

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Thomas A Salciccia Jr

**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 10:42 AM

**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles does not need another temple to incredible wealth - particularly at the expense of open, natural space. We need to keep our green/open/park areas un-developed for the benefit of all, not developed for the benefit of the few. Not only does this development impinge on the public's right to open space in a densely packed city, but also it creates additional hazardous conditions on the access road. Small and large dogs, small children, large children not paying attention, joggers, hikers are all put at risk of serious injury or death. Imagine the lawsuit against the city if someone were to be killed because of car traffic on the access road. Further, this is a blatant capitulation of the council to the wealthy. It's reprehensible and disgusting to prefer the privileged to the public. There are many other places someone can build another mega-home, flaunting their wealth and locking people out of what is rightfully their space while putting people at risk. This is a bad idea, and you on the council know it.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ralph

**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 12:53 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** Re: 3003 Runyon Canyon Road: Enter the Council File Number: 24-1371. PLUM Commi ee Hearing Date: February 11, 2025 City council c/o City Clerk, Forward A orney General if applicable. My name is Ralph Gonzales, I am in support for the progression on their private property. As a regular visitor to Runyon Canyon Park, I have observed the progression al respect, the Valencia family has for the beauty of the park and its community. I par cularly acknowledge that they have dedicated almost a decade to mee ng all the City's mi gated Fire, Water Municipali es, Codes, guidelines and requirements, in pursuit of approval, to build on their private land. Recently, voted 5 Approved to move forward and progress the land and 0 votes to violate the Valencia's rights. Their Venue. Allodial would be part of the redress and regression. Where will that leave the public funds if communi es revoke venues of idle and un-progressions? From what I have seen, the Valencia's, have taken extraordinary measures to ensure preserva on of current home, and that, this new home benefits both the community and the environment. The new residence is though ul and respec ul of its surroundings, allowing the structure to blend seamlessly into the landscape. The home is built into the hillside, nearly buried, and follows the natural contours of the land, providing a peaceful and nearly invisible connec on to Runyon Canyon Park. People in the park will hardly know it is there. The owners, could have gone another route by exercising their rights to subdividing their lots to build 3 addi onal homes. But choose to preserve the land and build just 1 addi onal home. They s ll have those rights, as land owners, if they choose. Senate Bill 9 – the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act streamlines the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an exis ng lot. Ergo, is allowed, 2 lots. 1 addi onal home, 2 addi onal dwelling units, on their current parcel, without constant harassment, from venues that are not applicable to their Cons tuent laws, and common rights. Laches. An illegal process. Senate Bill No. 450 Coastal areas, are exempt from council mee ng beau acracies. Senate Bill 450 limits the autonomy of local governments across California to pass housing restric ons protec ng single family zoning progressions. All aspects of Mi ga on have been approved for progression of the project. Last Council mee ng on this approved project, received 5 approvals to - 0

against, delaying to move forward; And to not furthermore, violate, the Valencia's rights. They will not need approvals, from venues that harass and violate their fourteenth amendment on their rights of Constituents, Common Law grounds. According to census data of 2022, only 39 homes in all of L.A County have been created from SB9, since inception. Where is the progression of the adaptation of progress for the city, County or communities? Constant badgering and violations of their 14th amendment is an unethical practice. Even with shady reasons to appeal the previous proceedings laches the real questions of, why the delays? This case should never be retried for an already unanimous vote for proceedings to progress the project on their land. Hindering, any more delays, makes the matter questionable of some sort, not in line with ethical practices of the Valencia's rights. This matter should be dismissed with prejudice and never be retried. No case. The appellant is barred to never be allowed to question the common law and constitutional rights of the Valencia's. TITLE 1.81.5. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 [1798.100 - 1798.199.100] ( Title 1.81.5 (Sec. 3. ) 1798.120. I am happy to say that I fully support the mitigated development of this new home and look forward seeing the development of progression to one of our loved communities CONSTITUENTS RIGHTS; And we approve this project to move forward. Thank you for your meeting and consideration. Sincerely, Ralph

