

December 28, 2003

Daniel and Nancy Sweeney  
9517 Cordero Avenue  
Tujunga, CA 91042  
(818) 841-9300

Los Angeles City Planning Dept  
Maya E. Zaitzevsky  
200 N. Spring St., Room 763  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RECEIVED**  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEC 30 2003  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
UNIT

Re: Canyon Hills, Tujunga, CA proposed development  
Draft Environmental Impact Report # 2002-2481-EIR  
SCH # 2002091018  
Date of Report: October 2003

Dear Ms. Zaitzevsky

It has recently come to our attention that the development of 280 homes is being proposed next to our neighborhood. Of course we were very unhappy to hear about this because we enjoy the rural nature of the area. There are still no curbs along most of Tujunga Canyon Blvd and none at all along La Tuna Cyn and we like it that way. The woodlands and wildlife throughout Tujunga were some of the chief reasons we moved here 25 years ago. Now it seems a lot of changes are going to take place and not all of them good.

136-1

Of course a property owner should have the right to build on his land - even an out of state corporation whose only interest is speculation. However, I find it disturbing that developer Whitebird is expecting a number of zoning variances and additional exemptions to be made to increase their profitability while leaving our community with a greater number of homes in the development than present ordinances allow. We ask you to please deny Whitebird these numerous variances.

I realize that 280 homes will increase the tax base for the city but at what price? One specific variance the developer has requested concerns the removal of over 400 live oak trees. If our state found it imperative enough to introduce a law to protect live oak trees, why is it acceptable for Whitebird to remove any of them? An ordinary citizen has to obtain a permit to remove a dead live oak tree from his property. So our feeling is this: Whitebird, which is an out of state corporation must also follow the zoning laws as any ordinary citizen living in this city would have to or what is the point of ordinances? Surely, Whitebird was aware of the restrictions it would face well before the purchase of this site.

136-2

136-3

If granted these variances and exemptions, Whitebird's development will certainly change the entire nature of the area and might open the door for future requests by future La Tuna Canyon developers. It just takes one foot in the door. Furthermore, the developer's desire for a larger profit should not be a reason to grant the extensive variances requested.

136-4

Another worry is the project's location in a "Very High Fire Hazard Zone" which is prone to wind driven fires. The new resident population will increase the potential for wildlife fires starting in the area. No matter what fire requirements are met by Whitebird, we are now dealing with the human factor and fires are inevitable. What a shame it would be to increase the probability of fires which are already prevalent up here. Are we going to destroy the remaining woodlands that will exist along La Tuna Canyon? Haven't we learned our lesson from the most recent fires Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino counties experienced?

136-5

Please deny Whitebird's request for it's numerous variances and exemptions and thank you for your attention to our concerns.

136-6

Very truly yours,

  
Daniel and Nancy Sweeney

Cc: Mayor James K. Hahn  
Los Angeles City Councilwoman Wendy Gruel  
City Planner Dale Thrush