

PLUM Committee:

COUNCIL FILE: 16-1048  
VTT 73704 / ENV-2015-2618-MND

# TOP 26 REASONS to DENY THIS PROPOSAL

1. Applicants DO NOT OWN THE PROPERTY
2. Causes A Significant Effect On The Environment
3. PERMANENTLY REMOVES Affordable Housing
4. PERMANENTLY REMOVES The History And Culture Of The Area
5. PERMANENTLY REMOVES DOZENS Of Mature Trees And Wildlife Habitat

6. Applicants DO NOT OWN THE PROPERTY
7. NOT Consistent with Applicable General and Specific Plans (CGC 66474.61)
8. Site is NOT physically suitable for the type of development (CGC 66474.61)
9. Site is NOT Physically Suitable For The Proposed Density Of Development (CGC 66474.61)
10. PERMANENTLY REMOVES UTILIZED Public Sidewalks And Public Streets

11. Applicants DO NOT OWN THE PROPERTY
12. NOT Compatible With Neighborhood And Does NOT Relate Well To The Street
13. NOT Demographically Appropriate (CGC 66474.61)
14. Is An Issue Of Public Controversy
15. CAUSES A Significant Effect On The Environment

16. Applicants DO NOT OWN THE PROPERTY
17. Negatively Impacts Wildlife
18. PERMANENTLY REMOVES The LAST  
Of The Neighborhoods Open Space
19. INCREASES CRIME
20. Applicants ARE NOT CONDUCTING REAL-  
ESTATE TRANSACTIONS LEGALLY IN THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

21. This Was a BACK-ROOM DEAL
22. The CouncilMember has PERSONAL Interest/Relations With Applicants
23. NOT SUPPORTED By A Single Constituent
24. Appeal Supported By 2 South Valley Area Planning Commissioners
25. CONTRADICTS Goals & Policies Of General And Specific Plans

26. Applicants ARE SUING, TRYING  
TO FORCE THE PROPERTY  
OWNERS TO SELL TO THEM