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Constituent Law  
**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 01:03 PM  
**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** Re: 3003 Runyon Canyon Road: Enter the Council File Number: 24-1371. PLUM Commi ee Hearing Date: February 11, 2025 City council c/o City Clerk, Forward A orney General if applicable. My name is Ralph Gonzales, I am in support for the progression on their private property. As a regular visitor to Runyon Canyon Park, I have observed the progression al respect, the Valencia family has for the beauty of the park and its community. I par cularly acknowledge that they have dedicated almost a decade to mee ng all the City's mi gated Fire, Water Municipali es, Codes, guidelines and requirements, in pursuit of approval, to build on their private land. Recently, voted 5 Approved to move forward and progress the land and 0 votes to violate the Valencia's rights. Their Venue. Allodial would be part of the redress and regression. Where will that leave the public funds if communi es revoke venues of idle and un-progressions? From what I have seen, the Valencia's, have taken extraordinary measures to ensure preserva on of current home, and that, this new home benefits both the community and the environment. The new residence is though ul and respec ul of its surroundings, allowing the structure to blend seamlessly into the landscape. The home is built into the hillside, nearly buried, and follows the natural contours of the land, providing a peaceful and nearly invisible connec on to Runyon Canyon Park. People in the park will hardly know it is there. The owners, could have gone another route by exercising their rights to subdividing their lots to build 3 addi onal homes. But choose to preserve the land and build just 1 addi onal home. They s ll have those rights, as land owners, if they choose. Senate Bill 9 – the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act streamlines the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an exis ng lot. Ergo, is allowed, 2 lots. 1 addi onal home, 2 addi onal dwelling units, on their current parcel, without constant harassment, from venues that are not applicable to their Cons tuent laws, and common rights. Laches. An illegal process. Senate Bill No. 450 Coastal areas, are exempt from council mee ng beau acracies. Senate Bill 450 limits the autonomy of local governments across California to pass housing restric ons protec ng single family zoning progressions. All aspects of Mi ga on have been approved for progression of the project. Last Council mee ng on this approved project, received 5 approvals to - 0

against, delaying to move forward; And to not furthermore, violate, the Valencia's rights. They will not need approvals, from venues that harass and violate their fourteenth amendment on their rights of Constituents, Common Law grounds. According to census data of 2022, only 39 homes in all of L.A County have been created from SB9, since inception. Where is the progression of the adaptation of progress for the city, County or communities? Constant badgering and violations of their 14th amendment is an unethical practice. Even with shady reasons to appeal the previous proceedings laches the real questions of, why the delays? This case should never be retried for an already unanimous vote for proceedings to progress the project on their land. Hindering, any more delays, makes the matter questionable of some sort, not in line with ethical practices of the Valencia's rights. This matter should be dismissed with prejudice and never be retried. No case. The appellant is barred to never be allowed to question the common law and constitutional rights of the Valencia's. TITLE 1.81.5. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 [1798.100 - 1798.199.100] ( Title 1.81.5 (Sec. 3. ) 1798.120. I am happy to say that I fully support the mitigated development of this new home and look forward seeing the development of progression to one of our loved communities CONSTITUENTS RIGHTS; And we approve this project to move forward. Thank you for your meeting and consideration. Sincerely, Ralph

Re: 3003 Runyon Canyon Road: Enter the Council File Number: 24-1371.

PLUM Committee Hearing Date: February 11, 2025

City council c/o City Clerk, Forward Attorney General if applicable.

My name is Ralph Gonzales, I am in support for the progression on their private property. As a regular visitor to Runyon Canyon Park, I have observed the progression al respect, the Valencia family has for the beauty of the park and its community.

I particularly acknowledge that they have dedicated almost a decade to meeting all the City's mitigated Fire, Water Municipalities, Codes, guidelines and requirements, in pursuit of approval, to build on their private land. Recently, voted 5 Approved to move forward and progress the land and 0 votes to violate the Valencia's rights.

Their Venue. Allodial would be part of the redress and regression. Where will that leave the public funds if communities revoke venues of idle and un-progressions?

From what I have seen, the Valencia's, have taken extraordinary measures to ensure preservation of current home, and that, this new home benefits both the community and the environment.

The new residence is thoughtful and respectful of its surroundings, allowing the structure to blend seamlessly into the landscape. The home is built into the hillside, nearly buried, and follows the natural contours of the land, providing a peaceful and nearly invisible connection to Runyon Canyon Park. People in the park will hardly know it is there.

The owners, could have gone another route by exercising their rights to subdividing their lots to build 3 additional homes. But choose to preserve the land and build just 1 additional home. They still have those rights, as land owners, if they choose.

Senate Bill 9 – the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act streamlines the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an existing lot.

Ergo, is allowed, 2 lots. 1 additional home, 2 additional dwelling units, on their current parcel, without constant harassment, from venues that are not applicable to their Constituent laws, and common rights. Laches. An illegal process.

Senate Bill No. 450

Coastal areas, are exempt from council meeting beau acracies.

Senate Bill 450 limits the autonomy of local governments across California to pass housing restrictions protecting single family zoning progressions.

All aspects of Mitigation have been approved for progression of the project.

Last Council meeting on this approved project, received 5 approvals to - 0 against, delaying to move forward; And to not furthermore, violate, the Valencia's rights.

They will not need approvals, from venues that harass and violate their fourteenth amendment on their rights of Constituents, Common Law grounds.

