

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: Project ID# is ENV-2007-2769 EAF New Leaf Homes Development**
Date: September 27, 2007 11:50:11 AM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: "Harold, John G., M.D" <john.harold@cshs.org>
Date: September 27, 2007 11:35:14 AM PDT
To: <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Cc: "Harold, John G., M.D" <john.harold@cshs.org>, "Remba, Diana" <Diana.Remba@cshs.org>
Subject: **Project ID# is ENV-2007-2769 EAF New Leaf Homes Development**

EAf NO: ENV-2007-2769 EAF

PROJECT NAME: New Leaf Homes

PROJECT LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2500 - 2529 N. Woodstock, 2500- 2548 Thames and 2500-2551 Leicester(22 lots total)

COMMUNITY PLANNING AREA: Hollywood

COUNCIL DISTRICT 4:

DUE DATE FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS: September 14, 2007

To Mr. Tom Glick:

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is written is a response to the request for comments on the proposed Greenleaf Development in the Mount Olympus area of the Hollywood Hills (Project ID# is ENV-2007-2769 EAF):

DESCRIPTION: The applicant proposes to construct eleven new homes and remodel 5 partially completed homes on this 3.9-acre site. In addition, improvement of 0.7 acres of public streets is proposed. Woodstock Road (a graded but unpaved roadway) and Leicester Drive (unimproved) pass through the site and terminate just west of the site; both roadways would be improved and paved as part of the project. Thames Street (improved and paved) abuts the site on the south. The applicant proposes to remodel 5 homes that have been constructed but not occupied and that exceed the Mulholland Specific Plan height limit. Height and set back variances may be needed for these homes. An additional 11 homes are proposed. Minor setback variances may be requested for these homes. Retaining walls will be a part of many of the homes; any potential for a retaining wall variance will be explored through the environmental review process. Also the potential for a Zoning Administrator Determination regarding improvement of substandard streets will be explored through the environmental review process. A pocket park with public steps is also proposed.

Requested Land Use Entitlements:

Project Permit Compliance with LAMC 11.57 (c) Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.Design Review Pursuant to Section11, Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.Haul Route Hearing and Approval.An "A" Permit to improve city streets.Potential for Specific Plan Exceptions for the existing homes (height and prominent ridgeline).Potential variance from height and setback requirements (including the hillside Ordinance requirements for existing homes and new homes.Potential for Zoning Administration Determination for grading improvements substandard streets. Potential for for retaining wall variance

Dear Mr. Glick,

This letter is written in my capacity as a former Board of Director of the Mt. Olympus Home Owners Association. The proposed construction would negatively impact the residents of Mt. Olympus which is adjacent to the proposed construction site.

I was surprised to see a scoping application by New Leaf Homes Development. Almost two decades ago, Former City Councilman Michael Woo gave a press conference adjacent to the proposed development talking about the fire hazards in the area and the dangers of excessive development with the lack of suitable infrastructure. The Willow Glenn area sustained a disastrous fire in the 1970's and this historical perspective is critical given that we are in the greatest fire risk period in recent memory. The proposal to build megamansions in sites originally designed for weekend cabins sounds ludicrous to me. The current development has been an eyesore for years on the Mulholland corridor and has been subject to numerous landslides following periodic rainstorms. The current developer proposes to use a historical right of way to break into the top of Mount Olympus. We were advised following the last legal challenge that the City Council would never allow this to happen. I now understand that this may no longer be the case. Mount Olympus is already used as a vehicular short cut to the Valley during rush hours. This development would critically exacerbate this situation if the potential existing right of way roadway into Mount Olympus was developed further.

The proposed construction will occur on a tiny connecting road that sits adjacent to Mt. Olympus and the Valley. As it is, two cars can barely pass together at the same time at this point. We were surprised to learn that the City was considering this application given the obvious negative environmental impact in the Mulholland corridor and adjacent properties. I'm not a geologist but I certainly have fears that digging pylons into the hill site may impact on the stability of the adjacent road. I certainly don't know how equipment will gain access to this point without causing major hazard to the residents and commuters that use the adjacent heavily trafficked conduits.

Your agency should prepare a negative declaration to address the concerns which are outlined below. The scoping application does not resolve serious environmental concerns raised by the proposed development. This opinion is shared by numerous area residents who have reviewed the relevant details of the current application. This issue was a topic of prolonged and heated discussion during the recent homeowners meeting of the Mt. Olympus Homeowners Association. This meeting was attended by representatives of Councilman Tom LaBonge. They were acutely aware of the community's concerns regarding the negative impact of the proposed development on the adjacent community and the obvious negative environmental impact.

By definition, the current scoping application does not address the obvious needs at the site for carefully consideration on how the site will be excavated and graded, site drainage, and adjacent street improvements. The lots are so steep that excavation, grading and drainage concerns would be obvious from a mere site inspection. Because of the narrow and hazardous streets at this site and throughout our neighborhood area, any excavation tonnages need to be made known, and hauling routes, schedules and procedures need to be identified in advance of any approvals. The extent of any foundation work which would be permitted on both of the subdivided lots should be specified. Height computations need to be included in the lot split application so as to determine if they are in compliance with the Hillside Ordinance. The developer has already stated they would be looking for variances to these various city ordinances. Historical precedence would suggest that these "variances" could lead to "eyesores" as already exist from the prior developer who reportedly violated height restrictions with the existing properties!

As part of this process, soils and geological reports will need to be submitted and shared. There is a huge amount of earth moving and grading which would be needed for this proposed development. The small frontage along the affected streets will make excavating, grading and foundation work extremely difficult and will negatively impact nearby neighbors and traffic. Slopes in the immediate area have failed before, which should be a sufficient basis by itself for additional study, information and environmental concern with respect to the lot application. Huge unsightly retaining walls will be visible from Laurel Canyon as part of the process of constructing houses in the New Leaf Homes Development. The residents of Mt. Olympus and adjacent communities are entitled to know about the need for such walls before any application is approved.

In summary, much more information should be provided and work done before your agency approves the scoping application for the current project. At a minimum, the environmental issues/concerns are sufficient and significant enough to require a mitigated negative declaration to be prepared.

Sincerely,

John G. Harold, MD

Past Member, Board of Directors,
Mount Olympus Home Owners Association

Cedars-Sinai Medical Office Towers
8635 West Third Street
Los Angeles, CA 90048
(310) 659-2030

IMPORTANT WARNING: This message is intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is **STRICTLY PROHIBITED**.

If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by calling (310) 423-6428 and destroy the related message. Thank You for your cooperation.

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: Project #ENV-2007-2769 EAF - New Leaf Homes**
Date: September 27, 2007 11:50:48 AM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: Pamela Ventura <pieman8@sbcglobal.net>
Date: September 27, 2007 11:49:14 AM PDT
To: Tom.Glick@lacity.org
Cc: POGUEFILM@aol.com
Subject: **Project #ENV-2007-2769 EAF - New Leaf Homes**

Dear Mr. Glick,

As a property owner at 2531 Thames St., which is the street directly below this project, I'd like to bring to your attention a number of problems that have occurred in the past.

