Department of City Planning & PLUM Committee Sharon Dickinson and Patrice Lattimore 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

File: 16-1470-S2

04/17/2	018
Submitted in PLUM	
Counce File No. 16-15	470-52
atem No 7	
Comm. from	Public

It has been brought to my attention that the Planning Dept. staff report is recommending a zone change for Brookside. As a resident of a block that will be directly affected by this decision, I would like to voice my opposition to the R1R3 zone. I think it would be a huge mistake to divide Brookside. In fact, I have lots of questions on how the Planning Dept. concluded this was the will of the Brookside neighbors, especially the ones affected by the change.

Did the Planning Dept. require the group pushing this agenda to secure a signed petition from the affected homes showing a majority consensus want this change?

Did the Planning Dept. require the group who sought their approval to communicate the zoning options on all Brookside's communication vehicles- Facebook page, website, mass email distribution list or Nextdoor in December or January so that the residents understood their options?

Did the Planning Dept. encourage the group before they concluded their recommendation to vet the financial impact of sub dividing Brookside and making the homes affected "Brookside Adjacent?"

Did the Planning Dept. know before they voted in Feb that this group never worked with the elected Brookside HOA board on this initiative?

I asked Councilman Ryu the same questions in meeting on April 6, 2018 only to learn that he thought his office and Julia Duncan had been working with the elected Brookside HOA. This was not the case. In fact, I presented him with an opposition letter from the HOA that was sent to his office in February and it was the first time he had seen it.

Not only do I oppose this change, more importantly I am a concerned resident who wants answers on how we got to this point. There are 219 homes in the affected area. Where is the documentation that demonstrates an overwhelming support for this change? I don't see any on the Clerk's site for public comment. I think it would be irresponsible for PLUM to move forward without thoroughly vetting the process and securing the majority voice of the residents affected.

Very concerned resident,

934 S. Mullen Ave