Fallbrook Ave, A street that the developers neighborhood themselves have called a "secondary highway" and the Eldercare Ordinance, it seems that this project "would result in practical difficulties AND Additionally, the neighborhood has concerns regarding the need and viability of this proposed facility. We have done our own survey of existing Eldercare facilities in the West Valley area and have determined that there is a minimum vacancy rate of 21%. We believe that the vacancy rate may actually be much higher than that due to facilities not being completely forthcoming with their vacancy rates. With such high vacancy, rates at existing facilities, and knowing that exthere is at least one other 300-bed facility planned within 2 miles of the Fallbrook property, we have concerns of over-building of expensive eldercare facilities. If this particular facility is allowed to go forward, and then cannot fill its beds and operate profitably, what happens to it? With only 30 parking spaces to offer what can it possibly be modified to accommodate? Then what happens to the neighborhood? Wouldn't that be "materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area"? Always be cars in the parking area, the

Thank you, Dawn Stead

delivery vehicles will have to park in the street on busy Fallbrook Ave, creating unsafe conditions for other morprists, pedestrians, and the delivery drivers as they lead/unioad their supplies

The delivery vehicles will block the site-line of motorists attempting to make have party pattyps out of Erwin Street, onto pusy fallbrook Ave. A street that the developers of themselves have called a "secondary highway"

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File # 12-1126

Letter of Opposition to Councilman Zine's Motion

经金融股票 经不存款 计分子系统 医乳腺皮质 不知识的现在分词 计记录

I reside at 22712 Erwin St, Woodland Hills, CA, and am just outside of the 500 foot radius from the proposed Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave.

one il la completa de la completa d

I have many concerns regarding the negative impact that this project would have on our neighborhood, both immediate and long-term. In reviewing the Findings for Approval in the Eldercare Ordinance, it seems that this project "would result in practical difficulties AND unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations." I must, therefore, ask that the Los Angeles PLUM Committee reject this proposed project.

Specifically it appears that Findings for Approval, Item 3 and 4 are NOT met. As you are aware, Item 3 states that for approval the project "Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood."

- This project has only a small, 30-space parking area planned
- parking lot will not accommodate both cars and large delivery vehicles at the Letter, of Opposame time. Therefore isince there will always be cars in the parking area, the delivery vehicles will have to park in the street on busy Fallbrook Ave, creating reside at 227 unsafe conditions for other motorists, pedestrians, and the delivery drivers as the proposed they load/unload their supplies ok Ave.
- The delivery vehicles will block the site-line of motorists attempting to make i have many coturns out of Enwin Street, onto busy Fallbrook Ave. A street that the developers neighborhood, themselves have called a "secondary highway" in a rindings for Approval in the Eldergare Ordinance, it seems that this project would result in practical difficulties AND Additionally, the neighborhood has concerns regarding the need and viability of this proposed facility. We have done our own survey of existing Eldercare facilities in the West Valley area and have determined that there is a minimum vacancy rate of 21%. We believe that the vacancy rate may actually be much higher than that due to facilities not being completely forthcoming with their vacancy rates. With such high vacancy rates at existing facilities, and knowing that a there is at least one other 300-bed facility planned within 2 miles of the Fallbrook property, we have concerns of over building of expensive eldercare facilities. If this particular facility is allowed to go forward, and then cannot fill its beds and operate profitably; what happens to it? With only 30 parking spaces to offer what can it possibly be modified to accommodate? Then what happens to the neighborhood? Wouldn't that be "materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area"?

delivery vehicles will have to park in the street on busy Fallbrook Ave, creating Thank you, unsafe conditions for other motorists, pedestrians, and the delivery devers as Dawn Stead. (they load/unload their supplies

The delivery vehicles will block the she-line of more uses attempting to make have a more used that the developers as you will be have cabecial secondary makes. A street that the developers as your makes have cabecial secondary makes.

properties or improvements in the immediate area??

Thank you, and seemed where the control of the cont

City Council Planning and Land Use Management Committee
Los Angeles, CA

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File # 12-1126

Letter of Opposition to Councilman Zine's Motion

I reside at 22712 Erwin St, Woodland Hills, CA, and am just outside of the 500 foot radius from the proposed Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave.

I have many concerns regarding the negative impact that this project would have on our neighborhood, both immediate and long-term. In reviewing the Findings for Approval in the Eldercare Ordinance, it seems that this project "would result in practical difficulties AND unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations." I must, therefore, ask that the Los Angeles PLUM Committee reject this proposed project.

Specifically it appears that Findings for Approval, Item 3 and 4 are NOT met. As you are aware, Item 3 states that for approval the project "Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood."

- This project has only a small, 30-space parking area planned
- Parking lot will not accommodate both cars and large delivery vehicles at the Letter of Opposame time. Therefore since there will always be cars in the parking area, the delivery vehicles will have to park in the street on busy Fallbrook Ave, creating unsafe conditions for other motorists, pedestrians, and the delivery drivers as the proposed (they load/unload their supplies of Ave.
- The delivery vehicles will block the site-line of motorists attempting to make I have many coturns out of Erwin Street, onto busy, Fallbrook Ave. A street that the developers neighborhood themselves have called a "secondary highway" a midings for Approval in the Eldercare Ordinance, it seems that this project "would result in practical difficulties AND Additionally, the neighborhood has concerns regarding the need and viability of this proposed facility. We have done our own survey of existing Eldercare facilities in the West Valley area and have determined that there is a minimum vacancy rate of 21%. We believe that the vacancy rate may actually be much higher than that due to facilities not being completely forthcoming with their vacancy rates. With such high vacancy rates at existing facilities, and knowing that a there is at least one other 300-bed facility planned within 2 miles of the Fallbrook property, we have concerns of over building of expensive eldercare facilities. If this particular facility is allowed to go forward, and then cannot fill its beds and operate profitably, what happens to it? With only 30 parking spaces to offer what can it possibly be modified to accommodate? Then what happens to the neighborhood? Wouldn't that be "materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area??

Thank you, Dawn Stead

* The delivery vehicles will block the airc-line of motorists attempting to make fibre 1997 of turns out of Erwin Street, onto busy Fallbrook Ave. A stresh triat the developers. The meet have called a "secondary highway"

they lead/unload their sumfles

delivery valueles will have to pack in the street on busy Pallbrook Ave, dreating

unsafe countitions for other motorists, pedestrians, and the delivery deliginas,

File No 121126

This letter is in regards to the massive proposed Elder Care Facility with a proposed location of 6221 Fallbrook Ave, Woodland Hills, CA. In short, I oppose this project.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will greatly and negatively impact surrounding property values due to the common knowledge fact that properties adjacent to commercial buildings are less desirable than properties located adjacent to like properties.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will greatly increase traffic volume in the near vicinity on Fallbrook Avenue as well as the immediately adjacent Erwin Street. Traffic will be negatively impacted from Calvert Street to Victory Blvd on Fallbrook and with the increased speed limit of 45 mph on Fallbrook the increased traffic will present a new danger to drivers.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will be an immense departure from and completely inconsistent with the zoning code, the existing single family dwellings, and the style and arrangement of the current building structures on surrounding and neighboring properties. It just doesn't fit our neighborhood!

Please do not allow this project to continue forward and please do not consider like structures in our RA-1 zoned neighborhood in the future.

incatago ef with a latter of the manner of the second state of the

Terry Coupe 23327 Califa St. Condition of the properties. Woodland Hills, CA 91367

The perpendiction of the State State long of the meets of the property of the state of the define active as the following of the state of the state

This prove is the control of the con

Carron conservation is a compagner to the conservation of the conservation as a set of stabilities. Succeeding

Shinteress

Herry Catipe 23327 Vullia Se Windows First, CASTAR File No 12-1125

This letter is in regards to the massive proposed Elder Care Facility with a proposed location of 6221 Fallbrook Ave, Woodland Hills, CA. In short, I oppose this project.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will greatly and negatively impact surrounding property values due to the common knowledge fact that properties adjacent to commercial buildings are less desirable than properties located adjacent to like properties.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will greatly increase traffic volume in the near vicinity on Fallbrook Avenue as well as the immediately adjacent Erwin Street. Traffic will be negatively impacted from Calvert Street to Victory Blvd on Fallbrook and with the increased speed limit of 45 mph on Fallbrook the increased traffic will present a new danger to drivers.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will be an immense departure from and completely inconsistent with the zoning code, the existing single family dwellings, and the style and arrangement of the current building structures on surrounding and neighboring properties. It just doesn't fit our neighborhood!

Terry Coupe

23327 Califa St. The control of the properties located adjacent to like properties. Woodland Hills, CA 91367

The proposal is a least the Car West point point, according to the value of the value of the near victors, and afficed to the street according to the minimum adjacent brains in the near will be acquiredy to protect from Calcord is well as Victory Medical Followith and with the increased speed unit of 45 raph on Fall brook the accorded tracke will present a new danger to this ers.

The propose transce of litters are trackly will be an error as experience bear and compared transcent as a little of an experience of the experience of the

Please do not allow this project to condition to award and please do not consider like structures in our RAST coined neighborhood to the labora.

Sincerely.

Tour Cours Digit Camp of Woodland Hills, CA 91367

File No 12-1125

This letter is in regards to the massive proposed Elder Care Facility with a proposed location of 6221 Fallbrook Ave, Woodland Hills, CA. In short, I oppose this project.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will greatly and negatively impact surrounding property values due to the common knowledge fact that properties adjacent to commercial buildings are less desirable than properties located adjacent to like properties.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will greatly increase traffic volume in the near vicinity on Fallbrook Avenue as well as the immediately adjacent Erwin Street. Traffic will be negatively impacted from Calvert Street to Victory Blvd on Fallbrook and with the increased speed limit of 45 mph on Fallbrook the increased traffic will present a new danger to drivers.

