

CPC-2015-4184-GPA-ZC-BL-SPR - 9433 Sepulveda Blvd/15500-15508 Plummer St.

Debora Masterson <deborawkart@gmail.com>

Oct 13, 2018 2:40 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

To Whom It May Concern:

I have attached my comments (Reasons for No Rezone & NH population 2010) to be submitted and filed against this proposed development because of the corrupt and illegal process and lack of respect and consideration for the resident stakeholders adjacent to this proposed development. The San Fernando Valley has become a dumping ground for the greedy developers who have no regard whatsoever for the community.

North Hills is already more densely populated than the rest of the city of Los Angeles and the whole state of California. STOP THIS MADNESS NOW!

Sincerely, Debora

Debora Masterson & Craig Ingraham

9563 Langdon Avenue

North Hills, CA 91343

“A national association of realtors survey in 2011 found that roughly 80% of adults prefer to live in detached single-family houses while only 8% preferred an apartment.” -Forbes article April 16, 2013

Intro

Residents are united in opposing the rezoning on Plummer Street. We support the development and enhancement of North Hills East, as long as it is indeed an enhancement to the neighborhood, not something that will bring a few on the developer end, money in their pockets and then add additional problems to the area and its residents but not have to deal with the lasting negative affects once their checks have cleared.

This existing single family residential neighborhood must be protected from **out of scale development**. Admittedly, this project has angered residents due to the way it has been handled, events (which will be discussed) have occurred leaving many with a bad taste in their mouths for dealing with the city.

By the time property owners around and within 500 feet of this project were notified of the proposed development on August 15, 2016, a year had passed since the NHENC Board Action was taken. It was at the hearing on August 30, 2016 that residents learned from Williams Homes that they had met with the NHENC, police department and fire department and all had approved the project without their knowledge.

By August 30, 2016, over 100 petitions against the rezoning representing 99% of the property owners within the 500 feet rang plus ¼ mile away have been signed and we have been contacted by many other neighbors outside of the 500 foot range offering their signatures to stand in protest to rezoning because they also realize the future problems that this rezoning will bring to them as well. A second round of petitions circulated the area in January 2017 because many residents had not heard about the petition and wished to show their opposition to the rezone along with their fellow neighbors.

Again, we do not object to developing this land as long as it protects our existing single family residential neighborhood from new **out of scale development**. We strongly oppose the zone change from **RA-1 to R1-1** at 15508 Plummer St. as

presented by Eric Lieberman representing the property owners. This property already has a livable home on it and so do the properties adjacent and to the west of it.

Focal point – 15508 Plummer

The main portion of this rezone that the residents are opposed to is the rezoning of 15508 Plummer Street. This property is zoned as a single family dwelling as the rest of the homes on Plummer and in the surrounding neighborhood are.

Rezoning and merging this single family dwelling property to be a part of a larger condominium project site IS a drastic change which will negatively affect the surrounding neighborhood (crime, parking, traffic etc.). The rezone of the Sepulveda property is not so drastic going from Medium Residential to Low Medium II Residential.

No one disputes the rezone for Sepulveda, by right they can build for a higher density and Sepulveda Boulevard was designed to accommodate more vehicles. Plummer was not designed to be a main thoroughfare running only 7.3 miles from Zelzah to Woodman. Traffic has increased substantially on Plummer over the years and anyone who regularly travels on it experiences the gridlock at Sepulveda, making a left onto Plummer from our neighborhoods is virtually impossible and allowing access for more cars to enter traffic here will only exacerbate the problem.

We also know that this drastic rezone would set a precedence for the rest of the properties on Plummer. The city has acknowledged it had intended to rezone the rest of the block although it was not a part of the project site. This is a problem because the studies (traffic, environmental) to justify the current project site do not reflect the impact of increasing density on an even larger area of a block that is .3 miles in length. Consideration of rezoning the added areas, but only utilizing impact studies incrementally lessens the affects on paper, but the full negative affects will still be felt in the community. *E.g. – Project 1 will bring in 150 extra cars and it will increase traffic and pollution by 10%, Project 2 will bring in 250 extra cars and will bring in 10% increase and Project 3 will bring in 150 extra cars and bring in 5% increase.* Each project considered individually looks to have

less impact, but if you look at the possibility of the entire area, it's 550 extra cars and the impact will be greater.

If the Plummer property (currently there is a tenant renting the property) were to be excluded from the rezone or the rezone were to go back to the compromise that had been made with Williams and the residents, it is my personal opinion that the residents would be supportive.

