



13654 Victory Blvd., #136 Valley Glen, California 91401
www.greatervalleyglencouncil.org



July 8, 2020

Ms. Sarah Hounsell
Hearing Officer
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Case No: CPC-2018-7165-CU
CEQA No: ENV-2018-7166-CE
Sarah.Hounsell@lacity.org

Dear Ms. Hounsell,

The Greater Valley Glen Council's ("GVGC") Planning and Land Use Committee ("PLUC" or "Committee") held a hearing on February 19, 2020 addressing the Case No: CPC-2018-7165-CU affecting property located at 6254 N. Ranchito Avenue, Valley Glen (property in question or "PIQ") to consider an application to approve a variance for a 6-bed Congregate Living Health Facility ("Facility") to become an 18-bed Facility (the "Variance"). An invitation to the Representative for the Applicant was extended, without a response. Additionally, the surrounding community was invited to comment.

After an extended period of testimony from those in attendance on February 19, 2020, the Committee recommended to the General GVGC Board to support a denial of the Conditional Use Permit and the Exemption from CEQA to State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15303 (Class 3).

At its March 2, 2020 Regular Board meeting, the GVGC Board voted unanimously to uphold the Committee's recommendation. Once again, the Applicant's Representative was noticed of the meeting, and the community was notified as well. The Applicant's Representative never responded to any notices by the GVGC Board. Over 20 community members were present and spoke against the project. They brought a 35-signature petition of non-support of the CUP to allow for an 18-bed Facility.

On March 9, 2020, an LA City Planning Department Hearing on this matter was presided over by Daniel Skolnick. Three GVGC Board members, including the current chair of PLUC, and approximately 50 stakeholders spoke against the Variance.

As noted at GVGC's PLUC and Board meetings, GVGC and the community are concerned about several matters:

- 1) A demonstrated unwillingness of the Applicant to conduct any outreach to its neighbors. Outside of the Early Notification system notice to GVGC and a short lead-time notice to neighbors. Only the required sign was posted in an overgrown yard on the Facility site, making the notice virtually unnoticeable. The applicant did not reach out to the community with its plan to expand the property into the proposed Facility.
- 2) The PIQ has had a history of poor exterior maintenance with weeds in the front and side yards as high as 3-4 feet high. How could the State or County Department of Health allow the PIQ to operate a Facility where weeds that tall could create respiratory issues. i.e. what capabilities do government agencies have to monitor an expanded Facility?