The proposed massive Elder Care Facility will be an immense departure from and completely inconsistent with the zoning code, the existing single family dwellings, and the style and arrangement of the current building structures on surrounding and neighboring properties. It just doesn't fit our neighborhood!

Please do not allow this project to continue forward and please do not consider like structures in our RA-1 zoned neighborhood in the future.

This review is in regardless of the massive proposed beaution of a 121 feather of Ave. We arthur the like to A the state of a project. Sincerely,

The proposed mansive bides Care facility will peculty and anymorely impact surrounding Terry Coupe of the community of the properties adjacency in 23327 Califa St. Community of the properties adjacency in properties. Woodland Hills, CA 91367

The propostal mostly rather Care memory of transition course notific solution in the neur vicinity on fulfbrook. Avenue as well as the immediatory adjacent travia Street. Traffle will be negatively impacted from Calven Street to Victory Blad on Fulfbrook and with the increased speed time of 45 capit on halfbrook, us, increased maffly will present a new danger to day wis.

The progress of the second second are the first of the second second second manufactured completely inconstructed with the second building second arrangement of the current building second area or seconding and neighboring properties to presidence because on seconding and

Please de nor alle waters project to contrare forward and please de not consider like structures in our KA-r zeroed neighborhood in the reame.

Shedren.

Tugo Coupe 2017 Calify St Woodland Hills, CA 21367

File# 12-1126

We bought our home in Walnut Acres within the past year and have invested a lot of money in remodeling it. We would not have bought this property having known about the ill-conceived project on the corner of Fallbrook and Erwin. This project would severely impact our home. The coming and going at all hours of the night, including emergency vehicles and services vehicles will increase the traffic dramatically. The increased traffic will be a danger to our small children and we are opposed to this project in any form! Also the possibility of only having 2 attendants for 76 beds at night increases the likelihood that Alzheimer's patients will wander from the home, creating havoc in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Best regards,

John & Amy Feldmann

22940 Erwin street will be useful to higher the military positions and have been the for of Woodland Hills. CA 91367. In this was the closest of the property of a people to each discovered to the Physical transfer of the control of the property of the property of the control of the property of the control of the control

Best weards,

John & Anny Foldmand 2004 - Langer Communication

And the second

Tele # 12-1126

We bought our home in Walnut Acres within the past year and have invested a lot of money in remodeling it. We would not have bought this property having known about the ill-conceived project on the corner of Fallbrook and Erwin. This project would severely impact our home. The coming and going at all hours of the night, including emergency vehicles and services vehicles will increase the traffic dramatically. The increased traffic will be a danger to our small children and we are opposed to this project in any form! Also the possibility of only having 2 attendants for 76 beds at night increases the likelihood that Alzheimer's patients will wander from the home, creating havoc in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Best regards,

John & Amy Feldmann

22940 Erwin street. Woodland Hills CA 91367 which were within the past this past and to remain a darket of Woodland Hills CA 91367 would not have twent this past as the pasted would make interesting the pasted would severely impact our learner. The come rad past going a roll to not of the regime including emergency vehicles and services retrictes with increase the natific darp atically. The increased traffic will be a danger to work will indicate and a case appear in this project in any forms. Also the possibility of only to vivy a association to 7 of the radiation increases the time of the Christian of spations will be needed to the same creating havor in the automatching neighborhoods.

Bust regards.

John & Amy Eviorania

All the second s

File #12-1126

We bought our home in Walnut Acres within the past year and have invested a lot of money in remodeling it. We would not have bought this property having known about the ill-conceived project on the corner of Fallbrook and Erwin. This project would severely impact our home. The coming and going at all hours of the night, including emergency vehicles and services vehicles will increase the traffic dramatically. The increased traffic will be a danger to our small children and we are opposed to this project in any form! Also the possibility of only having 2 attendants for 76 beds at night increases the likelihood that Alzheimer's patients will wander from the home, creating havoc in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Best regards,

John & Amy Feldmann

22940 Erwin street we bound to the wider within the party out and have an exact a for of Woodland Hills, CA, 91367, whealt not have longer this propose; the anglinovar about the libraries of project out he consist of his project would severely impact out hence. The consists end going to all mans of the right, including emergency vehicles and services vehicles will increase the buffle draintification. The increased traffic with the a danger to our small children and we are opposed to this project in any form! Also the possibility of only making "tratandents for 75 bade at night increases the abothered deal Meheimen's purious will wanter from the source, creating haven in the semouthing analthorticods.

Best regards,

John & Amy Feldmann 22940 (gesta street Wass Band (FEL 1977) of the

aleg.

Tuesday, August 14, 2012

File No 12-1125

This letter is in reference to the above item, which will be heard before the PLUM Committee on Tuesday August 14, 2012.

I urge the PLUM Committee and the entire City Council to reject the effort to overturn the democratic decision of the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) that rejected the Zoning Administrator's approval of this project.

The SVPAC correctly found that the developer, the ZA and Councilman Zine failed to show that this project met all five (5) findings required by law for such a project.

As an expert on the factors that affect property values, I have seen no evidence that the developer, et. al. conducted any studies that showed its project:

Requirement (1) Will not be materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area;

Requirement (3) Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood

Every City Councilmember who voted to seize jurisdiction over the SVPAC and its decision, reached after reading the ZA's findings and listening to testimony from both sides of the issue, has shown despise for the democratic process.

No project - including this one - should proceed without having met all five (5) legal requirements, regardless of the popularity of the project with a Councilmember or his campaign contributors. In fact, ignoring the law as a matter of convenience will have future negative impacts to other neighborhoods as the City Council engages in decision-making based on self-interest rather than both the law and the will of voting property owners.

Sincerely, the second control of the second

Monique Bryher, Broker-Associate/Realtor Pinnacle Estate Properties, Inc. cell: 818-430-6705 / office: 818-774-0043 Ca. Lic. #01766461

A transcription of the control of th

No property instrading the one should proceed without having not all five (5) logal proping about about something the proceeds of the property site of an element or or bis compling a central chair to a high appropring the law as a matter or convents new with have follow regardly a frequency of a decision-making based or related association. There is a loss of the convents of a large property owners.

Tuesday, August 14, 2012

File No 12-1125

This letter is in reference to the above item, which will be heard before the PLUM Committee on Tuesday August 14, 2012.

I urge the PLUM Committee and the entire City Council to reject the effort to overturn the democratic decision of the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) that rejected the Zoning Administrator's approval of this project.

The SVPAC correctly found that the developer, the ZA and Councilman Zine failed to show that this project met all five (5) findings required by law for such a project.

As an expert on the factors that affect property values, I have seen no evidence that the developer, et. al. conducted any studies that showed its project:

Requirement (1) Will not be materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area;

Requirement (3) Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood

Every City Councilmember who voted to seize jurisdiction over the SVPAC and its decision, reached after reading the ZA's findings and listening to testimony from both sides of the issue, has shown despise for the democratic process.

No project - including this one - should proceed without having met all five (5) legal requirements, regardless of the popularity of the project with a Councilmember or his campaign contributors. In fact, ignoring the law as a matter of convenience will have future negative impacts to other neighborhoods as the City Council engages in decision-making based on self-interest rather than both the law and the will of voting property owners.

Sincerely, as an expert on the factors that exhect property values, I have seen no evidence that the developer, et. al. the mental has stock a flat of two I is applied.

Monique Bryher, Broker-Associate/Realtor.
Pinnacle Estate Properties, Inc.
cell: 818-430-6705 / office: 818-774-0043
Ca. Lic. #01766461

to very ting it cannot be a little rector over the arms guide testion as on the SA DAR and its general reactive testing that all a treatings and the replacement of the body sides of the instance in stance despise for the day occurs of projection.

No project this halfing the one obtains proceed without me my metrif tree (it, it gal requires property regardless of the populative count property when a their climates or with have campained employees to have failed to be a treatfer or convenience will have failed togethe appears to other toky there can be the convenience will have failed togethe appears to other toky there can be the convenience of engage property arranged.

Tuesday, August 14, 2012

Participation of the state of t

File # 12-1125

This letter is in reference to the above item, which will be heard before the PLUM. Committee on Tuesday August 14, 2012.

I urge the PLUM Committee and the entire City Council to reject the effort to overturn the democratic decision of the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) that rejected the Zoning Administrator's approval of this project.

The SVPAC correctly found that the developer, the ZA and Councilman Zine failed to show that this project met all five (5) findings required by law for such a project.

As an expert on the factors that affect property values, I have seen no evidence that the developer, et. al. conducted any studies that showed its project:

Requirement (1) Will not be materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area;

Requirement (3) Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood

Every City Councilmember who voted to seize jurisdiction over the SVPAC and its decision, reached after reading the ZA's findings and listening to testimony from both sides of the issue, has shown despise for the democratic process.

No project - including this one - should proceed without having met all five (5) legal requirements, regardless of the popularity of the project with a Councilmember or his campaign contributors. In fact, ignoring the law as a matter of convenience will have future negative impacts to other neighborhoods as the City Council engages in decision-making based on self-interest rather than both the law and the will of voting property owners.

Sincerely As an elementary of the following states of the second for the second for the developer, and the second elementary of the following states of the second following states of the

Monique Bryher, Broker-Associate/Realtor Pinnacle Estate Properties, Inc. cell: 818-430-6705 / office: 818-774-0043 Ca. Lic. #01766461

Every City Asserted to the entry of the section of the first meaning to the five NAV and its dealing property of the issue, has shown despise for the democratic process.

No gregory man know this one establish proceed without having metall live to legal. I require entropy acquires at the proportion of the project of the defendant of contribution or his family and contributes at the project of the last was a sound of the action of object will have fairne negative improve to other neighborhoods at the tipe to be if engages in decision-making based on self-increase called the last of the action of the value property owners.