Prior precedence in the area:

On July 29, 2006, it was recommended that city council adopt a zone change for an adjacent lot, 15526 W. Plummer Street in this same tract. Case number: **APCNV 2004-5691-CZ: ENV-2004-2995—MND: TENATIVE TRACT MAP NO 61202, RA-1 to R1-1.**

Instead, The City council recommended a zone change from **existing RA-1 to (T)(Q)RE(-1**, as set forth in Section 12.32 of the municipal code, subject to certain conditions attached to the report. A maximum of 3 single family homes on a 1 acre lot in the Mission Hills, Panorama, North Hills Community Plan.

However, Large single story homes built on 9000 sq. ft. lots would more conform to the style of homes already existing in our neighborhood.

Parking:

We all know that 2 ¼ parking spaces are not enough, just because this is the minimum that the city requires does not mean that it will meet the needs of a specific neighborhood. *One size does not necessarily fit all!*

North Hills East facts

According to the [United States Census Bureau](#) there are 3.02 persons per household in Los Angeles County (2010-2014) and according to a study prepared by the **Institute of Transportation Studies, School of Public Policy and Social Research at UCLA** for the **California Department of Transportation** in 2002, approximately 55.3% of households with \$50,000 - \$75,000 annual income (*North Hills median household income \$52,456 per year. Source: [Los Angeles Times](#)*) have 3 or MORE cars. The [Los Angeles Times](#) also lists that the average

household size is 3.4 people which is “high for the city of Los Angeles and high for the county.

In fact, a more recent study by [Institute of Transportation Studies, School of Public Policy and Social Research at UCLA](#) for the **California Department of Transportation** in February 2018, states: “Between 2000 and 2015, private vehicle ownership dramatically increased among households in the SCAG region, from 1.7 to 2.4 vehicles per household.” This is attributed to a decline in transit ridership and adding “2.3 million people and 2.1 million household vehicles, nearly one car per new resident” to the region. While this is for the entire Southern California region, it stands to reason, many of these additional vehicles are here in North Hills.

Existing parking problems in the surrounding community

There is no overnight parking on Plummer or in the neighborhood to the south of Plummer due to prostitution and drug activity and the neighborhood to the north is considering a similar approach to keep the prostitutes and drugs from returning each day and night.

People from the senior apartment building on Plummer next to 15508 Plummer park on the streets North of Plummer, motor homes park all day on Plummer and then park on Langdon, blocking streets, making the turn from Plummer unsafe and leaving no room for residents to put their trash bins out for pick up in front of their own homes.

Employees and visitors to the nursing home Country Villa park up and down our streets, they used to only allow valet parking in their lot, which of course remained empty because there was free parking on the street... where they eat their lunches in their cars and leave the trash on lawns and in the street. Residents of the apartment buildings and condos across Sepulveda drop their cars off in our neighborhood and pick up another that they've parked and left earlier. I'm fairly certain that one person who parks her car at all hours of the day and night only to be picked up by different men is a prostitute, not to mention other prostitutes and their johns who park here to take care of business.

Parking comments

The extra cars generated by these condo's will be distributed up into the neighborhoods north and west of the property. That is one of the reasons that the North Hills West residents just west of the 405 expressed a concern and highly object to the proposed project also as their streets are crowded with parked cars.

This is a family neighborhood, and these days children are living with their parents longer due to economics. Many homes have more than two adults who reside in a home, multi-generational households are very common here, and most have a car for each adult. If any problem arises, resolution is made neighbor to neighbor. Problems arise with people who don't live on the streets where they park their cars on a regular basis, and many times do not get resolved because the attitude is different.

I once lived in a seemingly "nice" neighborhood with condos but the parking available could not accommodate the increasing number of occupants per home that were coming into the neighborhood. If I parked on the street to allow visitors to park in my space, I often found myself blocked in with scratches on my car because of someone trying squeeze into too small of a space. Arguments over a parking space, parking in no parking zones, blocking fire hydrants, blocking someone else's parking space became more common as more people were stuffed into the area. There were a few neighbors who would purposely do damage to other vehicles over parking disputes. Developers and the city seem to ignore just how important adequate parking is, lack of parking can create a lot of stress and dispute, just remember how it is to go to the mall right before Christmas. The point is, available parking IS a big issue and is a big source of disputes in areas where parking is scarce.