1. Extreme erosion during the rainy season caused mud to fill the swimming pool and property at 2530 Thames St.
2. Thames Street itself, as well as my property, was impacted with the mud to the extent that vehicle passage was nearly impossible. The property owner never responded to requests to assist in the cleanup.
3. Over the years, the hillside has eroded to the extent that the topography originally considered to support a narrow street no longer exists.
4. The lots on this site, which were originally mapped in the 1920s, were intended to house small summer bungalows, not 4 and 5,000 square foot homes.
5. The infrastructure required to support whatever number of homes are permitted must be designed to protect the streets and homes below. This was never considered when the structures that now exist were built.
6. Because this is a volatile brush area that has burned in the past, all requirements from the Fire Department must be given priority.

In closing, I'd like to say that the Environmental Impact Report should and must have the strictest

requirements and mitigations before this project can even be considered.

Thank you for your time,

Ralph Ventura
2531 Thames St.

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: ENV-2007-2769 EAF- NEW LEAF HOMES**
Date: September 27, 2007 1:13:49 PM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: "Jeffrey Eyster" <jeffrey@aearchitect.com>
Date: September 27, 2007 1:10:46 PM PDT
To: <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **ENV-2007-2769 EAF- NEW LEAF HOMES**
Reply-To: <jeffrey@aearchitect.com>

Tom Glick, City Planner
Department of City Planning
Van Nuys Civic Center
14410 Sylvan Street Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 9140

Re: ENV-2007-2769 EAF- NEW LEAF HOMES

Dear Mr. Glick,

On behalf of my family, I am writing you in regards to the development that surrounds our home. We are the only neighbor whose property borders the project on all three non street fronting sides. Not only do we have a lot at stake, I am also the co-owner of the architecture firm which has prepared the design for the development.

My home was approved and described by the Mullholland DRB as, " The new precedent for the area" , By Lynn Wyatt the acting precedent at the time. Our goal for our home was not to recreate the corridor effect of large surfaced homes fronting on narrow canyon street, but to set our home back 20 feet from the right-of-way and to exceed zoning setbacks. In addition we built an environmentally responsible home recently published in the LA Times, and featured in a variety of magazine editorials.

Our broad objective for the project is to enable people to get the most out of living in the Hollywood Hills; houses where they can live according to their progressive, cosmopolitan and ecological views. We think that "ecologically intelligent" building is more than just mitigating negative impact – building and construction must also enhance the environment by becoming an integral part of the scenery, bringing shade and comfort, restoring habitat, and perhaps most importantly, by psychic environmental outcomes, like helping people to enjoy being part of the natural world. Buildings are not a necessary environmental evil, they are, when done right, environmental enhancements.

The building materials are chosen to use, as much as possible, rapidly renewable resources and resources with low embodied energy. (embodied energy includes the energy used to manufacture and transport the material, plus the energy contained in the material itself). The principal structural and finish materials will be wood, which is both beautiful and renewable. Wood will be selected which has been certified by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), an international forest products certification standard which seeks to ensure that forest products are produced in an "environmentally responsible, socially acceptable, and economically viable" way. Structural wood will use, as much as possible, engineered composite members which are made from young, fast growing trees rather than old growth trees. The principal interior and exterior finishes will be wood, and the interior floors will be bamboo which is durable, fast growing and plentiful. The other main finish material is natural stone, which has very low embodied energy and can be sourced domestically. In addition to having a light footprint, these natural materials will remain exposed to view where their composition can be seen, to remind people of their interdependence with the natural world.

Passive climate control will be used to reduce dependence upon heating and refrigeration equipment. Because most of the houses will be set into the hillside, they will have basement areas which will need little or no heating or cooling because of the thermal mass of the earth. Under-floor crawl spaces will be used as plenums for cool air supply. Refrigeration will be further reduced through window shading, both from projecting exterior overhangs and carefully selected and sited trees, and from the use of interior materials with high thermal mass, such as concrete, stone and tile. Mechanical refrigeration will use non HCFC coolant, and run off a building management system which optimizes its use and distribution.

We are exploring the possibility of construction the homes as prefabricated elements manufactured off-site and assembled at the site, if large crane access is possible. This could reduce the number of times my kids wake up from construction noise.

This is a rare opportunity where a neighbor who lives on the project site and has a environmentally-friendly vision is also the designer. My fear is the project ending up in the hands of a different owner and architect without vision.

You have received many letters from my neighbors who also protested my own home construction project. Several meetings have occurred with the neighbors and the owners where we presented models, drawings, and renderings. I have mostly received a no-negotiation attitude. I encourage them to engage working with us to create this unique neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Eyster, M.Arch, AAIA , Alla Furman, Eva and Max Eyster

2540 N. Thames St.

Los Angeles, CA. 90046

310.493.3739

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: New Leaf Homes; ID# ENV-2007-2769 EAF**
Date: September 27, 2007 3:20:37 PM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: Sandra Lipschultz <harveyandsandra@lipschultz.net>
Date: September 27, 2007 2:38:19 PM PDT
To: Tom.Glick@lacity.org
Subject: **New Leaf Homes; ID# ENV-2007-2769 EAF**

Dear Mr. Glick:

I know you have heard many concerns from Mt. Olympus and Laurel Canyon residents about the New Leaf Homes Project. While I share their concerns, my letter addresses the Draft EIR which will be required of the developer, so that the Planning Department and others will be aware of the potential hazards and difficulties of a large scale, (16 home) project on a steep hillside that abutts Mt. Olympus

Please be sure that it is required to include the following issues:

1. Geology and erosion of the steep hillsides
2. Earthquake and soil fracture impacts
3. Use of retaining walls in excess of current ordinances
4. Traffic and street width of Woodstock Road
5. Cul-de-sac turnaround hammerhead at Woodstock
6. Fire vehicle access: Please note that by current LA city council resolution there is to be NO CUTTHROUGH of Woodstock into Mt. Olympus or Hercules Drive
8. Slope density requirements
9. Export and excavation haul routes
10. Landscaping.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Harvey and Sandra Lipschultz
2339 Jupiter Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90046
323-512-7837

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: FW: New Leaf Homes project**
Date: September 27, 2007 3:20:53 PM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: Miri Mandel <mirika1@hotmail.com>
Date: September 27, 2007 1:36:10 PM PDT
To: <tom.glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **FW: New Leaf Homes project**

The project no is :ENV-2007-2769-EAF New Leaf Homes

From: mirika1@hotmail.com
To: tom.glick@lacity.org
Subject: New Leaf Homes project
Date: Thu, 27 Sep 2007 20:31:42 +0000

Many of us residents in the area object heavily to this debatable project. As it is the complete opposite of beautification of the area, that's very obvious, and should be taken in consideration. But much more than that, this project would make the whole area look like a stitched up area filled with retaining walls everywhere, and since the area is an obvious site, how will it make our crowding up city and mostly, our famous hills look? All the finesse is disappearing from the hills due to these kinds of "insensitive" projects. What's going on here, Is it really all about ambitious businessmen/builders?