We live a short way from this proposed project and we urge you to STOP your attempt to use your influence over other council members to overturn a decision on this project that was made after MANY months of review and negotiations between the Zoning Administrator, the developer, and the residents!!! In addition to the fact that the subject property would result in difficulties or hardships on the adjacent neighborhood, it is also INCONSISTENT with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations!! Please remember that the Eldercare Facility MUST MEET ALL 5 CRITERIA - and research shows you that it does NOT

On a personal level, I want to say how disappointed we are in your attempt to coerce your fellow councilmembers into rejecting this project that has already been proven unworthy: (We know they have not studied (or even READ) the background on this facility, but in a "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" move, they defer to your opinion - and you have chosen to attempt to "bully" your residents in a lame-duck move in order to win favor with a major contributor to your campaigns, but this move is not going unnoticed by your constituents either in OR out of that neighborhood!

We are Neighborhood Watch Block Captains just north of Vanowen and Fallbrook who have supported you for years because of your previous commitment to help residents with neighborhood issues. Regardless of how you might protest, your action on this matter gives the appearance that you are deeply entrenced in "Pay to Play" politics: (You are not just abstaining on the issue but are taking the lead role AGAINST a decision that was made after many months of "due process" during which residents made great sacrifices of time and money to defend their neighborhood.

This project was denied because it does not meet all 5 required criteria, and your choice to support a campaign contributor over the residents you were elected to represent will not go unnoticed the next time many of us vote for an office of which you are a candidate. It is hard not to reach the conclusion that you have been corrupted by politics when your actions seek to make a "mockery" of legitimate due process. Please take a step back and re-consider your motivations for this action.

Sincerely yours,
On a personal to the average and a process of the average and the coerce your fellow

Jim and Elaine Boynton

State of the average and the av

West Hills, CA 91307

William to desirable the first of the second Statis tituling in the personal content of the persona Here was the control of the control and the second s

But distributed to the control of the control of the control of the control of the Case of the control of

His projections to the constant of the control of t ter transfer to the control of the c 8.00 000000 Nager Appendix of the first

Cince algorithms

diterioris Education in the co-

We live a short way from this proposed project and we urge you to STOP your attempt to use your influence over other council members to overturn a decision on this project that was made after MANY months of review and negotiations between the Zoning Administrator, the developer, and the residents!!! In addition to the fact that the subject property would result in difficulties or hardships on the adjacent neighborhood, it is also INCONSISTENT with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations!! Please remember that the Eldercare Facility MUST MEET ALL 5 CRITERIA - and research shows you that it does NOT

On a personal level, I want to say how disappointed we are in your attempt to coerce your fellow councilmembers into rejecting this project that has already been proven unworthy. (We know they have not studied (or even READ) the background on this facility, but in a "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" move, they defer to your opinion - and you have chosen to attempt to "bully" your residents in a lame-duck move in order to win favor with a major contributor to your campaigns. but this move is not going unnoticed by your constituents either in OR out of that neighborhood!

We are Neighborhood Watch Block Captains just north of Vanowen and Fallbrook who have supported you for years because of your previous commitment to help residents with neighborhood issues. Regardless of how you might protest, your action on this matter gives the appearance that you are deeply entrenced in "Pay to Play" politics: (You are not just abstaining on the issue but are taking the lead role AGAINST a decision that was made after many months of "due process" during which residents made great sacrifices of time and money to defend their neighborhood.

This project was denied because it does not meet all 5 required criteria, and your choice to support a campaign contributor over the residents you were elected to represent will not go unnoticed the next time many of us vote for an office of which you are a candidate. It is hard not to reach the conclusion that you have been corrupted by politics when your actions seek to make a "mockery" of legitimate due process. Please take a step back and re-consider your motivations for this action. light of the last of the soft of the end of the last of the last of the soft of the soft of the last o

Sincerely yours,

Jim and Elaine Boynton

50753 Minstrel Avenue,

But das assistantes de la company proposition de la company de la compan West Hills, CA 91307

We are to be the control of the cont supported years of the control of th And the second s on the case times. This against that you shake the access of that was made after meny months. of those provides were by wear about the way of a resolution of the contraction of the first first neighblathicat

This projects have a transfer as forces forces and a sect of the same of december and so un analyse to t support to lead it sign in this little or so have become recovered which the file log content with <mark>not go</mark> uning strand the result is the first light of the first containing a consist furth rate. The **hard not** to a deligitar de la tribula di Sanciara e transcribita dall'hy proposi suranyo martian, rispekto make To find the contraction of the state of the contract which we have a contest a year methyphicans. at works of for this audion

Can Canada y vinda.

Jim and Elega, Boydon

We live a short way from this proposed project and we urge you to **STOP** your attempt to use your influence over other council members to overturn a decision on this project that was made after MANY months of review and negotiations between the Zoning Administrator, the developer, and the residents!!! In addition to the fact that the subject property would result in difficulties or hardships on the adjacent neighborhood, it is also INCONSISTENT with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations!! Please remember that the Eldercare Facility **MUST MEET ALL 5 CRITERIA** - and research shows you that it does **NOT**

On a personal level, I want to say how disappointed we are in your attempt to coerce your fellow councilmembers into rejecting this project that has already been proven unworthy: (We know they have not studied (or even READ) the background on this facility, but in a "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" move, they defer to your opinion - and you have chosen to attempt to "bully" your residents in a lame-duck move in order to win favor with a major contributor to your campaigns, but this move is not going unnoticed by your constituents either in OR out of that neighborhood!

We are Neighborhood Watch Block Captains just north of Vanowen and Fallbrook who have supported you for years because of your previous commitment to help residents with neighborhood issues. Regardless of how you might protest, your action on this matter gives the appearance that you are deeply entrenced in "Pay to Play" politics:(You are not just abstaining on the issue but are taking the lead role AGAINST a decision that was made after many months of "due process" during which residents made great sacrifices of time and money to defend their neighborhood.

This project was denied because it does not meet all 5 required criteria, and your choice to support a campaign contributor over the residents you were elected to represent will not go unnoticed the next time many of us vote for an office of which you are a candidate. It is hard not to reach the conclusion that you have been corrupted by politics when your actions seek to make a "mockery" of legitimate due process. Please take a step back and re-consider your motivations for this action.

Sincerely yours,

Jim and Elaine Boynton

6953 Minstrel Avenue

West Hills, CA 91307

22935 Erwin Street Woodland Hills, Ca. 91367 August 12, 2012

Dear Councilman,

Re: ElderCare Facility, 6221 Fallbrook Ave., File #12-1126

I grew up on Erwin Street, and visit weekly. I want to express my concern over a monstrous building that doesn't belong in this residential setting. The proposed lot is small, and the proposed square footage is a **20 times** increase on this lot. The original square footage is contained in a single-family home there.

After months of review, the Planning Commission decided the proposed structure is not compatible and does not meet the criteria needed. Why should one councilman succeed in overturning the careful decisions — just to appease the campaign contributions from this developer?.

The next concern is the need for more eldercare at this time. All the existing facilities have vacancies when you call, and we heard the Jewish Care Center is nearly empty. There is another new facility going in within a half mile.

The trend seems to be for developers to make Eldercare facilities when the apartment market profits have dried up. What will happen to these huge facilities if they cannot make a profit? The buildings will have very few good residential uses in this neighborhood.

In the construction phase, we would imagine the construction workers would overtake our streets with their trucks, noise, and parking spots. The neighbors suffer and gain nothing – the profiteers would move forward filling their pockets at neighborhood expense. They aren't doing it for the benevolence of taking care of seniors – they just want money. There is nothing but annoyance and anger in the present neighborhood, and what do the neighbors gain? They lose on every front – peace of mind, their parking spots after work for their cars, and frustration with the extra traffic it brings.

We understand the developer has hired a lobbyist seeking seniors to attend the meeting in return for a free lunch and bus ride to the meeting. The Walnut Acres residents are refused parking permits to attend the meeting, and must find their own transportation. Please vote NO against building this inappropriate facility under these circumstances.

ing and the second of the seco

Sincerely.

Janel Birk

22935 Erwin Street Woodland Hills, Ca. 91367 August 12, 2012

Dear Councilman,

David Comp. Holan

especial file of the second of the second

tangkat pagtang salah Bitangkat salah salah

Macrosansin in a statutor and a target and a little control of the control of the

Re: ElderCare Facility, 6221 Fallbrook Ave., File #12-1126

I grew up on Erwin Street, and visit weekly. I want to express my concern over a monstrous building that doesn't belong in this residential setting. The proposed lot is small, and the proposed square footage is a **20 times** increase on this lot. The original square footage is contained in a single-family home there.

After months of review, the Planning Commission decided the proposed structure is not compatible and does not meet the criteria needed. Why should one councilman succeed in overturning the careful decisions -- just to appease the campaign contributions from this developer?.

The next concern is the need for more eldercare at this time. All the existing facilities have vacancies when you call, and we heard the Jewish Care Center is nearly empty. There is another new facility going in within a half mile. 大海 医肾内 医复数增多

The trend seems to be for developers to make Eldercare facilities when the apartment market profits have dried up. What will happen to these huge facilities if they cannot make a profit? The buildings will have very few good residential uses in this neighborhood.

In the construction phase, we would imagine the construction workers would overtake our streets with their trucks, noise, and parking spots. The neighbors suffer and gain nothing - the profiteers would move forward filling their pockets at neighborhood expense. They aren't doing it for the benevolence of taking care of seniors - they just want money. There is nothing but annoyance and anger in the present neighborhood, and what do the neighbors gain? They lose on every front - peace of mind, their parking spots after work for their cars, and frustration with the extra traffic it brings.

We understand the developer has hired a lobbyist seeking seniors to attend the meeting in return for a free lunch and bus ride to the meeting. The Walnut Acres residents are refused parking permits to attend the meeting, and must find their own transportation. Please vote NO against building this inappropriate facility under these circumstances.