According to census data of 2022, only 39 homes in all of L.A County have been created from SB9, since inception. Where is the progression of the adaptation of progress for the city, County or communities?

Constant badgering and violations of their 14th amendment is an unethical practice.

Even with shady reasons to appeal the previous proceedings laches the real questions of, why the delays? This case should never be retried for an already unanimous vote for proceedings to progress the project on their land.

Hindering, any more delays, makes the matter questionable to laches of some sort, not in line with ethical practices of the Valencia's rights.

This matter should be dismissed with prejudice and never be retried.

Notice.

The appellant is barred to never be allowed to question the common law and constitutional rights of the Valencia's.

TITLE 1.81.5. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 [1798.100 - 1798.199.100] ( Title 1.81.5 (Sec. 3. ) 1798.120.

I am happy to say that I fully support the mitigated development of this new home and look forward seeing the development of progression to one of our loved communities CONSTITUENTS RIGHTS; And we approve this project to move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ralph Gonzales

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ralph Gonzales', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** 1st Amendment

**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 01:15 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** Why are my comments for approval not posting. 1st amendment violation. I clicked the spyware link for verification. Dont discriminate. Re: 3003 Runyon Canyon Road: Enter the Council File Number: 24-1371. PLUM Commi ee Hearing Date: February 11, 2025 City council c/o City Clerk, Forward A orney General if applicable. My name is Ralph Gonzales, I am in support for the progression on their private property. As a regular visitor to Runyon Canyon Park, I have observed the progression al respect, the Valencia family has for the beauty of the park and its community. I par cularly acknowledge that they have dedicated almost a decade to mee ng all the City's mi gated Fire, Water Municipali es, Codes, guidelines and requirements, in pursuit of approval, to build on their private land. Recently, voted 5 Approved to move forward and progress the land and 0 votes to violate the Valencia's rights. Their Venue. Allodial would be part of the redress and regression. Where will that leave the public funds if communi es revoke venues of idle and un-progressions? From what I have seen, the Valencia's, have taken extraordinary measures to ensure preserva on of current home, and that, this new home benefits both the community and the environment. The new residence is though ul and respec ul of its surroundings, allowing the structure to blend seamlessly into the landscape. The home is built into the hillside, nearly buried, and follows the natural contours of the land, providing a peaceful and nearly invisible connec on to Runyon Canyon Park. People in the park will hardly know it is there. The owners, could have gone another route by exercising their rights to subdividing their lots to build 3 addi onal homes. But choose to preserve the land and build just 1 addi onal home. They s ll have those rights, as land owners, if they choose. Senate Bill 9 – the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act streamlines the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an exis ng lot. Ergo, is allowed, 2 lots. 1 addi onal home, 2 addi onal dwelling units, on their current parcel, without constant harassment, from venues that are not applicable to their Cons tuent laws, and common rights. Laches. An illegal process. Senate Bill No. 450 Coastal areas, are exempt from council mee ng beau acracies. Senate Bill 450 limits the autonomy of local governments across California to pass housing restric ons protec ng single family zoning progressions. All



aspects of Mi ga on have been approved for progression of the project. Last Council mee ng on this approved project, received 5 approvals to - 0 against, delaying to move forward; And to not furthermore, violate, the Valencia's rights. They will not need approvals, from venues that harass and violate their fourteenth amendment on their rights of Cons tuents, Common Law grounds. According to census data of 2022, only 39 homes in all of L.A County have been created from SB9, since incep on. Where is the progression of the adapta on of progress for the city, County or communi es? Constant badgering and viola ons of their 14th amendment is an unethical prac ce. Even with shady reasons to appeal the previous proceedings laches the real ques ons of, why the delays? This case should never be retried for an already unanimous vote for proceedings to progress the project on their land. Hindering, any more delays, makes the ma er ques onable to laches of some sort, not in line with ethical prac ces of the Valencia's rights. This ma er should be dismissed with prejudice and never be retried. No ce. The appellant is barred to never be allowed to ques on the common law and cons tu onal rights of the Valencia's. TITLE 1.81.5. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 [1798.100 - 1798.199.100] ( Title 1.81.5 (Sec. 3. ) 1798.120. I am happy to say that I fully support the mi gated development of this new home and look forward seeing the development of progression to one of our loved communi es CONSTITUENTS RIGHTS; And we approve this project to move forward. Thank you for your me and considera on.

Re: 3003 Runyon Canyon Road: Enter the Council File Number: 24-1371.

PLUM Committee Hearing Date: February 11, 2025

City council c/o City Clerk, Forward Attorney General if applicable.

My name is Ralph Gonzales, I am in support for the progression on their private property. As a regular visitor to Runyon Canyon Park, I have observed the progression al respect, the Valencia family has for the beauty of the park and its community.