And more smog, and drivers, and congestion...

And what about the natural habitat that is really screeching and squeezed already at this point?

Businessmen and money do not recognize that aspect at all, but somehow, in the grand picture, balance can be shifted slightly but not entirely.

Our city "managers", the ones that we count on to do the right thing, (and the right thing here is to NOT APPROVE this project), should think about all the above things and show the city care and concern.

sincerely,

Miri Mandel

From: Miri Mandel <mirika1@hotmail.com>
Date: September 27, 2007 1:31:42 PM PDT
To: <tom.glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **New Leaf Homes project**

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: New Leaf Homes**
Date: September 28, 2007 11:07:49 AM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

||| "Hilary de Vries" <devrieshi@earthlink.net> 9/27/2007 7:01 PM >>>
Dear Mr. Glick:

This letter is in response to the invitation for Public Comment on project "New Leaf Homes," ENV-2007-2769-EAF.

As a 15-year resident of Laurel Canyon and the owner of a home on Woodstock Road directly across from the proposed project, I am writing as a concerned neighbor. You will have gathered from the public comments provided at the scoping meeting of Sept 10th, this project is out of scale and size with the existing neighborhood. In addition to the issues raised at that meeting regarding the projects adversarial impact on the native flora and fauna in what remains one of the last open spaces in Laurel Canyon - The Mountain Recreation and Conservancy Administration (MCRA) has this area identified on its map of target acquisition parcels - I am especially concerned about the size and pace of the proposed construction. The neighborhood is already under siege and the New Leaf project would only guarantee that it would remain under siege for years, probably decades to come. This development will require thousands of truckloads of soil removal, and an unending stream of construction trucks, drilling, cement pouring, welding, sawing, hammering, and other related construction noises, in addition to the transportation vehicles required for the hundreds of laborers who will be required to build this large-scale development. The cumulative effect of this construction noise, even within allowed time limits and days-of-week, will result in the neighborhood being a virtual construction site for years to come. It is not unusual for homes of the size and scope proposed for this development to be under construction for three or more years. I refer you to the recent 2600 Woodstock project, which was begun in 2004 and continues to this date, and the 7835 Willow Glen project, which began in 2000 and was not completed until 2003. Perhaps the most germane example remains the Eyster property on Thames across from 2549 - built by the New Leaf architect himself - which took three years to complete and has yet to be landscaped. Assuming the projects proposed dimensions of 16 homes - and built how? concurrently? one at a time? - and construction potentially extends for 48 years. Additionally, the bowl-like topography of the area increases sound levels exponentially, further increasing the effect and degrading residents quality of life. Specifically:

- a. Staging for construction vehicles and the associated noise

from traffic—the existing local roads do not permit parking and are not wide enough to accommodate large construction vehicles nor the day-to-day transportation needs of construction workers

b. Delivery of materials to the site (see the same restrictions above in a. as to street width, accessibility, etc.)

c. According to the Standard Street Dimensions, Standard Plan S-470-0, D-22548, adopted on May 13, 1999 by the Department of Transportation and Director of Planning, limited access conditional Access Roadways (limited-private street only), with no more than 4 dwellings and of length no longer than 300 feet, may be 20 feet wide plus 2 feet on each side for an easement line, for a total of 24 feet. That distance of 24 feet does not exist today on Leicester Dr., and therefore, further build out of the street is not possible.

d. Neither Woodstock or Willow Glen can be considered adequate construction routes. Both streets are substandard in width and at least three new homes - one consisting of 5000 square feet - are already proposed on Willow Glen. Construction vehicles that currently use Willow Glen as an access road have already resulted in the breaking of the water main that runs under Willow Glen twice, necessitating extensive repairs by DWP that included jack-hammering and re-asphalting. Three years ago, Woodstock Road collapsed due to traffic and area mudslides. Not only did that require almost two years of waiting for federal funding to repair and re-open the road, but the city was forced to pay \$3 million in damages to an area home owner whose house was damaged by the road's failure. Construction vehicles can only safely enter the neighborhood via Mt. Olympus where the streets are standard sized, curbed and sufficient to bearing traffic of this nature.

In addition to the construction issues, I would also like to raise the issue of aesthetics. Without any specific plan or architectural models provided by the developers, we have only the artist's rendering of the project. Even a glance reveals a depressingly incongruous landscape of cookie-cutter homes comprised of the same brown wood, the same boxy shapes. Call it what you will, New Leaf, Green Leaf - the project has had several names - but as it is proposed now, it's a standard development. A subdivision totally out of keeping with the existing area homes. Laurel Canyon - and specifically Willow Glen, Thames, and Woodstock Roads - is an architecturally eclectic neighborhood of small bungalows tucked away on hillsides, behind trees. The neighborhood is rich in cultural history and its rambling ad hoc nature is essential to its appeal. It is not a subdivision. It is not Mt. Olympus. What the New Leaf developers propose is nothing short of subdividing one of the last open spaces in the canyon, to extend the reach and scope of Mt. Olympus over the hillside. It is unacceptable and should be recognized as such by the city. In light of these concerns, as well as the already voiced at the scoping meeting, a project that brings the existing four homes into current building code compliance and leaves the remainder of the hillside untouched in its natural state is the only reasonable one.

Sincerely,

Hilary de Vries

2717 Woodstock Road

. 2733 Woodstock Road
Los Angeles, CA 90046-1118

September 28, 2007

VIA email and USPS

Mr. Tom Glick
City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning
Van Nuys Civic Center
14410 Sylvan Street, room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Re: New Leaf Homes
ENV-200-2769 EAF

Dear Tom,

Thank you so much for arranging for the scoping meeting on September 10, 2007, as well as for your public comments during the meeting. Your public comments have been very helpful in shaping the comments which I will make in this letter.

I understand that the comment period deadline is September 28th, and that this letter will be part of those public comments and available in the file.

As you know, I am the current vice president for the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council (“HHWNC”). I also serve as an appointee of Los Angeles City Council Member Tom LaBonge on the Citizens Oversight Committee for the Open Spaces Bond Monies in District One. The New Leaf Homes development is in the HHWNC’s area as well as District One. I am also a former committee chair for the HHWNC’s Area 9 Committee, which is the area just across Willow Glen from the New Leaf Homes.

HHWNC’s Area 9 is north of the New Leaf Homes, and the New Leaf Homes are visible from a large part of Area 9, most of Willow Glen as well as parts of Mt. Olympus, Laurel Canyon and Mulholland Drive.

In this letter, I am making my comments as an individual, rather than on behalf of the HHWNC or the Citizens Oversight Committee.