Transparant in Armen (1976) en 1970 en 2007 en 1970 en en en en 1986 eta en encenare en a<mark>va vecabalas.</mark> Abrillo a valor en 1978 en antico de la Millon de la composition de la composition de la Rev

ing kanalang panggalang ang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang pangg Panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang panggalang

Sincerely,

Janel Birk

22935 Erwin Street Woodland Hills, Ca. 91367 August 12, 2012

Dear Councilman,

Re: ElderCare Facility, 6221 Fallbrook Ave., File #12-1126

I grew up on Erwin Street, and visit weekly. I want to express my concern over a monstrous building that doesn't belong in this residential setting. The proposed lot is small, and the proposed square footage is a **20 times** increase on this lot. The original square footage is contained in a single-family home there.

After months of review, the Planning Commission decided the proposed structure is not compatible and does not meet the criteria needed. Why should one councilman succeed in overturning the careful decisions — just to appear the campaign contributions from this developer?.

The next concern is the need for more eldercare at this time. All the existing facilities have vacancies when you call, and we heard the Jewish Care Center is nearly empty. There is another new facility going in within a half mile.

The trend seems to be for developers to make Eldercare facilities when the apartment market profits have dried up. What will happen to these huge facilities if they cannot make a profit? The buildings will have very few good residential uses in this neighborhood.

In the construction phase, we would imagine the construction workers would overtake our streets with their trucks, noise, and parking spots. The neighbors suffer and gain nothing – the profiteers would move forward filling their pockets at neighborhood expense. They aren't doing it for the benevolence of taking care of seniors – they just want money. There is nothing but annoyance and anger in the present neighborhood, and what do the neighbors gain? They lose on every front – peace of mind, their parking spots after work for their cars, and frustration with the extra traffic it brings.

We understand the developer has hired a lobbyist seeking seniors to attend the meeting in return for a free lunch and bus ride to the meeting. The Walnut Acres residents are refused parking permits to attend the meeting, and must find their own transportation. Please vote NO against building this inappropriate facility under these circumstances.

and the control of th

<mark>andres a greet</mark> in the company of the control of the

The season of the second s Second second

Sincerely,

Janel Birk

the second of th

The second of the second second

We live a short way from this proposed project and we urge you to **VOTE NO** on this project. The project underwent many months of review and negotiations between the Zoning Administrator, the developer, and the residents - and it was denied. In addition to the fact that the subject property would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, please note that the Zoning Administrator must find that the Eldercare Facility must meet ALL 5 criteria - and research will show you that it does not.

Please do not "rubber stamp" Dennis Zine's attempt to "bully" residents in order to win favor with a major contributor to his campaigns! Please READ the file carefully and consider the severe impact on the surrounding neighborhood BEFORE YOU VOTE on this large, commercial development in a residential neighborhood. Do not let Dennis Zine make a "mockery" of the legitimate due process that so many people have contributed to over these past months.

Sincerely yours,

Jim and Elaine Boynton

6953 Minstrel Avenue

West Hills, CA 91307

We five a short way from this proposed imaged and we arge you of V605 760 and his project. The project underwent many months of review and disguissions between the Zoning Administrator, the developer, and the residents - and a was decided. In addition to the fact that the subject property would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and in the of the reporting agreedants options that the Zoning Administrator can be as a fact of the resulting and the case and the account of the decided not decided and

Frequency of the process of supplications of the authority of the Control of the Severe of the Sever

Sanconner years

Jan Bar Clare Dogwood

6963 Manster Avenue

West Hills CASISSIS

We live a short way from this proposed project and we urge you to **VOTE NO** on this project. The project underwent many months of review and negotiations between the Zoning Administrator, the developer, and the residents - and it was denied. In addition to the fact that the subject property would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, please note that the Zoning Administrator must find that the Eldercare Facility must meet ALL 5 criteria - and research will show you that it does not.

Please do not "rubber stamp" Dennis Zine's attempt to "bully" residents in order to win favor with a major contributor to his campaigns! Please READ the file carefully and consider the severe impact on the surrounding neighborhood BEFORE YOU VOTE on this large, commercial development in a residential neighborhood. Do not let Dennis Zine make a "mockery" of the legitimate due process that so many people have contributed to over these past months.

Sincerely yours,

Jim and Elaine Boynton

6953 Minstrel Avenue

West Hills: CA 91307 of 9271 (antirous). Consult the 8-12-1126

We live a short way from this proposed project and recorder you to VCVE NO on this project. The project project actions enable many months of review and regorishops between the Köning Administrator, the developer and the ossitions - and a was demed in addition to the sent that the subject property would see it in practical difficulties or unaspectary bandships accomesion with the general purpose and rotein of the zoning regulations, please note that the Energy Administrator must find that the Eigenbare Pacifity must meet ALL 5 oftens, and research will show you that it does not.

Please do not implied startp" Deanis Zincle altempt to budy residence a coupl to via favor with a project contribute. In the paraphagest Cleave READ the Not the solution of the severe improf on the trace of the paraphagest Cleave READ the Not to be case a get to atmendial development in a contribute angitude of the paraphages of the following the contribute of the registrate depresent that an appropriate have a paint that to the tree opening propriate development.

Since ely yours

Jim and Clarke Northern

8983 Albshill we had

West Hills, GA 9130?

We live a short way from this proposed project and we urge you to **VOTE NO** on this project. The project underwent many months of review and negotiations between the Zoning Administrator, the developer, and the residents - and it was denied. In addition to the fact that the subject property would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, please note that the Zoning Administrator must find that the Eldercare Facility must meet ALL 5 criteria - and research will show you that it does not.

Please do not "rubber stamp" Dennis Zine's attempt to "bully" residents in order to win favor with a major contributor to his campaigns! Please READ the file carefully and consider the severe impact on the surrounding neighborhood BEFORE YOU VOTE on this large, commercial development in a residential neighborhood. Do not let Dennis Zine make a "mockery" of the legitimate due process that so many people have contributed to over these past months.

Sincerely yours,

Jim and Elaine Boynton

6953 Minstrel Avenue

West Hills: CA 91307 YEAR \$223 Feliander, General File & File Al

We five a short way from this proposed project and we arget to to VOTE MO on this project. The project underwent many morths of review and registrations between the Boning Aprohistrator, the developer, and the residents and always desired to indiction to the fact that the subject property would result in practical difficulties on innecessary bordships reconsistent with the general purpose and about of the coming regulations, please note that the zonling Administrator must find that that if there are frecitly must recent Alit is often a represent well show you that it does not.

Flesse do not "rubber stamp" Dennis Zine'n attempt to "buily" residence in order to win favor with a major contributor to his campaigns! Please READ the file carefully and consider the severe the mysical contributor of the severe that argue commercial development in a residential resplacement. Dure the Canton Director of the file free make a "modifiery" of the fapilitate due to over these past months.

The state of the s

Since ey yours

dim and filter a Scotton.

6963 Withsteld Avenue

West Hills OA \$1307

THE SECOND STATES

August 12, 2012

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

I agree with the decision made by the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) on June 28, 2012. They listened to the comments from the neighbors and the prospective developers and granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's (ZA) determination.

The five requirements and prerequisites for allowing an eldercare facility on residential land without a zoning change have not been met. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood. I believe the project will also create an adverse impact on street access, parking, and driving in the surrounding neighborhood. Facility at 6021 Fac

The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project. Councilman Dennis Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City Council take jurisdiction of the issue.

Please support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVAPC by voting AGAINST the proposed massive eldercare development on RA-zoned property. It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you.

eldercare groupel ng ny auropantur and re ad ng dayarop com en rang borang properties

🛬 prochalator (n. 1900), and the application and also become accepted to

adictring reference populars of a 81/4/20 fearer for the score density and scale of Keith Heavenridge

22903 Sylvan Street of a heavenridge and scale of the second of the score of the second popular of the second of the second

Woodland-HillsaCA 91367 and on stress amount personal processing the grant has purrounding t

海疫病毒素 医二氏管 计图片 计自动存储器 医多层的

neighburhdod.

The majority of heighbors are transing the property in a percent of a proposed confect. Control of a proposed disconnected transitive of the angle by efficient place proposed in a second control of the regulation of the proposed of the angle of the regulation of the proposed of the disconnected the

SVAPO by found and AGABEST the progressor is reasonal effection of the property. If is the wrong else, clearly, and always of a solidation of the property. If is the wrong else, density, and always of a solidation upward of facility thank

August 12, 2012

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

I agree with the decision made by the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) on June 28, 2012. They listened to the comments from the neighbors and the prospective developers and granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's (ZA) determination.

The five requirements and prerequisites for allowing an eldercare facility on residential land without a zoning change have not been met. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood. I believe the project will also create an adverse impact on street access, parking, and driving in the surrounding neighborhood: Facility at 6221 Fallianute Avail Woodbard State CA. 6336

project. Councilman Dennis Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City Council take jurisdiction of the issue. Lagree will the decision make by the South Valley Area Channing Commission

SVAPC by voting AGAINST the proposed massive eldercare development on RA-zoned property. It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you.

cepicar (EX) sand without the change of this public was not used the change of some commercial self-decrease project agreemped by compediate with axisting development on passiblorung broberties.

海峡名 电控制工作 计设计

Keith Heavenridge

22903 Sylvan Street are inappropriate for the couplantwood, thick are the project will

Woodland-HillseCA 91367peot on sinselesticess, perking, and criving in the surrounding t **nal**ghadaneact

The maintiful of a significant automating the property energy and to the proposed.