I particularly acknowledge that they have dedicated almost a decade to meeting all the City's mitigated Fire, Water Municipalities, Codes, guidelines and requirements, in pursuit of approval, to build on their private land. Recently, voted 5 Approved to move forward and progress the land and 0 votes to violate the Valencia's rights.

Their Venue. Allodial would be part of the redress and regression. Where will that leave the public funds if communities revoke venues of idle and un-progressions?

From what I have seen, the Valencia's, have taken extraordinary measures to ensure preservation of current home, and that, this new home benefits both the community and the environment.

The new residence is thoughtful and respectful of its surroundings, allowing the structure to blend seamlessly into the landscape. The home is built into the hillside, nearly buried, and follows the natural contours of the land, providing a peaceful and nearly invisible connection to Runyon Canyon Park. People in the park will hardly know it is there.

The owners, could have gone another route by exercising their rights to subdividing their lots to build 3 additional homes. But choose to preserve the land and build just 1 additional home. They still have those rights, as land owners, if they choose.

Senate Bill 9 – the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act streamlines the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an existing lot.

Ergo, is allowed, 2 lots. 1 additional home, 2 additional dwelling units, on their current parcel, without constant harassment, from venues that are not applicable to their Constituent laws, and common rights. Laches. An illegal process.

Senate Bill No. 450

Coastal areas, are exempt from council meeting beau acracies.

Senate Bill 450 limits the autonomy of local governments across California to pass housing restrictions protecting single family zoning progressions.

All aspects of Mitigation have been approved for progression of the project.

Last Council meeting on this approved project, received 5 approvals to - 0 against, delaying to move forward; And to not furthermore, violate, the Valencia's rights.

They will not need approvals, from venues that harass and violate their fourteenth amendment on their rights of Constituents, Common Law grounds.

According to census data of 2022, only 39 homes in all of L.A County have been created from SB9, since inception. Where is the progression of the adaptation of progress for the city, County or communities?

Constant badgering and violations of their 14th amendment is an unethical practice.

Even with shady reasons to appeal the previous proceedings laches the real questions of, why the delays? This case should never be retried for an already unanimous vote for proceedings to progress the project on their land.

Hindering, any more delays, makes the matter questionable to laches of some sort, not in line with ethical practices of the Valencia's rights.

This matter should be dismissed with prejudice and never be retried.

Notice.

The appellant is barred to never be allowed to question the common law and constitutional rights of the Valencia's.

TITLE 1.81.5. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 [1798.100 - 1798.199.100] ( Title 1.81.5 (Sec. 3. ) 1798.120.

I am happy to say that I fully support the mitigated development of this new home and look forward seeing the development of progression to one of our loved communities CONSTITUENTS RIGHTS; And we approve this project to move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ralph Gonzales

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ralph Gonzales', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Marian Dodge

**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 03:00 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support to appeal of this project. A private residence does not belong in a city park.

**CF 24-1371**

**3003 Runyon Canyon Rd.**

**Item # 10**

Case No. APCSV-2016-4179-SPE-DRB-SPP-MSP-ZV-ZAD-1A

Environmental No. ENV-2016-4180-EIR

2/11/25

I am in support of the appeal of the approval of the EIR Report for the proposed project at 3003 Runyon Canyon Rd.

The biggest problem is that a private residence does not belong in the middle of a city park. This project proposes building a *second* residence in the middle of Runyon Canyon Park, compounding the problem. The recent fire in Runyon Canyon demonstrates vividly another reason why this project is inappropriate in this location.

One only has to review the number of major variances required to build this project to see that it is not a good project for this location.

I strongly urge PLUM to reject this project now.

Sincerely,  
Marian Dodge

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Barbara Kramer

**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 03:17 PM

**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:** 02/09/2025 03:29 PM

**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:** Carol Tavis

**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 03:42 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** I just learned about the proposed new 6000-Sq foot home at 3003 Runyon Canyon Road. In a word, this is a crazy idea. Have we all not come through disastrous fires, with the Hollywood Hills spared in the nick of time, without learning anything? I am seconding this statement from my neighborhood association, which makes my point perfectly: "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:** 02/09/2025 07:28 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the appeals by the Santa Monica Conservancy, MRCA, and Hillside Federation of the project at 3003 Runyon Canyon Park. There is no justification for ruining Runyan 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:** 02/09/2025 07:40 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1371

**Comments for Public Posting:** It's unconscionable that this additional 6,000 Sf dwelling would gain city council approval after the fires last month and the councils consideration of the wild life ordinance. Where are this city's priorities? Still pro development no matter the costs?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** William Finkelstein

**Date Submitted:** 02/09/2025 10:23 PM

**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 taking away 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. This is an unnecessary and not needed incursion on our public space experience. Protect our parkland -- and please say no to this project!