

Los Angeles City Planning Dept.  
Maya E. Zaitzevsky  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RECEIVED  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEC 31 2003  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
UNIT

Re: EnV-2002-2481 EIR  
SCH#2002091018  
Canyon Hills Project—  
DEIR Comments.

Dear Maya E. Zaitzevsky

I am writing on the matter of the Canyon Hills development.

I live near the proposed development site and therefore consider myself a "citizen expert." I would like to discuss three points with you:

**ENVIROMENTAL ISSUE**

I have studied the DEIR report and am concerned with glaring contradictions in the report concerning emergency access and egress for Verdugo Crestline Drive and Inspiration Way. The DIER (IV.d-155) states that paving these streets would not impact the local or regional corridors for wildlife.

As someone who walks in the area in a daily basis, it's rather odd to be told that the proposed project would not permanently damage the migratory patterns of the wildlife in the area. Remember, we are not dealing with a minor corridor. We are dealing, in fact, with a central corridor used daily by these animals, who are already surrounded by Tujunga development to the north and the 210 freeway to the south.

185-1

It's difficult to conceive how a plan for over 200 houses and the cars and families that will come with them will have only nominal impact.

I therefore strongly urge you to demand further study of the environmental impact.

**HUMAN IMPACT**

I am also concerned that this so-called emergency egress and exit will not become a *defacto* shortcut. Our streets are narrow, there are children who play in the streets. I think you need to ask these people why there is no discussion of the HUMAN impact of the development on the existing neighborhood of Hillhaven and Inspiration Way. I can tell you as a "citizen expert" I feel the that the impact will be far from minimal, nor in any way positive.

185-2

Everyone in the neighborhood I have spoken to about this project is against more than the existing leagal development of the site in question. I can only assume that Whitebird, a *nonvoting entity* that is not even based in the area, is the only party in favor of it.

185-3

**PROPOSED VARIANCE CHANGES**

According to the DEIR, I understand that legally Whitebird is only allowed to build 87 houses and has asked for consultation on plans to build more than is legally allowed.

I am categorically against this petition for any zone changes. Variances are merely rouses to circumvent rules which were designed to protect the community.

The idea that Whitebird can and should be allowed any variances is specious: If I have the money to buy a Ferrari that is capable of cruising at 200 miles an hour, it does not mean that my money gives me the right to change the speed limit. The law is the law and the limit is the limit. A police officer does not look at the price of a car but the speed at which it travels. What the car is capable of traveling at is irrelevant; equally, the environmental commission and city council should not decide to slacken the law simply because a corporation has lots of money. The law is equal for all and should be enforced for all.

185-4


*America allows for free enterprise but it does not guarantee profit.*

If Whitebird or its proxies can't make money on 87 houses, that is hardly the fault of the residences of Tujunga, nor should we be expected to bend the rules for this corporation. Sometimes an expensive car is a waste of money, sometimes builders buy land without thinking through on their financial decisions.

In short, as a tax-payer and voter and property owner, I strongly urge the environmental commission and city council *to enforce the existing legal restrictions: 87 house maximum, no grading changes, etc..*

I will be monitoring carefully whether the aforesaid bodies, which are employed by the citizens of Tujunga, enforce the people's will.

Yours Respectfully,



Jeffrey Kahan, Ph.D.  
9609 Hillhaven  
Tujunga, Ca,  
91042.