The September 10th scoping meeting

The September 10th scoping meeting on the New Leaf Homes was the fourth scoping meeting which I have attended in the last several months, including the MTA Universal site meeting, which was held in the same room as our September 10th meeting at the Van

Nuys Civic Center. The other scoping meetings I attended were with regard to (i) the NBC Universal Vision Plan, and (ii) Temple Israel of Hollywood.

The New Leaf Homes scoping meeting was the only one at which there were no presentations by the developer(s)/applicant(s). Instead, as you know because you were there, a 16 page brochure, which included very little information, was distributed. The first four pages of the brochure were devoted to highlighting the title of the meeting, who was running it, and the agenda. Several other pages had just brief phrases, such as “New Leaf Hills Proposal”, and EIR process overview, a time line and, finally, the words “Public Comments” were the sole entry on the 16th page. In short, it was a vacuous brochure.

Wendy Lockwood, a consultant, conducted most of the meeting. Approximately 25 to 30 people attended the meeting.

Ms. Lockwood startled me when she said that this EIR process would begin with an idea or concept which would be developed over time.

I interrupted Ms. Lockwood’s presentation to tell her that the starting point is the existing legal decision in this case. That would be the September 11, 2002, decision of the California Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District, Division Seven in Case B156529, which was entitled Arviv Enterprises v. South Valley Planning Commission.

There also is a December 21, 2000 South Valley Planning Commission determination in Case No: CPC 2000-1053(DRB).

Additionally, there are Mulholland Design Review Board advisory decisions with regard to the hillside where New Leaf Homes would be built, and there probably are Los Angeles Building & Safety Department orders for annual maintenance plan filings. The LADBS inspector on the case at that time was Grace Harper, who now is a senior manager in LADBS; presumably, you could ask her for assistance in locating LADBS’ file(s) and that department’s order(s).

I will send copies of the Court of Appeals decision and the South Valley Planning Commission’s determination along with the hard copy of this comment letter.

The South Valley Planning Commission “concurred with the recommendation of the Planning Department, that the environmental clearance for Case No. CPC 2000-1053 (DRB), (Mitigated Negative Declaration No. MND 2000-3120 (DRB) was determined to be inadequate because of the significant adverse impacts and cumulative effects of the project. These impacts include but are not limited to geologic issues (extensive grading, landslides, mudslide), inadequate drainage infrastructure, inadequate public access, including emergency fire and public safety vehicles.....Additionally, the cumulative impacts of these [adjacent] projects on adjoining properties must be considered.”

The Court of Appeals certified its decision for publication, which means the decision can be cited as a legal precedent in this and other cases. In this particular project, it is the law of the case! It's the real legally significant starting point for any environmental review process, such as the one you are doing (and upon which this letter is making comments).

On pages 20 and 21 of the Court of Appeal's decision, the court stated that "although five of the houses are already built, these structures are only part of all amenities required to make those houses habitable. Unresolved issues specifically regarding those five houses include ensuring adequate street width, an emergency vehicle turnaround area, sewer system design, drainage and other matters which demonstrate even the five-house project is not yet complete.....In short, Arviv has failed to demonstrate any part of his proposed project should be immune from environmental scrutiny."

Sadly, the very issues which the Planning Department, the Mulholland Design Review Board, the South Valley Planning Commission and the State's courts considered so many years ago are still unresolved. The New Leaf Homes proposal makes little, if any, progress towards resolving those issues.

In the scoping meeting, Ms. Lockwood also erroneously stated that Arviv Enterprises may have inadvertently built homes which didn't comply with the City's building codes and his permits. However, Mr. Arviv admitted at a South Valley Planning Commission meeting, that he had intentionally built the five existing homes to be bigger and taller than his permits. He told the Commission that every builder did such things.

The New Leaf Hills Proposal

New Leaf is proposing to finish the five existing homes and build 11 additional, new homes. Included in the brochure was one simple diagram of where the homes would be built. There also was one illustration or rendering shown at the scoping meeting of what the homes might look like.

As you told those of us who attended the scoping meeting towards the end of that meeting, the New Leaf developer(s) presented insufficient information to provide a basis for making definitive comments on their proposal. You further told us that we should make our comments on a "worst case" basis or scenario because we weren't provided with enough information to make concretely specific comments about New Leaf's plan(s) for the hillside.

From the brochure's diagram, it seems that there would be 5 new structures for 3 new homes built up slope from Woodstock Road along the ridgeline of Mt. Olympus. Additional structures, maybe as many as ten structures, would be built along Leicester Drive's upslope and down slope to provide 5 more new homes. And, one new home consisting of two new structures would be built on Thames Street. Retaining walls would be needed to build out Leicester Drive (which is called Leicester Street in the brochure).

The Mulholland Specific Plan

The New Leaf Hills Proposal seems to fall short, and irretrievably so, of satisfying the standards of the Mulholland Specific Plan Ordinance, as amended, which originally was effective June 29, 1992.

Part 1 of the Specific Plan's summary states that "the general intent of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan is to promote and maintain Mulholland Drive as a scenic parkway." The Specific Plan is designed to provide environmental protection measures for various features, including prominent ridges and oak trees. The Specific Plan regulates walls, which also are regulated by the City's subsequently adopted retaining wall ordinance, landscaping materials, and major vista points. Building heights and building massing are also major issues for the Mulholland Design Review Board under the Mulholland Specific Plan.

From (i) the inner corridor of Mulholland Drive between Laurel Pass and Laurel Canyon, and (ii) large portions of Willow Glen, Woodstock Road, upper Laurel Canyon and Mt. Olympus, the New Leaf Homes will look like a massive wall of concrete hardscrabble. The homes and retaining walls for the various streets are likely to look like a massive construction project. This would be contrary to the intent of the Mulholland Specific Plan to preserve the views throughout the one half mile area on either side of Mulholland Drive, which includes the New Leaf Hill/north facing slope of Mt. Olympus.

Any careful viewshed analysis would seem destined to result in denying New Leaf the right to build any more new homes on the New Leaf Hill.

Because the New Leaf Hillside Plan doesn't provide information about the actual size of the homes which New Leaf is proposing to be built, it seems that we must assume that the homes would be too big, too high, and too massive under the Mulholland Specific Plan and the Mulholland Design Review Board's design guidelines, which have been adopted by the City Council.

We do know, however, that the New Leaf Hillside is very visible from Mulholland Drive, a national scenic corridor, and from around the adjacent hillside canyon areas. The five existing homes already "read" and seem to be one massive construction project when you drive through there going eastbound on Mulholland Drive or stand at Mulholland Drive just east of Laurel Pass, or stand in the dog park below Mulholland there, or when viewed from the streets along those ridges all around Laurel Canyon.

If new homes were built above Woodstock Road on the Mt. Olympus ridgeline, presumably, the massing would be accentuated. The massing would even seem to be more so than it already appears to be, which is hard to imagine.

The proposed development would be likely to be a visual blight from so many vantage points in this community.