Crime:

CRIME MAPS AND CORRESPONDING PHOTOS

Our immediate area has had very little crime, but the high concentrations of crime tend to be near apartments and condominiums in North Hills East. In North Hills East where the apartments are there is quite a lot of crime as noted on the monthly crime sheets from the police dept and crimemapping.org. This isn't

necessarily true of all apartments and condominiums everywhere, but it does appear to be a pattern here in North Hills East. The police have their hands full with the growing gang problems and violent crimes south of us near Nordhoff and Parthenia in particular. It is undeniable that we have a crime and homeless problem here in North Hills East. Before we start bringing more people in this area which will exacerbate our problems, the focus should be more on letting the police department concentrate on our existing problems, increasing their budgets for more manpower and how we as a community can help prevent crime. Additionally, The prostitution problem on Sepulveda Boulevard with the motels do not exactly scream family friendly, and yet families are going to shell out \$400,000 (which calls for an income of over \$100,000) with that next door?

Speaking ahead of a North Hills East Neighborhood Council board meeting, Tony Wilkinson was quoted in the Daily News article from March 31, "This is the way the community transforms itself by having nicer-quality residential projects. This brings a particularly different person who participates in civic affairs and helps us fight street gangs." First, majority of gangs problems are concentrated South of Plummer and also around Columbus to the east, where the density is greater. Second, if condominiums help to get rid of gangs, why is there still a gang problem in North Hills East? Not a great marketing campaign for North Hills, "Hey! Make Six Figures? Great! Come spend half a million dollars so you can come help us fight our gang problem!!"

Let's get some more support for our police department so they have the manpower and funds they need to deal with the existing crime. People feel more empowered to be civically active in their communities when they see they're needs and concerns are being addressed.

Once more people and their vehicles come into our neighborhoods to park, our quiet neighborhood will match the rest of the crime map.

**[Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles](#) RELEASED BY CITY PLANNING
Appendix 2 Health-related Policies in the General Plan**

POLICIES RELATE TO THIS REZONE AND NEIGHBORHOOD

Framework Element Policies released by City Planning dated March 2015

Section: Housing

- 3.7.2 (a) Consider decreasing the permitted densities, by amendments to the community plan, of areas designated for multi-family residential where there is a mix of existing unit types and density and/or densities are below the maximum permitted. When determining whether to reduce these densities, consider the following criteria: (a) there is inadequate public infrastructure or services to provide for the needs of existing or future residents for which the cost if improvements would result in an undue burden on the community or are infeasible.

3.7.2(b) The quality of life of the area's residents has been adversely impacted by the density of development (crime, noise, pollution, etc.)

- 3.18.1 (3b) The quality of life of the area's residents and/or businesses has been adversely affected by the density of development as measured by crime, noise, pollution, traffic, congestion, overcrowded schools, lack of open space, limited sewer capacity and other comparable conditions. •

3.18.1 (3g) Adequate housing and/or commercial potential can be provided in nearby areas with sufficient infrastructure and service capacities, including those designated for mixed-use development, in order to offset the loss of potential housing units and/or commercial square footage due to reduced densities.

4.1.2 Minimize the overconcentration of very low- and low-income housing developments in City subregions by providing incentives for scattered site development citywide. • 4.1.3 Minimize the overconcentration of public housing projects in a City subregion.

4.1.7 Establish incentives for the development of housing units appropriate for families with children and larger families.

Section: Crime

3.7.2 (b) Consider decreasing the permitted densities, by amendments to the community plan, of areas designated for multi-family residential where there is a mix of existing unit types and density and/or built densities are below the maximum permitted. When determining whether to reduce these densities, consider the following criteria: The quality of life of the area's residents has been adversely impacted by the density of development (crime, noise, pollution, etc.) •

3.18.1 (b) Consider decreasing the permitted densities of areas designated for multi-family residential, mixed-use, and/or commercial uses where there is: 1) a mix of existing unit types and densities; 2) built density is below the maximum permitted; 3) a significant concentration of high density development relative to the intensity of development in the surrounding area or other communities in the City. This may be accomplished by amendments of the permitted densities in Community Plans or by zoning. Determination of reducing permitted densities should consider the following criteria: The quality of life of the area's residents and/or businesses has been adversely affected by the density of development as measured by crime, noise, pollution, traffic congestion, overcrowded schools, lack of open space, limited sewer capacity and other comparable conditions. •

9.13.1 Monitor and report police statistics, as appropriate, and population projections for the purpose of evaluating police service based on existing and future needs. •

9.14.1 Work with the Police Department to maintain standards for the appropriate number of sworn police officers to serve the needs of residents, businesses, and industries. •

9.14.2 Support the provision of additional sworn police offers to meet the safety needs of the City

Sense of betrayal

FELIPE FUENTES RESIGNS RIGHT BEFORE FIRST HEARING, NO COUNCIL MEMBER FOR A YEAR. NO HELP FROM NC, OR EXISTING STAFF AT CD7. MAJOR CONCERNS OF RESIDENT ARE DOWNPLAYED BY CITY REPS. CD 10 AND STAFF HAS TO STEP IN.