Subject Countries of the More Concides and displaying so the disperity of the resignification of the and the disperitual transfer of the and the dispersion of the less that the proposed concept the less than the dispersion of the dispersion of

SVAPO-by-violing AGAINST the proposed messive eldencers development of RIA-zoned biopetry this the proposed messive eldencers development of RIA-zoned

在Washintsananna. August 12, 2012

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

The same of the same than the same of the same than the same of the same of the same than the same of the same of

I agree with the decision made by the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) on June 28, 2012. They listened to the comments from the neighbors and the prospective developers and granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's (ZA) determination.

The five requirements and prerequisites for allowing an eldercare facility on residential land without a zoning change have not been met. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood. I believe the project will a also create an adverse impact on street access, parking, and driving in the surrounding Reighborhood: Eachty at 6221 Flathmak Ave., Woodkard 1886, CA 51067.

Council The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project. Councilman Dennis Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City Council take jurisdiction of the issue. Lagres with the decision made by the South Valley Arca Planding Commission.

(SVAP Please support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVAPC by voting AGAINST the proposed massive eldercare development on RA-zoned property It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank

you. The five requirements and postagosites to abovery an elderome ladify on residential land within the control oberige here not been met. The increase commercial aidercare progect ആസ്വിവന്നുടില്ല് solit exosidiry development on neighboring properties.

📨 😹 the shall all the call the manual depositions it in waites the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SVAPC found that the acops, density, and seate of Keith Heavenridge 22903 Sylvan Street are inappropriate it. The resplications of Theheve the project will

Woodland:Hills: CA:91367pact on subset access, parang, and priving in the surrounding t nalchborhood

The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed. etarelect. Councibrzar Derims Zine discarded the volce of the material of the relighbors \sim rand the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City Council take presentation of the

188179

Hoses support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVAPC by Viting AGAINST the proposed massive attercare development on RAizoned property! With the "wrong size, consity cold as yet of a solor that yet cell of land. Thank

August 12, 2012

ALL HE SERVICE

Tip the details

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

I agree with the decision made by the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) on June 28, 2012. They listened to the comments from the neighbors and the prospective developers and granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's (ZA) determination.

The five requirements and prerequisites for allowing an eldercare facility on residential land without a zoning change have not been met. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood. I believe the project will also create an adverse impact on street access, parking, and driving in the surrounding **neighborhood**: Facility at 0221 Faithrous Ave. , 755 ideans tiple: QA 91987

Council The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project. Councilman Dennis Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City Council take jurisdiction of the **issue**. Lauree with the decision made by the South Valley Area Planning Commissioner.

Please support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVAPC by voting AGAINST the proposed massive eldercare development on RA-zoned property It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you. I ha hea feigeirtin it it spirit pe ensychters let alle ome, ar extendere brolley on

residential land/withetaut a zuning change have not been met. The massive commensial

The grander bis with existing development on neighboring properties.) is would be about many deep painted it values also walked the privates of

#\$10/2000 residential proporties. This between councilities the doubt, beneaty, and scale of Gail LaFrance

22903 Sylvan Street sile mauprophate son the neighborhood. I behave the project will

Woodland:HillsaCA 91367pant on the enacodes, panding and disping to the enitounding

neighbathadd:

the individual proposed for the proposed to the proposed for the proposed project. Occarbing a Decore Zide dispards the voice of the majority of the insighbors of and the Gesteral of the bloke to by airling one to the Cong Coursel care purished and their

The Salar support the majority of the invocessing this majorities and the action of the BIMBIL by withing AGAINST the proposed massive eltercars develope and aminable proposed massive eltercars develope and aminable proposed massive eltercars. property of the same ground classify, and sooper of one in the species of least. Therefore

August 12, 2012

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

Company of the first of the control Harrie The State of the Control of t THE REPORT OF THE PROPERTY OF

I agree with the decision made by the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) on June 28, 2012. They listened to the comments from the neighbors and the prospective developers and granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's (ZA) determination.

The five requirements and prerequisites for allowing an eldercare facility on residential land without a zoning change have not been met. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood. I believe the project will also create an adverse impact on street access, parking, and driving in the surrounding neighborhood: Escally at 6221 Featurees Ave., Woodsend Has. CA 91067

Council The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project. Councilman Dennis Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City Council take jurisdiction of the issue. Lagges with the decision made by the Sound Valley Area Flanning Complission:

Please support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVAPC by voting AGAINST the proposed massive eldercare development on RA-zoned propertyelt is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you. The five requirement import prorequested for estiming an elseroure lacity on

 $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{R}^3]$ is $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ in Acting Charles have the been make the discussive eleminarisis

Profession would be materially declinental because thinyades the private of

Gail LaFrance

22903 Sylvan Street are mappingnase for the noighborhood, I believe the project will be Woodland:Hills#CA:91367pact on stratt access, parking, and criting in the outrounding neighbothead.

was all his majority of neighbors surrounding the property are apposed to the proposed project. Councilman Dumas Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the pelchbine in and the decision of the SVASC by backing the LA City Council who proved the

share Massar separate the majority of the Vigodishul hills neighbors and the action of the BYARCHAYAGUNG AGAINST the proposed massive eldercare development on RA-zoned property this the wrong size, censity, and acops of use for this percei of land. Thank

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

在1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,1966年,

Property of the property of th

法主义 医乳生物 医自然性神经神经病的主体检验性神经性神经神经

I agree with the decision made by the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) on June 28, 2012. They listened to the comments from the neighbors and the prospective developers and granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's (ZA) determination.

The five requirements and prerequisites for allowing an eldercare facility on residential land without a zoning change have not been met. The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The proposed design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood. I believe the project will also create an adverse impact on street access, parking, and driving in the surrounding neighborhood.

Project. Councilman Dennis Zine discarded the voice of the majority of the neighbors and the decision of the SVAPC by having the LA City Council take jurisdiction of the issue.

Please support the majority of the Woodland Hills neighbors and the action of the SVAPC by voting AGAINST the proposed massive eldercare development on RA-zoned property. It is the wrong size, density, and scope of use for this parcel of land. Thank you.

漢数0美(相対 jaby) mil/) if a zurang chenge háze hót betar nigh. The massive pommeromi

The passible will existing be adopted to traighporting prepartes

willing a result free throughout all all provided by a major a trade to be privately of

Gar LaFrance

22903/SVWah Street are inappropriate for the norgaborhood. I believe the project will

Woodland Hills: CA 91367 and an alread accept, particip, and driving in the surrounding

aelgi logidnood

The mentify of regulations constant to the proposed opposed to the proposed project. Council has a translative discertised the votes of the memority of the projects and the position of the SVARC by having the LA. City Council taken broken of the security of the second translation of the SVARC by having the LA. City Council taken broken of the security of the second translation of

disching the property of the visional file and the second time and the action of the second time by withing AGAINST the processed measure eldenders development on RA-zoned property in the time withing accordance to the period of tend. Thank

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File # 12-1126

8/13/12

To Whom It May Concern:

I have worked very for thirty eight years to build a wonderful Home in Walnut Acres. My grandchildren love the RA1 neighborhood and our animals love our grandchildren.

Please do not let this commercial project be built in our residential neighborhood, traffic alone on the Ventura Freeway is difficult enough to deal with on a daily basis,

This project is too large for the property and fails to meet the city's requirements for elder care facilities.

The city's elder care ordinance says such facilities must not detract from surrounding areas, must include certain specific amenities and be in conformance with the city's general plan.

To Whem It May Cencern:

Please do not let this happen

Richard Jackson Age 67

Lynne Jackson d vage 66 tricty eight years to build a wonderful Home in Walnut Acres. My grandchildren love the PIA1 neighboth and our 22837#Haiteras Stur grandchildren.

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Fichard@showreel.com/is commercial project be built in our residential 323-270-2040 d, traffic alone on the Versura Freeway is difficult enough to deal with on a daily basis,

We do understand what it is like to grow old the and fads to must the city's requirements for elder care facilities.

The city's elder care ordinance says such facilities must not detract from surrounding areas, must include certain specific amendies and be in conformance with the city's general plan.

Please do hor let this happen

Richard Jackson | Age 67 Lynne Jackson | Au. 66

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File # 12-1126

8/13/12

To Whom It May Concern:

I have worked very for thirty eight years to build a wonderful Home in Walnut Acres. My grandchildren love the RA1 neighborhood and our animals love our grandchildren.

Please do not let this commercial project be built in our residential neighborhood, traffic alone on the Ventura Freeway is difficult enough to deal with on a daily basis,

This project is too large for the property and fails to meet the city's requirements for elder care facilities.

The city's elder care ordinance says such facilities must not detract from surrounding areas, must include certain specific amenities and be in conformance with the city's general plan.

To Whom it May Concern:

Please do not let this happen

Richard Jackson Age 67

Lyane Jackson vage 66 thirty eight years to build a wonderful Home in Walnut Acres. My grandchildes Hove the RA1 saighborhood and our

22837 Hatteras Stat granda hadren.

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

richard@showreel.com/s consider that project the both in our replacential 323-270-2040 to a chiral the continuous fire except is difficult enough to deal with on a daily basis.

We do understand what it's like to grow oldery and fails to made the dity's requirements for elder care facilities.

The city's elder care ordinance says such facilities must not detract from symptoding areas, must include certain specific action ties and be in conformance with the city's general plan.

Please do not for this happen

Mark Mary Jan

Richard Jackson Age 67 Lynne Jackson Age 66

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File # 12-1126

8/13/12

IN Mayor H. H.

To Whom It May Concern:

I have worked very for thirty eight years to build a wonderful Home in Walnut Acres. My grandchildren love the RA1 neighborhood and our animals love our grandchildren.

Please do not let this commercial project be built in our residential neighborhood, traffic alone on the Ventura Freeway is difficult enough to deal with on a daily basis,

This project is too large for the property and fails to meet the city's requirements for elder care facilities.