Not only would the 5 existing homes continue to be a visual blight, but the proposal to build Leicester Drive out would be too. According to the Court of Appeals decision, at page 16, the retaining walls for the roadway would need to be 20 to 50 feet high, and 300 feet in length. No mitigations have been proposed. The visual impact, as well as the impact on wildlife passing, would be significant.

It's also hard to imagine where people visiting any new homes on Leicester could park without impeding the ability of LAFD and other public safety vehicles to service the area and the larger community, especially in the event of a fire. Also, how would it be possible to cover or hide the massive retaining walls for the road with any landscaping? What landscaping plan would work there? How many decades would it take to restore any portion of the beauty which existed before the trees on the New Leaf hillside were cut down?

The project's hillside slope is severely constrained. It's a very steep slope. It's geological stability is questionable. Fissures are visible, slides have occurred, and geological studies have indicated that there have been geological problems or issues long known to be related to this hillside. The Court of Appeals decision, at pages 3 and 4, refers to a 1987 preliminary geology report and another geology report submitted in 1998 which describe geological problems there. Those reports should be re-examined and updated. It seems desirable to have new geology reports prepared in light of the erosion which has occurred on the hillside over the years of construction there and subsequent landslides and erosion there. Some of the problems may be on adjacent lots not owned by New Leaf, but need to be taken into account.

The new homes proposed for the ridgeline would be visible from miles around, and would seem to be at variance with the City and County's recent moves to stop new homes from being constructed on ridgelines. It's hard to imagine a ridgeline with more prominence, even if this ridgeline doesn't fall within the actual definition of a "prominent ridgeline".

The new homes also would seem to require much grading to prepare their sites. Those sites are directly adjacent to several existing homes on Mt. Olympus Drive, which would be likely to be undermined by the grading and removal of that ridgeline. The City may be assuming a significant liability risk if it permits the new homes to be built there, and this potential liability risk should be examined as part of the environmental review process.

Another issue which needs to be studied, measured and mitigated is the potential adverse impact of additional night light which would be generated from any new homes which might be built as part of the New Leaf Homes Hillside. No information was provided on this issue as part of the New Leaf Homes brochure or during the scoping meeting.

Roads and Public Safety Issues

The New Leaf Hills Proposal doesn't seem to provide for any turnarounds for Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) and other emergency service vehicles. Fire trucks need to have significant turnarounds to provide fire protection. This New Leaf hillside was the site of the disastrous Willow Glen fire decades ago, which the Los Angeles Times recently included in its list of the top 10 fires in modern Los Angeles' history.

Ordinary residents and visitors also would need the turnarounds just to maneuver their cars and trucks.

Woodstock Road on the New Leaf hillside is currently a dirt road. It needs to be improved to be a standard road width with a turnaround satisfactory for the LAFD and Sanitation Dept. vehicles to provide fire protection as well as garbage pick ups. The distance from the five existing homes on Woodstock Road to the Willow Glen intersection is several hundred feet. The five existing homes are too far away from the Willow Glen/Woodstock intersection for LAFD to be able to provide adequate or acceptable fire protection from there. That intersection also is too far from the five existing homes for garbage pick up service to be made from there.

Similarly, Leicester Drive is a substandard street in the portion west of where the New Leaf lots are located. There's no Leicester Drive turnaround included in the New Leaf Hills proposal. A turnaround should be included before any construction is permitted there. The fire safety issues are similar. So are the garbage pick up issues. Engineering a turnaround might not be feasible from an engineering perspective, and should be studied as part of the environmental review process.

On Thames Street, the turn from Thames Place to Thames Street is too sharp to permit adequate LAFD access. It also is too sharp for many other vehicles. It should be improved before any new construction there would be permitted. Similarly, from public safety and emergency management services perspectives, a turnaround should be built at the end of Thames Street if any new homes are to be permitted along Thames Street. There may not be enough land available on Thames Street to make a turnaround, and that should be evaluated as part of the environmental review process.

As it is, Leicester Drive and Thames Street are substandard streets on which there is inadequate road width now for vehicles trying to come in and out of those streets.

Woodstock Road is shown on the New Leaf Hills proposal as possibly connecting to Mt. Olympus Drive in lieu of building any turnaround.

There is a City Council ordinance prohibiting the connection of those two streets. Although the City Council could reverse its decision, it doesn't seem likely to do so. So, planning on a cut through from Woodstock Road to Mt. Olympus Drive doesn't seem prudent or desirable.

From a traffic impact perspective, it might be disastrous to our community to open up and connect Woodstock and Mt. Olympus Drive. That connection could be viewed as a desirable alternate route for cut through traffic backed up on Laurel Canyon Blvd. At different time, the LA Department of Transportation's traffic counts for Laurel Canon Boulevard have indicated that anywhere from 40,000 to 60,000 cars use Laurel Canyon Boulevard on any particular day. Cut through traffic could be overwhelming on Mt. Olympus Drive and Woodstock Road.

Our area's secondary roads are not sufficiently wide to handle two-way traffic now. Increasing the traffic would be a serious negative impact on the community. Secondary roads such as Willow Glen, Woodstock, Mt. Olympus and Woodrow Wilson could not take increased traffic flows safely or efficiently.

Utility Issues

No plans for providing water, electricity or sewage have been submitted. The original Yehuda Arviv proposal assumed that sewage would be removed via a connection to Thames, which has a four inch sewer pipe. Adding 16 new homes to that pipe isn't practical or desirable. It would have an adverse impact.

Studies should be done to determine if the sewage hookups to Woodstock and/or Willow Glen are feasible, and whether any infrastructure improvements should be required before any such connections are permitted.

Water and electrical connection proposals also need to be evaluated since none have been submitted as part of the New Leaf Hills Proposal.

Landslides, Erosion Control, Grading, Hauling etc.

I've commented on some of these issues earlier in this letter, but it's important to point out that there have been significant landslides and erosion control problems on this hillside. Some were created by the original developer's removal of almost all of the trees on the hillside, which included many old magnificent oak trees.

The impact on the community downslope from the New Leaf Hill and the surrounding area too has been significant, and will continue to be so during the future. It will be especially so during any construction period(s). Not only was the community below the five existing houses affected, but the prevailing winds blew dust coatings across the entire Willow Glen canyon for a period of several years while Yehuda Arviv was building the five existing homes. This impact should be evaluated as part of the environmental review process.

At the scooping meeting, several people also commented on how much sound travels throughout the Willow Glen area. It's true, and the impact should be evaluated and mitigated if at all possible, which seems unlikely given our prior experiences with the sounds of constructing the five existing homes.

Even the early rainy season storm last weekend brought a widening or increase on the existing erosion/fissures on the New Leaf Hillside. Storms are an ongoing problem, and no drainage plan has been presented.

