



Alan Como <alan.como@lacity.org>

RE: Yucca/Argyle proposed project

L S <mypadinla@gmail.com>
To: alan.como@lacity.org

Thu, Dec 3, 2020 at 1:03 AM

Hi Alan,

I hope this email finds you well.

Please find my letter of support with the recommendations made by the CPC which includes condition 14 (d) as a condition of approval.

It is clear that these developers cannot be trusted to do the right thing based on the Crossroads project which includes the same developer, lawyers, and Del Richardson and Associates to intimidate tenants to take a buyout (cash for keys).

Also taking into account the bad act they put up here with this project, creating an unlivable situation where this property almost went into REAP last year due to so many violations from this bad operator Bob Champion, Greg Beck and their property management company Moss and Company and the person who works for Del Richardson and Associates Andre Augustine who actually lives on the property. I still have a case open with HCIDLA for various violations.

I should also mention that I am a board member of the Hollywood United NC and the board also voted to protect the tenants at the Yucca/Argyle apartments given that it would displace the city of Los Angeles volunteers like myself and employees like my wife and another neighbor.

The main reason HUNC voted not to recommend this project is that Bob Champion and his partner Greg Beck did not fulfill their promise they made to the board back in 2016 to work with the tenants through the proper channels of the council members office and our tenant's association.

Please do the right thing.

Thank you,
Luis Saldivar and Family

To the Honorable PLUM Committee

Los Angeles City Council

[200 N Spring Street](#)

[Los Angeles, CA 90012](#)

RE: CPC-2014-4705-ZC-HD-DB-MCUP-CU-SPR/ Yucca-Argyle proposed development/ Condition 14 (d)

To the Councilmembers,

The City Planning Commission has agreed that we as a city are lacking a plan to address displacement caused by development. I am hopeful that our City Council also agrees that we need to do more to make sure people aren't displaced by development. It doesn't make sense to continue to remove people who are housed and become displaced in order to build more housing due to the people that need housing from displacement. We have to break this cycle if we want to stop our homeless numbers from growing.

I am asking that Condition 14 (d), which requires a developer/landlord to allow for a right of return and the difference in rent in the interim, stay as a condition and be strengthened. The way it is currently written still allows for abuse against tenants and an increase in our homeless numbers. There is nothing that stops harassment or intimidation in order to get a signed agreement since we still don't have an anti-harassment policy. There is nothing in the current condition to make sure that there is transparency in the agreement that tenants can bring a lawsuit if the developer fails to uphold their end of the bargain. Developers prioritize their bottom line over everything else and more so from some bad players. The way the condition is written doesn't address this and it needs to. So please add wording to protect our renter families from profit-driven developers.

We are grateful to see the first step be taken to make sure people are housed and that we don't continue to push people out onto the streets. We have to do more to keep our families housed, and this starts to address this problem.

Thank you for your consideration,

Luis Saldivar, Mariana Vargas, and Family