The city's elder care ordinance says such facilities must not detract from surrounding areas, must include certain specific amenities and be in conformance with the city's general plan.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please do not let this happen

Richard Jackson Age 67

Lynne Jackson of vAge 66 thirty eight years to build a wonderful Home in Walnus Acres. My grandchildren love the RA1 neighborhood and our 22837-Halteras Still grandchildren.

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

itchard@showreel.com
is commercial project be built in our residential 323s270-2040bd, traffic alone on the Ventura Freeway is difficult enough to deal with on a daily basis.

We downderstand what it is like to grow old the and fails to meet the city's requirements for elder care facilities

The city's elder care ordinance says such facilities must not detract from surrounding areas, must include certain specific amendies and be in Conformance with the city's general plan.

Please do not let this happen.

Richard Jackson Age 67. Lymid Jackson - Age 66

Fele No 12 1126

Councilmembers:

It has come to my attention that lame duck Councilmember Dennis Zine has sold out Walnut Acres in Woodland Hills on behalf of a Developer who wants to construct an eldercare facility at the location indicated above even though the findings required to grant approval to construct such a facility in a residential neighborhood without a change in zoning have not been satisfied. It is laughable to think that there are elders in the Walnut Acres community who want this facility. If a busload of elders show up at the meeting next week, you can be sure they are not residents of Walnut Acres. I live in the community and know no one who favors it. The facility, among other objections, would clearly be materially detrimental and injurious to properties and improvements in the immediate area, will create an adverse impact on street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood and is incompatible with existing neighboring properties. I am not opposed to elder housing but it should be constructed in a commercial rather than residential area.

I am so disappointed in Councilmember Zine. I did not realize how insincere he was in representing his district, particularly the Walnut Acres area. I know he wants to run for Controller and needs contributions but selling out his constituents to achieve that goal shows a lack of character which in my opinion disqualifies him for the office he aspires to hold in the City of Los Angeles. I know that some other Councilmembers are seeking higher office and hope they and all of you will share my view that this project is inappropriate for Walnut Acres and refuse to assume jurisdiction in this case and take it away from the South Valley Area Planning Commission who has already disapproved this project. It would be so encouraging to the Walnut Acres community if you did not assume jurisdiction and let the matter be decided by people who are most affected by it. Perhaps I am naïve in thinking that is possible but I sure hope not.

Rehas come ki krej ateretan humum aktio mille kratim, isteka jile ikisi ili mbili ili di ili tiVte but. Adaps is Weedtan a shiro ve iset attici ili ili sili ili bili ili a timo a timo kratimi ili ili ili ili madaty &f the location arises that a first every final entities of the property of the contract of the sales and seeds Joseph P. Heffernan and the section is the product of the product Joseph P. Heffernan

Laughten Felders from Local Research and the Confilly If a

business from Local Research and the Confilly If a

Mary E. Heffernan

Le Configuration of the C Cligate placement of the contraction of the contrac in the correctate erap, without the continues without a substantial of about the continue the first the surrounding pengilit attacki at this area is a line wherever the line per but in the persons are not 229204Hatteras: Street any and of the see the line of the lin area.

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

House desperation of the control of all or you wall analise by see without this program is integer to other its. Nation Across and refuse to assume a constitution to the cross and toler if proof the South South Matter Across Planning. Commission who has discissly interproved the protect or round by the contribution of the Walnut Acres commonly, they are actions whose personances of the action and leader the facility because the people who are naist affected by the Perforce Linu make in thicking that is constituted but have being mot

dassan PiliteMajnos

War, E. Heffurans

22920 Harteras Straet

Tell # 12/12C

Councilmembers:

It has come to my attention that lame duck Councilmember Dennis Zine has sold out Walnut Acres in Woodland Hills on behalf of a Developer who wants to construct an eldercare facility at the location indicated above even though the findings required to grant approval to construct such a facility in a residential neighborhood without a change in zoning have not been satisfied. It is laughable to think that there are elders in the Walnut Acres community who want this facility. If a busload of elders show up at the meeting next week, you can be sure they are not residents of Walnut Acres. I live in the community and know no one who favors it. The facility, among other objections, would clearly be materially detrimental and injurious to properties and improvements in the immediate area, will create an adverse impact on street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood and is incompatible with existing neighboring properties. I am not opposed to elder housing but it should be constructed in a commercial rather than residential area.

I am so disappointed in Councilmember Zine. I did not realize how insincere he was in representing his district, particularly the Walnut Acres area. I know he wants to run for Controller and needs contributions but selling out his constituents to achieve that goal shows a lack of character which in my opinion disqualifies him for the office he aspires to hold in the City of Los Angeles. I know that some other Councilmembers are seeking higher office and hope they and all of you will share my view that this project is inappropriate for Walnut Acres and refuse to assume jurisdiction in this case and take it away from the South Valley Area Planning Commission who has already disapproved this project. It would be so encouraging to the Walnut Acres community if you did not assume jurisdiction and let the matter be decided by people who are most affected by it. Perhaps I am naïve in thinking that is possible but I sure hope not.

It has come to my attention that he is to be full out the adventure when any other wild but Wildhau Acres in Woodland Hills on belief all or a famous or who wenter a contract that discovers include at the location radiatives at the extitle of the first spread repetition on a temperature or the relational section Joseph P. Heffernan in the content of the following the content of the second of the content of is launded by the content of the content of a

and the state of the state of the second of the control of the control of the state of the stat Mary E. Heffernan and a common ony pad to be no poe who revers in 1914 facility, among other objections, would clearly be reatenally determental and incurous to properties and improvements in the immediate area, will create an edecate a good, at stood process, at directaling in the surrounding designationaged and is incommental with execute agistationage properties. I am not 22920/Hatteras: Street/ a treat a should be conscioused at a connected content content than residential area.

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Associated designment of the Color of the months of \$25 to \$1000 or a root of the months of the preference of regions, any factors of perfect any die avaire intrease dad, in house te in certain each for Controller and needs commute a that calling out has possible edition to the equal to a fine of the equal to as a leak of character which in my opinion disqualific countries the place are expected in field on the City of Los Angeles: I know the her other for exemplanes are a string for and the could be set the and all of you will share our new that the audience of her the formal specific and the set of the se versioner provide the contraction of the contractio Adres community if violable assemble pending a case of the station terms in bothly agreeis who are most affected by it. Perhaps has been ensured in a register a secretarian or a reference

date of Posts leader

Many El Flatton and

22020 Harraras Street

Wordship Hitchia Cultin

File No 12-112C

And the Health of

Councilmembers:

It has come to my attention that lame duck Councilmember Dennis Zine has sold out Walnut Acres in Woodland Hills on behalf of a Developer who wants to construct an eldercare facility at the location indicated above even though the findings required to grant approval to construct such a facility in a residential neighborhood without a change in zoning have not been satisfied. It is laughable to think that there are elders in the Walnut Acres community who want this facility. If a busload of elders show up at the meeting next week, you can be sure they are not residents of Walnut Acres. I live in the community and know no one who favors it. The facility, among other objections, would clearly be materially detrimental and injurious to properties and improvements in the immediate area, will create an adverse impact on street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood and is incompatible with existing neighboring properties. I am not opposed to elder housing but it should be constructed in a commercial rather than residential area.

I am so disappointed in Councilmember Zine. I did not realize how insincere he was in representing his district, particularly the Walnut Acres area. I know he wants to run for Controller and needs contributions but selling out his constituents to achieve that goal shows a lack of character which in my opinion disqualifies him for the office he aspires to hold in the City of Los Angeles. I know that some other Councilmembers are seeking higher office and hope they and all of you will share my view that this project is inappropriate for Walnut Acres and refuse to assume jurisdiction in this case and take it away from the South Valley Area Planning Commission who has already disapproved this project. It would be so encouraging to the Walnut Acres community if you did not assume jurisdiction and let the matter be decided by people who are most affected by it. Perhaps I am naïve in thinking that is possible but I sure hope not.

It has come to my attention that have duck Councilmember Denots America sold out Walnut Acres in Woodland Hills on behalf or a Daveinger who wand to countried an oldercore facility at the location indicated above even though the findings required to grant approval to construct such possibly properties an eighborhood without a change in zoning have not been satisfied. It is laughable to think that there are elders in the Walnut Acres commonly who want the facility. If a busical of elders show up at the masting note week, you can be also they are not residents of walnut Acres. Show up at the masting note week, you can be also they are not residents of walnut Acres. In the commonly and move no one who favores it. If a facility, enong other objections, according to the commonly debicerability of improves to proporties and providences in the immediate area, will create an advoice impact on stops occass and problems. I am not 22920cHatteras Streeting but it should be constructed in a continue said only a than residential area.

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Table 2015 the Walnut Acres and the Walnut Acres and the Acres and the Walnut Acres and the Colly of Los Angeles. The Acres are the Acres and the City of Los Angeles. The Acres are the Acres and the City of Los Angeles. The Acres are the Acres and the City of Los Angeles. The Acres are the Acres and the Colly of Los and Walnut Acres and the Colly of Los and will share any view that this project is mappropriate for Walnut Acres and refuse to account and the Acres and the Walnut Acres acres are the Acres and the Walnut Acres and the Acres acres and the Walnut Acres acres are the Acres acres and the Acres acres and the Walnut Acres acres and the Acres acres and the Acres acres and the Acres acres and the Acres acres acres acres acres and the Acres a

Joseph P. Heffernan

Mary E Heffeman

22920 Hatteras Street

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

File No 12-112C

The proposed eldercare facility does not meet the five standards required by law and was rejected by the SV Area Planning Commissioners in a 4-1 decision. These members are appointed by the mayor to learn the laws of the land use regulations and make careful decisions based on facts presented. Decisions made are only based on law, not feelings. This is not a political issue. It is a "law" issue that has already been determined by the correct commission.

