



San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Coalition

CASE NUMBERS: VTT-73704-SL, ENV-2015-2618-MND

ADDRESS: 5261, 5263, 5303, 5305 Hermitage Ave., 12300, 12301, 12302 Weddington St.

TO: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org,
councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org
councilmember.price@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE PLUM COMMITTEE,

It is with great concern and frustration the San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Coalition and its members reach out to you regarding a proposal that has been an issue of controversy since we first learned of it.

These particular applicants have done what they could to keep the public out of the procedural process as much as possible. What does this tell us? This shows you there is plenty to hide.

Raffi Shirinian and Steve Nazemi are well versed in filling out forms with all the right answers, everything you would need for an approval. Since the beginning and starting with initial planing applications it has been one misleading statement after another. This is nothing new from these applicants and communities all over the city know it all to well. Down right perjury? Yes. Should this be acceptable to the Department? Absolutely not.

These and other issues have been brought to the department's attention for some time now; but going to the same staff who see nothing wrong in the first place, is no different than a dog chasing its tail. This is why it has now been brought forth to you.

When the proposal went to the South Valley Area Planning Commission, **2 of the Commissioners VOTED TO UPHOLD THE APPEAL.**

Both **Commissioners who SUPPORT THIS APPEAL** are familiar with the site location. Efforts have been made multiple times to the Planning Staff to come to visit the site and get acquainted with the area and the community, which would provide the visual and physical evidence consistent with the Subdivision Map Act Section 66474.61:

the advisory agency, appeal board or legislative body shall deny approval of a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, if it makes any of the following findings:

- (a) That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.*
- (b) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.*
- (c) That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development.*
- (d) That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development.*
- (e) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.*
- (f) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements is likely to cause serious public health problems.*





San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Coalition

SFVNC would like to remind the Committee that the introduction of Small Lot Subdivision were intended to be utilized as INFILL. This is different than neighborhood destruction and extinction.

SFVNC would also like to remind the Committee that it is not you who is present in these neighborhoods EXPERIENCING THE IMPACT. Thus it is easy to pretend one does not exist. However hundreds and thousands of people have been proving to you over and over again that you are mistaken. Ignoring evidence has caused more harm than the PLUM Committee cares to acknowledge.

Having this knowledge thereby issuing approvals anyway demonstrates the intentional harm you are inflicting on the citizens of this city. For what? For one moment pretend it is your son or daughter. Does this change things? If any of the members of the PLUM Committee are concerned with how these decisions affect your future supporters / voters now is the time to contemplate such.

Approving every single project before you simply because it may or may not fall within a transit district is not a true and correct basis for approval- is it. ***“Each subdivision approved must conform to every element of the general plan and must reflect the spirit and intent of the specific plans.”***

“... In order to be effective, unique, neighborhood- specific implementation tools must be developed at a Community Plan level that reflect local circumstances and the particular character of each neighborhood...”

Abiding by the guidelines that were put into place to begin with has its benefits. For every proposal like this one results in another lawsuit against the city and the applicant. This is a financial burden to all and winds up serving no one in any community. This is the pattern that thus far no one has broke. When the precedence has been set and applicants continue to see no project goes denied, this has created unsafe and dangerous realities in communities where anything goes. This exists for one reason - lack of enforcement. Stamping “DENIED” is part of enforcing these guidelines.

If you have read any of the previously submitted documentation on these particular applicants, you would know by now you would be intentionally giving deceitfully dangerous individuals the keys to a community that has 80 years of sustainability, culture, history and long term residents.

The South Valley Area Planning Commission has a history of voting unanimously. In this case, they did not. There are reasons for that; reasons the PLUM Committee needs to consider.

There is a reason so many individuals are reaching out to the PLUM Committee members asking for your support - sadly, the community has never been able to get it from their *own* councilmember; who devotes his time only to those who demolish, evict and build.

There is a reason State AssemblyMember Patty Lopez stands supportive to the community in this matter. She showed up when everyone else turned their back. She listened, she reviewed evidence and continues to offer her support to uphold this appeal.

There is a reason so many people are reaching out to the State when all attempts at the local level have failed. There are a lot of people watching to see how the PLUM Committee is going to respond if at all, to a State representative. Or, will she be so disrespectfully and blatantly ignored by the Committee as she was by 3 of the SVAPC Commissioners.

SFVNC urges the PLUM Committee to make findings consistent with the provisions of LAMC 17.06 and the Subdivision Map Act as required and to uphold this appeal in due subsequence of carefully reviewing the record IN ITS ENTIRETY.

Respectfully,

SFVNC