From a practical point of view, no comments can be made on a nonexistent plan. Under this circumstance, it should be assumed that adequate drainage and erosion control mitigation isn't possible on the New Leaf Hillside. The ability of the existing sewer system on Willow Glen to take any additional water off that hillside safely and effectively is an issue which needs to be considered. Willow Glen had white caps and street flooding during the last big rainy season, it's likely to reoccur, and to have significant adverse impacts on the homes on Thames Place, Thames Street, Willow Glen and on Laurel Canyon Boulevard, which was nationally famous for its inability to take storm water run off during rains in the 1980s. The impact of building out/on the New Leaf Hillside needs to be studied and evaluated.

Another issue which came up at the scoping meeting was hauling. It seems that the grading being proposed might take seven (7) months of hauling. Not only would it be wrong to grade and remove the mountain top of Mt. Olympus from an environmental impact perspective, as well as being a severe negative visual impact, but it would be an engineering and haulage nightmare. The site is so constrained that any grading there would be likely to undermine the homes atop Mt. Olympus or other parts of the New Leaf hillside. The potential impact of any grading and haulage needs to be studied in much greater detail. NO mitigation was proposed, and much mitigation would seem to be necessary if any additional construction were to be undertaken on the hillside.

What haulage route would be used? At what times? What kind of manpower would be appropriate? Where would trucks waiting to do any hauling wait and idle? There's no adequate or appropriate staging ground or hauling route which would not significantly impact on our community in many substantial and negative ways.

Right now, Woodstock Road is a public right of way even though it's a dirt road. It is supposed to be open as a public right of way, but New Leaf has closed it off with a fence and lock. It should be reopened now! LADBS had issued such an order many years ago, but a series of owners/managers have ignored the order from time to time, including now. It's a fire hazard to have the road locked up.

The 5 existing homes also have been a nuisance with LAPD finding drug paraphernalia in one or more of the homes by an LAPD Senior Lead Officer in 2006.

A dead hawk also was found in one of the five existing homes in the last two years.

Wildlife Corridor Issues

The letter to you from the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy ("SMCC") board of directors' chair, Elizabeth A. Cheadle, which is dated August 27, 2007, represents an

accurate and current state of our knowledge about the significance of the wildlife corridor which runs from Nichols Canyon west through the New Leaf Hillside to Laurel Canyon. It's a significant connection between Griffith Park's vast area to the east and the hillside region going west out to Malibu. The impact of building out the New Leaf Hillside would be severe on the wildlife which use this important wildlife corridor.

The suggestions for extensive additional conservation easements are worthy of consideration. This would mean foregoing building any additional structures on Leicester Drive and maybe even on Thames Street, and the SMCC suggestions should be considered at greater length. They seem prudent and wise.

Many deer, hawks and even a bobcat have nested and lived on the New Leaf Hillside in recent years. It is a significant wildlife habitat.

Falcons take up residence throughout each year too, but I'm not quite sure where they nest in this canyon. I can tell you that they often will sit on top of my house looking for food in the form of animals to prey on in this area.

New Leaf's Requests for Variances and other Equitable Remedies/Relief

The August 7, 2007 scoping meeting notice indicated that New Leaf may ask for height, setback, and retaining wall variances. Also, an "A" permit to improve the streets, Mulholland Specific Plan exceptions for the existing homes, as well as height and prominent ridgeline rule exceptions, may be requested according to the scoping notice. It also seems that New Leaf has indicated it might ask for exceptions from rules requiring improvements on substandard streets.

Without specifying what variances, exceptions and other relief from the City Code's rules and requirements will be asked for, it is impossible to make specific comments on the possible requests. I would like to reserve the right to do so if and when any and all such requests are made. For the purpose of the environmental review process, under the "worst case" scenario you described at the scoping meeting, it would be inappropriate to grant any equitable relief to the New Leaf developers.

There is an additional issue which the Planning Department, and possibly other City agencies, including law enforcement agencies, might be wise to explore.

At common law and generally even in modern times, equitable relief and remedies are available in real estate development cases, like the New Leaf hillside, only if the applicants have "clean hands" when they ask for such relief and remedies. If an applicant or applicants has misrepresented themselves or their project(s) to the City, then it would be inappropriate to grant any such relief and remedies.

It is quite possible that the New Leaf developers have misrepresented who they are to the City. Simply put, it is quite possible that some of the same persons who had substantial economic interests in the original Yehuda Arviv development proposal still have

substantial economic interests in the New Leaf hillside. There is a significant likelihood that some of the original parties to the Arviv Enterprises project still are involved economically in this project and as owners.

Prosper Levy is a wealthy man who seems to have financed Yehuda Arviv and Arviv Enterprises stakes in this hillside development. He foreclosed through quitclaim deeds to various lots on the hillside back in 2002. Subsequently, I and three other area residents met with John Forbess, the general counsel to the Judah Hertz Family Enterprises. Mr. Forbess explained to us that Prosper Levy had been a long time investor with Judah Hertz in several projects around the US, including at least four in Los Angeles. Those four included the Wiltern Center on Wilshire Blvd., Wilshire Square at 3345 Wilshire Blvd. and the California Jewelry Mart at 607 South Hill Street in downtown Los Angeles.

During our meeting with Mr. Forbess, he told us that Prosper Levy not only financed Ariv Enterprises, but at some point became a 50% owner who got a deed of trust as evidence of Arviv's obligation to make repayment(s) to Mr. Levy.

Mr. Forbess also told us that Judah Hertz Family Enterprises would be Mr. Levy's local property manager for the hillside's development.

By 2005, an enterprise called Hadar Holdings, Inc. showed up on a title search. Only late in 2006 did we learn from Alan Kapilow that Hai Waknine was the owner of Hadar Holdings. Mr. Waknine is serving a long sentence in a federal prison for his conviction on federal racketeering charges. The Los Angeles Times has run several articles tying Mr. Waknine to an Israeli organized crime gang known as a large importer of the illegal drug, ecstasy, and several other illegal activities. Copies of some of the articles will be enclosed with the hard copy of this letter.

As it turns out, the Los Angeles Times articles also mention and explain ties between (and among) Mr. Waknine, his uncle and Mr. Hertz. Mr. Hertz's denial of a Nevada gaming license, supposedly on account of alleged ties to organized crime figures, also has been discussed in press articles.

New Leaf's current owner seems to be Alan Kapilow, but the extent of Mr. Kapilow's ownership interest is/should be an issue in this environmental review process.

When several community leaders first met Mr. Kapilow in the offices of Council Member Tom LaBonge a few years ago, he was accompanied by Alan Sarlo. We were told that Mr. Kapilow was the new owner of the existing 5 houses, and that Mr. Sarlo owned the rest of the hillside's land. Subsequently, we were told by Mr. Kapilow that Mr. Kapilow owned the entire hillside, Mr. Sarlo would be paid from any revenues for bringing "the deal" or the project to Mr. Kapilow, and that Mr. Kapilow had been surprised at the time of his acquisition of the hillside to find himself being asked to sign at least \$2,000,000 in a promissory note or notes payable to Mr. Levy.