WE LEARN THAT THERE WAS IMPROPER FACILITATION BETWEEN DEVELOPER AND SOMEONE AT CITY PLANNING SO THEN DEVELOPER MEETS WITH RESIDENTS TO NEGOTIATE A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE PLAN AND DROPS OUT WITH RESIDENTS COMPROMISING THE MOST. ORIGINAL PLAN IS SUPPORTED BY CITY A

Appearance of bias in favor of developer/owner Neighborhood Council

DEBORA MASTERSON'S EMAIL REGARDING NHENC meeting

At the April 2 meeting, despite a room packed with approximately 80 residents opposing the rezone of the property at [15508 West Plummer Street](#), and with some board members admitting they were confused (we all were!), the NHENC (North Hills East Neighborhood Council) voted 5 YES, 4 NO, 6 ABSTAINS. As you know, I immediately filed a request for a Motion to Reconsider the vote.

Since that meeting on April 2, there have been numerous complaints filed with the city regarding NHENC board violations, such as: 1) no Secretary and no Minutes are taken at the meetings; 2) We have learned that one of the YES votes was a former member of the board who was re-elected to the board for that night only, voted Yes, and then was removed from the board due to a conflict of interest, therefore, his vote is not valid; 3) the board president Tony Wilkinson is biased and persuasive toward the Yes vote. Just before the vote on April 2, he gave a speech in favor of a Yes vote and in the two Daily News articles (see links below), and at the board meetings, Mr. Wilkinson was deliberately swaying the vote to YES. All of the residents surrounding the property on Plummer St. and many more in the immediate area want a re-vote and we want the compromise agreement back on the Agenda!

Original board action supporting the development (without resident involvement) appears on the site but the board action supporting the resident's over a year later has disappeared.

A request to reconsider the original board action was made but we were told that this could not happen by Tony Wilkinson, who at the time was Vice President (but always presided over the meetings as if president) and but instead that the board could vote to "support and alternative" in addition to the original board action. He also met with the owners of the property during the summer of 2017 to discuss the rezone, not being the Land Use chair, this was also improper.

Improper procedure

"Garcetti appointee David Ambroz, President of the City Planning Commission said that any effort to maximize transparency should consider where the volunteer commissioners fit into the entire planning process. By the time a project makes its way to the commission, "almost all the details have been hammered out between the builder, the council office and interested community," Ambroz said in a brief written statement. "We are at the tail end of the process."

Aug. 3, 2015 Developer Williams Homes goes to the North Hills East Neighborhood Council (NHENC) to get their approval for a residential development at **15500 Plummer Street and 9433 Sepulveda Boulevard**. One of the owners said that the proposal is for **54 small lot homes or 56 town homes on the Sepulveda portion and up to 15 units on the Plummer portion if the Plummer property becomes part of the project.** (this is about 69-71 units)

The Board voted to support the concept without any residents in the area of the development present or notified of the proposal (No one in the area even knew of the existence of the North Hills East Neighborhood Council).

On or around August 15, 2016 (A full year after the developer went to the Neighborhood Council and still had not reached out to neighbors) – Neighbors within a 500 foot radius are first notified of the proposed rezoning application build **90 condominiums** at the project sites located at **15508 West Plummer and 9433 North Sepulveda Boulevard** and hearing to take place August 30, 2016.

Petitions are disbursed and collected from residents within the 500 foot radius to state opposition to rezoning.

October 2016 – We find out that the developer or the owners have chartered a bus and offered coffee and donuts to the residents of the low income senior apartment building on Plummer to come show support for them and then take them all out to lunch after because they know of the large number of neighbors planning to come to protest the rezone and the Planning Commission hearing. They taped flyers on everyone's apartment door. They did not go through with this and it's been said that the apartment building employee that allowed this was let go.

- **LA Times, California Section, article Friday, September 9, 2016** (In this case the interested community seems to be at the tail end of the process)

Also, we do not understand why the request for rezoning went from 15508 Plummer Street to include 15500-15508 Plummer Street and 15420-15450 Plummer Street. Comments have been made by those for the project have told us that the goal is to build retail and apartments on top of the retail along Sepulveda Boulevard and that a Jack in the Box and Starbucks next to the project were going to be built as well. So it also brings us to question if we have been fully notified of what is really being developed in our neighborhood?

North Hills Demographics Profile

Statistic	North Hills	Los Angeles	California
Population	99,507	3,918,872	38,654,206
Population density (sq mi)	10,497	8,362	232
Median age	34.1	35.0	36.0
Male/Female ratio	1.0:1	1.0:1	1.0:1
Married (15yrs & older)	n/a	44%	52%
Speak English	n/a	40%	56%