

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/08/2025 04:02 PM

Council File No: 24-1371

Comments for Public Posting: The city doesn't need more homes in the middle of the park / brush. It was a herculean effort for the firefighters to protect all the structures around Runyon Canyon park - they don't need the headache of any more homes inside the park that will be in danger of fires and mudslides and use city resources to protect.

Communication from Public

Name: Richard Barrow

Date Submitted: 02/08/2025 05:25 PM

Council File No: 24-1371

Comments for Public Posting: The real question here is- does the city want a park or bow to a error that occurred some forty years ago. The option of using eminent domain is one way to end the project if that's the final outcome desired.

Communication from Public

Name: Alyssa Heisten

Date Submitted: 02/08/2025 09:02 AM

Council File No: 24-1371

Comments for Public Posting: I'm submitting comments regarding the 3003 North Runyon Canyon Road project, having just today found out that the project has been approved by the South Valley Area Planning Commission. As a Runyon Park daily user for almost 20 years, I'm shocked and disappointed that the commission would approve such a project. In terms of safety, there are three blind curves on Runyon Canyon Road between the entrance gate on Mulholland to the property. At any given time, there are hundreds of dogs and humans walking this portion of the trail (in addition to deer and coyotes). The likelihood of loss of life is incredibly high and I've read nothing in the materials to take this into account. Additionally, standard size construction equipment will not be able to manage the curves (due to size) without altering the landscape and road. From a common-sense perspective, I'm baffled that the commission would feel so driven to substantially increase the long-term risk of more traffic along Runyon Canyon Road. The current owner purchased the property knowing the easement and limitations of it being a designated historic property. Development is almost never an option with historic properties located in national, state, or local parks. The justification in this case pales in comparison to the safety risks. Please reject this project.

Communication from Public

Name: Lisa

Date Submitted: 02/08/2025 09:09 AM

Council File No: 24-1371

Comments for Public Posting: I support the appeals by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, MRCA, and Hillside Federation of the project at 3003 Runyon Canyon Park. There is no justification for ruining Runyon Canyon Park by allowing someone to build a second house, of approximately 6,000 square feet in size, on a mountaintop property that already has a home on it. Haven't we learned anything from the recent wildfires? Protect our parkland -- and say no to this project!

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/08/2025 12:48 PM

Council File No: 24-1371

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to oppose the building of another 6000 sq ft home on Runyon Canyon Rd right in the middle of the park. There is already a home on that property, we need less development in the park, not more. After the recent Sunset wildfire this has become more apparent. We do not need the hillside compromised further. Please oppose.