It seems that the New Leaf hillside has been transferred among a group of people who have known each other to varying degrees, and been investors together in other projects. It seems that the New Leaf hillside has not been offered on the open real estate market, but has passed through various hands of people who have been involved in this and other investments together with the possible exception of Mr. Kapilow.

Mr. Kapilow has told us that he was duped into buying the New Leaf Hillside, didn't know about the existing Court of Appeals decision or its requirements, didn't know that he would have to go through this environmental review process, and feels that he was deceived. He may well have been deceived when he bought the New Leaf Hillside inasmuch as the Court of Appeals decision may not have been recorded on the title for the lots on the New Leaf Hillside.

I have asked A.J. Parnassus, who is the land use attorney for New Leaf about the roles of Mr. Sarlo and others mentioned above quite some time ago. Mr. Parnassus hasn't been able to provide any answer(s) other than to say, in effect, that his client(s) were not involved with Mr. Arviv. So, whether Mr. Sarlo has or had other real estate dealings with others involved in this hillside is something about which I don't know. Mr. Kapilow has told me that Mr. Sarlo brought the deal to him, and that Mr. Sarlo will be paid out of any revenue(s) from the project if it's ever completed. It's not clear whether Mr. Sarlo knew about the Court of Appeals decision before he brought the project/deal to Mr. Kapilow.

It seems that Mr. Levy has remained either as an owner or as a person with a significant and undisclosed ownership interest in this New Leaf Hillside development throughout most, if not all, of the time since Yehuda Arviv started building the 5 existing homes (or sometime soon after construction started, or at least since 2002). The likelihood that Mr. Levy was a 50% owner at the time of the Court of Appeals decision in September, 2002, is sufficiently great as to warrant further investigation as part of this environmental review process.

The ties between and among Prosper Levy, Judah Hertz, Hai Waknine and others in this hillside's ownership chain or group should be looked into because it is quite possible that Mr. Levy's ongoing ownership interest hasn't been disclosed to the Planning Department..

It would be inappropriate for anyone who was an owner of the New Leaf hillside back in 2002 and still today to benefit from any equitable relief in the form of exceptions, variances, exemptions etc. It would be inappropriate to reward an "original owner" or a long time owner with variances, exceptions and other equitable relief. Given the lack of any compliance efforts with the City's building codes, permits and the Court of Appeals decision in this very case for so long, it would be an awful result to provide equitable relief to benefit anyone who has had an ownership interest in the New Leaf hillside for a long time.

There is another case in which Mr. Levy's business interests were so tangled that it took a bankruptcy court decision to sort out whether and how he owned interests in several

Kansas hotels. The facts there may be sufficiently similar to how Mr. Levy's economic interests in the New Leaf Hillside may not have been adequately documented and appropriately disclosed, if that's how it turns out in this situation/case.

The bankruptcy case opinion is In re: Broadview Hospitality (U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Kansas, January 9, 2006). It was Case No. 04-16882, and Adv. No. 04-5348. A copy of the opinion will be enclosed with the hard copy of this letter.

If Mr. Levy's ownership interests have not been properly disclosed to the Planning Department and the City in this case, it's hard to imagine that the "clean hands" doctrine shouldn't be applied to bar any equitable relief and remedies from being granted.

The ownership interests between and among Mr. Waknine, Mr. Levy, Mr. Sarlo and Mr. Kapilow also should be looked into as part of the environmental review process.

The Los Angeles Times reported that there was a federal forfeiture order issued with regard to Mr. Waknine. Was his ownership interest in Hadar Holdings subject to reporting to the federal court, and was his interest in the New Leaf Hillside subject to forfeiture? Also, why would Mr. Waknine and Hadar Holdings have Mr. Kapilow assume or sign promissory notes payable to Mr. Levy if Mr. Levy no longer had an ownership interest when Mr. Kapilow bought the New Leaf Hillside?

From time to time, I've even wondered whether this case presents any racketeering/RICO, money laundering, or drug business or sales proceeds issues.

The Pocket Park Proposal

The pocket park proposal is little more than a stairway going between the various paper and dirt streets on the New Leaf Hillside. It hardly constitutes "open space" or a "vest pocket park". It seems unlikely that the City's Recreations and Parks Department would find it acceptable as a city park property, but this should be looked into as part of the environmental review process. It seems like another empty element of the New Leaf proposed project.

Evaluating Various Options

You asked those of us who attended the scoping meeting to evaluate alternatives for the New Leaf Hillside. You made that request in the context that there wasn't any specific project being proposed beyond the ideas of finishing the 5 existing homes, building 11 new homes, and somehow building out the roads which would go across that steep and constrained hillside site.

One alternative would be to permit the 5 existing homes to be finished. Woostock Road would be built out with a turnaround at the top of the road. This is the alternative with the most support in the community. It would resolve the issues of the homes being

unfinished and an unsightly visual blight. The nuisance provided by unfinished homes could be resolved and removed.

Whether the homes would need to be brought into compliance for height, setbacks and the Mulholland Specific Plan are issues which should be resolved. Obviously, because the 5 existing homes can be seen so prominently and well from Mulholland Drive and so many vantage points around Laurel Canyon, anything which could be done to reduce the massing and height would be helpful. Building more homes on the ridge line would not be desirable, would not generate any significant community support, and wouldn't be acceptable to the vast bulk of the community. In fact, building more homes on the ridgeline would be likely to generate significant community opposition.

Building additional homes on Woodstock Drive west of the existing 5 homes would just add to the massing effect of the 5 existing homes. It would seem to be an unacceptable proposal under standards set forth in the Mulholland Specific Plan and the Mulholland Design Review Board's design guidelines. It also would be counter to the anti-McMansionization proposals which the Planning Department has been working on over the last year or so.

Building additional homes on Leicester Drive seems impractical and possibly foolhardy. It's an unstable area both upslope and downslope. The road would be difficult and expensive to build. Granting a road building permit to New Leaf's developers, whether an "A" permit or a "B" permit, seems unwise.

Please understand that Yehuda Arviv had bond money on deposit with LADBS for completing the Woodstock Road, but that LADBS had released the money back to Arviv Enterprises, which resulted in Woodstock Road not having ever been built.

If Prosper Levy turns out to have had a significant economic interest – an ownership interest--throughout this last decade, it's hard to imagine authorizing him and his new owners to proceed with building out massive roads on this unstable, steep and constrained hillside site.

As for Thames Street, the one new home site which is suggested by the SMCC proposal would seem to be feasible only if Thames Street were improved all the way out to Willow Glen and if a turnaround were added at the end of Thames Street. The economic and ecological impact(s) seem significant and negative.

The SMCC proposal to complete the 5 existing homes and take a conservation easement for the rest of the New Leaf Hillside seems to be the preferred and appropriate outcome of the environmental review process. Community leaders have suggested it several times over the years since 2002 to John Forbess for Judah Hertz and Prosper Levy, to other representatives who claimed to be owners, but now seem to have been working for Hadar Holdings, and now to Messrs. Kapilow and Sarlo.