There is a very strange and unethical turn that has taken regarding this situation from Councilman Zine. He is so determined to have this facility built and seems to stop at nothing to do so. Bringing in busloads of seniors who don't own property in the neighborhood to speak in favor of the facility seems nothing short of desperate. There is a beautiful facility in Woodland Hills on Ventura Blvd that offers this same type care and service. The only difference is that it is located in an appropriately zoned area. There is no shortage of senior facilities large or small in the west valley. While we do not have any "hotel" size facilities in Walnut Acres, since that would be violating land use regulation laws, we do have numerous smaller residential-type facilities throughout the neighborhood. I have one across the street from me and have no issues with it being there. It looks like a single family residence, does not detract from the looks of the neighborhood, does not impact traffic or parking in the area, and does not intrude on the peace and quiet of our beautiful community. However, if it were the size of a hotel, I would definitely have an issue with it.

I am asking that you respect the well informed law based decision made by the SV Area Planning Commission on June 28, 2012.

Pati Moser.
23547 Burbank Blvd

Wille we do not have my theself suctivities as Walnut Acres, since that would be violating land are regularized lays, we do have numerous smaller residential-type facilities throughout the neighborhood, i have one across the same factories factor which is being them, to each one across factor is religious idense, does not decreas from the lector of a couplibation of, does not

FUL NO 12-1126

The proposed eldercare facility does not meet the five standards required by law and was rejected by the SV Area Planning Commissioners in a 4-1 decision. These members are appointed by the mayor to learn the laws of the land use regulations and make careful decisions based on facts presented. Decisions made are only based on law, not feelings. This is not a political issue. It is a "law" issue that has already been determined by the correct commission.

There is a very strange and unethical turn that has taken regarding this situation from Councilman Zine. He is so determined to have this facility built and seems to stop at nothing to do so. Bringing in busloads of seniors who don't own property in the neighborhood to speak in favor of the facility seems nothing short of desperate. There is a beautiful facility in Woodland Hills on Ventura Blvd that offers this same type care and service. The only difference is that it is located in an appropriately zoned area. There is no shortage of senior facilities large or small in the west valley. While we do not have any "hotel" size facilities in Walnut Acres, since that would be violating land use regulation laws, we do have numerous smaller residential-type facilities throughout the neighborhood. I have one across the street from me and have no issues with it being there. It looks like a single family residence, does not detract from the looks of the neighborhood, does not impact traffic or parking in the area, and does not intrude on the peace and quiet of our beautiful community. However, if it were the size of a hotel, I would definitely have an issue with it.

I am asking that you respect the well informed law based decision made by the SV Area Planning Commission on June 28, 2012.

Pati Moser, 15 focated in an appropriately zoned area. There is no Pati Moser, 23547 Burbank Blvd While we do not have any factally size facilities in Walnut Acres, since that would be violating land are regulation laws, we do have to near the regulation laws, we do have no glaborhood. There are near the areat from the and have no issues with it being there, it looks like a single family residence, does not detract from the free total areat from the code not.

nh No 12-1126

The proposed eldercare facility does not meet the five standards required by law and was rejected by the SV Area Planning Commissioners in a 4-1 decision. These members are appointed by the mayor to learn the laws of the land use regulations and make careful decisions based on facts presented. Decisions made are only based on law, not feelings. This is not a political issue. It is a "law" issue that has already been determined by the correct commission.

There is a very strange and unethical turn that has taken regarding this situation from Councilman Zine. He is so determined to have this facility built and seems to stop at nothing to do so. Bringing in busloads of seniors who don't own property in the neighborhood to speak in favor of the facility seems nothing short of desperate. There is a beautiful facility in Woodland Hills on Ventura Blyd that offers this same type care and service. The only difference is that it is located in an appropriately zoned area. There is no shortage of senior facilities large or small in the west valley While we do not have any "hotel" size facilities in Walnut Acres, since that would be violating land use regulation laws, we do have numerous smaller residential-type facilities throughout the neighborhood. I have one across the street from me and have no issues with it being there. It looks like a single family residence, does not detract from the looks of the neighborhood, does not impact traffic or parking in the area, and does not intrude on the peace and quiet of our beautiful community. However, if it were the size of a hotel, I would definitely have an issue with it.

I am asking that you respect the well informed law based decision made by the SV Area Planning Commission on June 28, 2012.

Pati Moser.

23547 Burbank Blvd White large of small in the west affect. While we do not have any "hotel" size facilities in Walnut Acres, since that would be violating land use resulution have, we do have higherfulls amulter residential by obtactives throughout the ncighborhood. There one series the street they are and have no issues with it being there. It books like a single family residence, does not detract from the looks of the neighborhood, does not

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

This letter is to oppose the proposed construction of an eldercare facility at 6221 Fallbrook Avenue.

On June 28, 2012, the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) heard the pros and cons of constructing a 50,000+ square foot eldercare facility on the approximately 1.5 acre lot listed above. The current landowner, prospective developer, and many neighbors of the property and surrounding neighborhood spoke to the commissioners. After thorough consideration of the issues presented, the SVAPC granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's determination that granted the construction, use and maintenance of an eldercare facility.

The SVAPC found that the requirements and prerequisites for granting an eldercare facility and site plan review as enumerated by Section 14.3.1 and 16.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code had NOT been established. (From the SVAPC Determination mailed on July 23, 2012).

The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing Council development on neighboring properties. The massive design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The SZA SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood.

The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project and it does not meet all the five findings required in the Los Angeles Cityeloger, "Eldercare Facility Ordinance" Therefore, the project should not be approved.

grapted the application comment for Rooting Astrobal century determination that

hied MAAS artis, was ann mante sance of an olderou a facility

commitmank you for your thoughtful review of this matter. The ALL ALL SYANG

22930 Sylvan Street of Code and Military when intend places in 4.75.00

Woodland Hills, CA 91367 (1972)

The massive commercial eldercare project is not composite with existing (2001) development on a significancy proposition. The massive dasign vestions analysis detrimental necessarial invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties; The COT SMAPO found that the scools, density, and unable to the properties builty are mappropriate for the projection.

The responsible eighbors have distincted an exception of the proposed to the proposed

STANS I THE STOR BUILD

Melescope (Paris)

This will be the second of the con-

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

This letter is to oppose the proposed construction of an eldercare facility at 6221 Fallbrook Avenue.

On June 28, 2012, the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) heard the pros and cons of constructing a 50,000+ square foot eldercare facility on the approximately 1.5 acre lot listed above. The current landowner, prospective developer, and many neighbors of the property and surrounding neighborhood spoke to the commissioners. After thorough consideration of the issues presented, the SVAPC granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's determination that granted the construction, use and maintenance of an eldercare facility.

The SVAPC found that the requirements and prerequisites for granting an eldercare facility and site plan review as enumerated by Section 14.3.1 and 16.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code had NOT been established. (From the SVAPC Determination mailed on July 23, 2012).

The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project and it does not meet all the five findings required in the Los Angeles City per "Eldercare Facility Ordinance". Therefore, the project should not be approved.

grantod the appeal to everturn the Zeehre Adrahelstretor of elementation that

The the massive commercial eldercare project is not compellate with existing

dammented because a constant to proceed of adjamica rapidemical properties of infilled

The malaxity of neighbors surrounding the properly dre-possed to the properly

development on English on page within "The treases a decian world be malenally

SVAPA (numer that the energy of the later and energy if the gard excellential are

bied W. A. Struffer, use and maintenance of an eldercore facility

Thank you for your thoughtful review of this matter.

22930 Sylvan Street at Cods has NO Charles a state that grown the SVATC

Woodland Hills, CA 91367 (23, 2012)

measurement to the make the personal

Andrews

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Council File # 12-1126

To: Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee/ Los Angeles City Council

This letter is to oppose the proposed construction of an eldercare facility at 6221 Fallbrook Avenue.

On June 28, 2012, the South Valley Area Planning Commission (SVAPC) heard the pros and cons of constructing a 50,000+ square foot eldercare facility on the approximately 1.5 acre lot listed above. The current landowner, prospective developer, and many neighbors of the property and surrounding neighborhood spoke to the commissioners. After thorough consideration of the issues presented, the SVAPC granted the appeal to overturn the Zoning Administrator's determination that granted the construction, use and maintenance of an eldercare facility.

The SVAPC found that the requirements and prerequisites for granting an eldercare facility and site plan review as enumerated by Section 14.3.1 and 16.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code had NOT been established. (From the SVAPC Determination mailed on July 23, 2012).

The massive commercial eldercare project is not compatible with existing development on neighboring properties. The massive design would be materially detrimental because it invades the privacy of adjoining residential properties. The 221 SVAPC found that the scope, density, and scale of the proposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood.

The majority of neighbors surrounding the property are opposed to the proposed project and it does not meet all the five findings required in the Los Angeles Cityloper. "Eldercare Facility Ordinance" Therefore, the project should not be approved.

graphic the appeal to everture the Touking Autoriation come determination that

WINGSULLED experience and period multiple for granting an

committee and for your thoughtful review of this matter.

hind that Associate commence of an effection of collections of collections

Ann Shahwan ity and site places view is encreed to Section 14.3.1 and 15.05 of the

22930 Sylvan Street of Cods had MOT been autablished. (From the SVAFC

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

The massive to annumal ester are project is not compatible with existing development on acquisite with existing. The massive dation would be materially definite restrictions in vector the privacy of adjoining fastilential procedure. The SVAPC found that the acope, density, and near of the purposed facility are inappropriate for the neighborhood.

The thatanty of relighbors survividing the property are apposed to the proposed

To: Members of PLUM and City Council

From: Henry Rice

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File# 12-1126

I am a longtime resident of the Walnut Acres community and I am opposed to the referenced proposed eldercare facility on Fallbrook Avenue. The massive, commercial facility surrounded by single family residences is totally out of character in this community. The proposed two story structure is oversize for the lot, overshadows surrounding single story dwellings and very likely violates the Mansionization ordinance. In addition the proposed project does not provide sufficient off street parking, thus forcing parking onto the streets in the neighborhood.

As proposed the project cannot meet all of the five findings necessary for approval. Specifically the following findings will not be met:

- 1. Will not be materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area.
- 2. Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding To: Marighborhood. Mand City Council
- Gonsists of buildings and structures (including, height, bulk, and setbacks), off-street parking facilities, loading areas, lighting, landscaping, trash collection, and other Re: Elepertinents improvements, which is or will be compatible with existing and planned future development on neighboring properties.

 I am a longtime resident of the Walnut Acres community and I am opposed to the referenced

Regarding finding #1 the proposed project by overshadowing and being out of character with by the surrounding single family dwellings will be detrimental to those properties used two story

structure is oversize to the local average was structured in the structure is oversized by not having sufficient off street parking facilities will have an adverse impact on street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood by hood.

Regarding finding #3 – the height and bulk and lack of off-street parking make the project not the compatible with existing and planned future development on neighborhood properties.

For the above reasons I strongly urge you to vote against this proposed eldercare facility.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

- 2: Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding A concerned resident,
- Henry Rice Parking facilities, londing areas, righting, hardscaping, trash softestion, and other Parking facilities, londing areas, righting, hardscaping, trash softestion, and other Parking facilities, which is or will be compatible with existing and planned future development on neighboring properties.

Regarding finding 31 - the proposed oragest by overshedowing and being major character with the someonetics single trially an efficies will be definitional to those properties. 300 to a content of the someonetics and the commental to those properties.

Regarding finding (2 b) not having sufficient off succeptuking facilities will be a madverse impact on street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood.

To: Members of PLUM and City Council

h Dispringuesti com a constitui de l'

From: Henry Rice

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File# 12-1126

I am a longtime resident of the Walnut Acres community and I am opposed to the referenced proposed eldercare facility on Fallbrook Avenue. The massive, commercial facility surrounded by single family residences is totally out of character in this community. The proposed two story structure is oversize for the lot, overshadows surrounding single story dwellings and very likely violates the Mansionization ordinance. In addition the proposed project does not provide sufficient off street parking, thus forcing parking onto the streets in the neighborhood.

As proposed the project cannot meet all of the five findings necessary for approval. Specifically the following findings will not be met:

- 1. Will not be materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area.
- 2. Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood.
- 3. Consists of buildings and structures (including, height, bulk, and setbacks), off-street parking facilities, loading areas, lighting, landscaping, trash collection, and other Repertinent improvements, which is or will be compatible with existing and planned future development on neighboring properties.

Regarding finding #1 the proposed project by overshadowing and being out of character with by the surrounding single family dwellings will be detrimental to those properties used two story structure is oversize for the lot, overshadows surrounding single story dwellings and very likely Regarding finding #2 — by not having sufficient off street parking facilities will have an adverse sufficient on street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood.

Regarding finding #3 — the height and bulk, and lack of off-street parking make the project not compatible with existing and planned future development on neighborhood properties.

For the above reasons I strongly urge you to vote against this proposed eldercare facility.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

A concerned resident,

Henry Rice
Henry Rice
Henry Rice

Henry Rice

Packing tactifies to add a near tighting tacks aping thesh collection, and other

packing tactifies to add a near tighting tacks aping thesh collection, and other

packing tactifies to add a near tighting to a will be compatible with existing and plained future

y development on neighboring properties.

Will not excite on all area impose a cooled across or streutation in the some unding

Regarding and ing #1 - the proposed project by overshadowing and tierng and of characterisming the surrounding single family divellings will be detrimental to those properties. At this contains the properties of this contains the surrounding single family divellings will be detrimental to those properties.

Regarding finding #2 - by not having sufficient off steed parking decities will have an adverse impact on street ances and circulation in the surremainty neighborhood.

To: Members of PLUM and City Council

From: Henry Rice

Re: Eldercare Facility at 6221 Fallbrook Council File# 12-1126

10.1. **有数据的结构的**的数据数据,由一种数据的问题的,通过数据的对象的形式。

I am a longtime resident of the Walnut Acres community and I am opposed to the referenced proposed eldercare facility on Fallbrook Avenue. The massive, commercial facility surrounded by single family residences is totally out of character in this community. The proposed two story structure is oversize for the lot, overshadows surrounding single story dwellings and very likely violates the Mansionization ordinance. In addition the proposed project does not provide sufficient off street parking, thus forcing parking onto the streets in the neighborhood.

รับสารัสที่สำคัญสารัสสรัฐกรรมี เป็นสายเกิดสาร์สรัฐสาราช เมษายา สาราชานายาล และสาราช กระสมสาร์สารัสสรัฐสิทธิสารา

As proposed the project cannot meet all of the five findings necessary for approval. Specifically the following findings will not be met:

- 1. Will not be materially detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the immediate area.
- 2. Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding To Mineighborhood. M and Ciry Council
- Consists of buildings and structures (including, height, bulk, and setbacks), off-street parking facilities, loading areas, lighting, landscaping, trash collection, and other Re: Experiment improvements, which is or will be compatible with existing and planned future development on neighboring properties.

Regarding finding #1—the proposed project by overshadowing and being out of character with by the surrounding single family dwellings will be detrimental to those properties used two story structure is oversize for the lot overshad we purrounding single story dwellings and very likely Regarding finding #2—by not having sufficient off street parking facilities will have an adverse impact on street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood abording the street access and circulation in the surrounding neighborhood.

Regarding finding #3 — the height and bulk, and lack of off-street parking make the project not be compatible with existing and planned future development on neighborhood properties.

For the above reasons I strongly urge you to vote against this proposed eldercare facility.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

2. Will not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding A concerned resident,

Henry Rice

Henry Rice

parking facilities, icading areas, lighting, headscaping, tresh collection, and other

to be parking facilities, icading areas, lighting, headscaping, tresh collection, and other

to be parking facilities, which is or will be downproble with existing and plained future

development on neighboring properties.

Regarding finding #1 - 4.c proposed project by overshadowing and haing out of character with the surremator single tabilly dwellings will be detrinoutal to those properties. and the

Regarding finding /2 or not having sufficient off states parking facilities will have an indverse impact on street access and circulation in the surrounding notificities find the surrounding notificities will have an indverse

Felino 12-1125

Councilman Reyes,

As a long time resident of this neighborhood, <u>I urge you not to approve</u> this blight on our neighborhood. This facility only benefits the present property owner and the builder.

As a senior (I'm 70), I can tell you that this place will not be affordable to the overwhelming majority of seniors.

As a neighbor I can tell you this facility will be a parking, traffic and noise disaster for us.

Please do not approve this project.

Thank you,

Henry Spitzer

Councilman Reyes, A techniques of the analysis of the second state of the council of the council

As a long time resident of this neighborhood, I urge you not to approve this blight on our neighborhood. This facility only benefits the present property owner and the builder.

As a senior (I'm 70), I can tell you that this place will not be affordable to the overwhelming majority of seniors.

As a neighbor I can tell you this facility will be a parking, truffic and noise disaster for us.

Please do not approve this project.

Thank you,

Henry Spitzer

Chine imangrever in the the second of the best of the

Viscalabe Unicellisation of all later resolutions and traces are used to record that chieffings our Resolution tooks. The scalably both the later was some constraint and the challent.

An a pale of the formation of the equi-

Asia spiglish to the tribing cars by the entire entire

Historia de la companya della compan

Tillelies yerd

File No 12-1120

Councilman Reyes,

As a long time resident of this neighborhood, <u>I urge you not to approve</u> this blight on our neighborhood. This facility only benefits the present property owner and the builder.

As a senior (I'm 70), I can tell you that this place will not be affordable to the overwhelming majority of seniors.

As a neighbor I can tell you this facility will be a parking, traffic and noise disaster for us.

Please do not approve this project.

國民軍就學家自己成立第二十分第二十二

Thank you,

Henry Spitzer

Councilman Reyes,

As a long time resident of this neighborhood. I urge you not to approve this blight on our neighborhood. This facility only benefits the present property owner and the builder.

As a senior (15m 70), I can tell you that this place will not be affordable to the overwhelming majority of seniors.

As a weighbor I can tell you this facility will be a parking, traffic and noise disaster for us,

The property of the property o

Please do not approve this project.

A Marketing for the programmer than the first of the firs

Thank you,

Henry Spitzer

reparational the faither obtains

Alfred Bereiter (1996) in die Die der de Alfred III de

Fde No 12-1126

Councilman Reyes,

As a long time resident of this neighborhood, <u>I urge you not to approve</u> this blight on our neighborhood. This facility only benefits the present property owner and the builder.

As a senior (I'm 70), I can tell you that this place will not be affordable to the overwhelming majority of seniors.

As a neighbor I can tell you this facility will be a parking, traffic and noise disaster for us.

Please do not approve this project.

Thank you,

Sand House With the Works of the

Henry Spitzer

Councilinan Reyes, and the second sec

As a longitime resident of this neighborhood, I urge you not to approve this blight on our neighborhood. This facility only benefits the present property owner and the builder.

As a senior (I'm 70), I can tell you that this place will not be affordable to the beginning majority of seniors.

As a neighbor I can tell you this facility will be a parking, traffic and noise disaster for us.

Please do not approve this project.

Thank you,

Henry Spitzer

Paragraphic and the second of the second of

Birdingstimeresions of this reightnesses burgs, some percent this right of our Birghbortness. The Callies out bird bird by some sent pureless of a percent birding.

Anacika (1 a 71), special vacturity sterios structures structures. Avanviolatus irainas esi makan

the probabilities from with consider wealth and the constraint of the constraint of

Million de san Krima - Activi

44