It still would be the best outcome achievable and practical to end this Charles Dickens-like real estate development tale with a project which could be achievable and not ruin the New Leaf Hillside for all time.

Thank you for reading this long letter. You've reached the end of my comments.

Inasmuch as this is an unusual case, if you have any question regarding my comments, please call me.

Sincerely,

Orrin M. Feldman

Enclosures

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: PUB. COMMENT, NEW LEAF HOMES**
Date: September 28, 2007 11:12:09 AM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

||| "michael@laurelcanyonthebook.com" <michael@laurelcanyonthebook.com>
9/28/2007 7:19 AM >>>
Dear Mr. Glick:

The following is in response to the invitation for Public Comment on the project New Leaf Homes, ENV-20-07-2796-EAF.

I am the author of LAUREL CANYON: THE INSIDE STORY OF ROCK AND ROLL'S LEGENDARY NEIGHBORHOOD (Farrar, Staus & Giroux); the book has spent seven months on the Los Angeles Times Book Review's bestseller list and been featured in the New York Times and on National Public Radio, the BBC and other international media. The German-language edition will be published in October.

The popularity of my book, which traces Laurel Canyon's incredible, ongoing impact on popular culture, is indicative of the public's intense interest in the canyon and all that it represents.

The city of Los Angeles should join the rest of the world in acknowledging that Laurel Canyon is an irreplaceable cultural asset and that the canyon's unique character--comprised of winding streets, bungalows and plentiful open space--should be protected from the sort of insensitive and intrusive development as is proposed in the New Leaf Homes project.

From the sparse material the developers have allowed the community to glimpse, the project in its present form completely ignores the historic aesthetic context of the canyon and instead proposes to shoehorn into one of its most visible slopes an array of thematically similar, boxy brown homes;

the
impression is that of a ski-condo
development built for maximum profit which aggressively rejects the
canyon's eclectic mix of diverse house styles
and intimate scale.

The New Leaf project in its present form would also subject a mature,
built-up neighborhood to years of daily
construction traffic and noise that would drastically reduce the
quality of
life.

We were told at the scoping meeting for the project "to assume the
worst"
and prepare for the likelihood the
developers would request every possible advantage in the form of
zoning
variances and other courtesies.

The community is adamant that he city should grant no such concessions
to a
development that seeks to exploit
Laurel Canyon's unique physical setting on the one hand while
destroying it
with the other.

The only acceptable outcome is for the city to allow the four existing
homes in the project to be reduced in size to
comply with the city's own code after years of looming over the
neighborhood, oversized and unoccupied--houses
that never would have been built had the city done its job.

The New Leaf project as proposed would only compound the damage. The
development in its present form must be
rejected.

Sincerely,

Michael Walker
Laurel Canyon

mail2web.com – Enhanced email for the mobile individual based on
Microsoft®
Exchange - <http://link.mail2web.com/Personal/EnhancedEmail>

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: New Leaf Project**
Date: September 28, 2007 12:12:55 PM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

||| "Mel Remba" <drremba@adelphia.net> 9/28/2007 10:59 AM >>>
Dear Mr. Glick,

Please consider this communication as the position of the 267 homeowner members of the Mt. Olympus Property Owners Association, Inc., (MOPOA) which is also the successor declarant of the Mt. Olympus Development, consisting of 402 homes. As you know, Mt. Olympus subdivision abutts the subject New Leaf property, primarily along Woodstock Road, and will be impacted with any proposed development on the New Leaf properties.

We have reviewed the comments sent to you by Orrin Feldman, our neighbor and community leader sent to your office on September 28, 2007, Mr. Feldmans comprehensive and accurate summary of the history and issues surrounding this project and his recommendations with regards to the draft EIR reflect the position of our membership and the Board of Directors of MOPOA.

So, without re-inventing the wheel, consider this letter as support for Mr. Feldmans letter.

Please note that MOPOA's particular interest in the proposed project are: 1. Any proposed vehicular access into Mt. Olympus from Woodstock Road (note city council resolution prohibiting such access), 2. Any additional home construction above Woodsock Road, on the upslope of Mt. Olympus ridgeline, and 3. Any completion of the extension of Woodstock Road must be in compliance with all geological, transportation, fire, safety, width, curbing, hillside support, turnaround provisions, codes and regulations. The draft EIR must address these issues, offer feasibility and mitigation options.

Sincerely,

(Dr.)Mel Remba
Vice President, MOPOA
Chair COC, District 1
2446 Apollo Drive
Los Angeles CA, 90046
Phone 323 851 1647
Fax 323 851 8647

Public Input Form
Scoping Meeting
New Leaf Homes project

September 10, 2007

This form allows you to make comments on what you believe should be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report. You may submit your comments at this scoping meeting or mail to the Lead Agency Contact listed below. Written comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Environmental Impact Report will be accepted until September 28, 2007 at 5:00 P.M.

Comments: TOM,

1. AS A PART OF THE NEW STREET IMPROVEMENT PLAN ALONG LEICESTER DRIVE, WOULD WE LOOSE A PART OF THE PROPERTY? IF WE DO, DO WE RECEIVE SOME KIND OF COMPENSATION?

You may also indicate if you would like to receive notices for hearings on the project. If you wish to have a notice, please be sure to include your name and full address. The EIR will be available at local libraries and the City offices and, for a charge, individual copies may be obtained through a bonded blue printer.

Name:

HIROSHI & NORIKO MORITA

Address:

1709 ISLAND DRIVE

City/State/ZIP:

FULLERTON, CA - 92833

Lead Agency Contact:

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401

FAX: 818-374-5070

From: "Tom Glick" <Tom.Glick@lacity.org>
Subject: **Fwd: Mulholland/Laurel Canyon**
Date: September 28, 2007 12:14:18 PM PDT
To: "Wendy Lockwood" <wl@siriusenvironmental.com>

Tom Glick
City Planning Department-Valley Office
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Phone: 818-374-5062
FAX: 818-374-5070
Work Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8:30am to 6pm; Friday: 10am to 2pm

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please e-mail me at tglick@planning.lacity.org and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

||| <bonniegarvin@sbcglobal.net> 9/28/2007 10:56 AM >>>
Dear Mr. Glick:

I am a homeowner on Laurel Canyon Place. I implore you to prevent any more development such as the New Leaf Home project. We are under seige from development. Yesterday it took my husband one hour to get to work from Laurel Canyon Place at Mulholland to Sunset Blvd. The amount of congestion, smog and noise is intolerable. Somebody has to take a stand against what is happening to our environment. I live on street that the Street Maintenance people refuse to pave despite the fact it is all potholes. They say it is "too dangerous" to work up here. That is because of the traffic and fried nerves that result.

There is a point at which development must stop if those who are already here are to maintain any decent quality of life.

Please vote against the New Leaf Homes.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Garvin
2809 Laurel Canyon Place
Los Angeles 90046
323 656-6390