

September 18, 2021

City Council Members

City of Los Angeles

Case No: ZA-2019-4701-ZAD-SPP-1A

CEQA: ENV-2019-4702-CE

I'm a resident at 630 Frontenac Avenue and have resided here for over 50 years.

I feel it is the minimum duty of the City to enforce the street improvements and building of sidewalks in Mount Washington with new construction projects, wherever possible, to increase the safety of our residents, and feel it should be considered an inherent cost to building in our neighborhood.

We deal with chronic congestion in which our narrow street provides a dangerous condition for drivers and pedestrians daily. There is a constant flow of neighbors walking their dogs, and young children, because there is a path which cuts from the end of Frontenac Avenue up to Rome Court and to the top of Mount Washington where the elementary school is located. Every day during the school year, a group of 30 young children walk along this path from Mount Washington Elementary to Carlin G. Recreation Center. In recent years, there has been a significant increase in car traffic and delivery trucks, with very little room to maneuver, and no room to turnaround even using privately owned driveways. There are patches of sidewalks on Frontenac Avenue, which allow for pedestrians, especially those with young children, to step out of the road and allow cars and trucks to safely pass. We live in a Very High Fire Hazard Zone, and the threat of fire is ever present as Frontenac sits at the top of Rainbow Canyon, making street improvement a major safety issue to provide access for emergency vehicles.

Presently the project at 621 Frontenac, is not conditioned to include street improvements, including sidewalk, curb and gutter, that are necessary to maintain the safety of the street and address the current unpermitted paving and asphalt berm fronting the property. We hope The Planning Land Use Committee can correct this and impose conditions that are consistent with the determination at 617 Frontenac, and at minimum, preserve the full extent of the Public Way.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dina L. DeSanctis", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dina L. DeSanctis M.S. LMFT

September 18, 2021

City Council Members
City of Los Angeles
Case No: ZA-2019-4701-ZAD-SPP-1A
CEQA: ENV-2019-4702-CE

My wife and I are residents at 630 Frontenac Avenue and have resided here for over 62 years. We feel it is the minimum duty of the City to enforce the street improvements and building of sidewalks in Mount Washington with new construction projects, wherever possible, to increase the safety of our residents, and feel it should be considered an inherent cost to building in our neighborhood.

We deal with chronic congestion in which our narrow street provides a dangerous condition for drivers and pedestrians daily. There is a constant flow of neighbors walking their dogs, and young children, because there is a path which cuts from the end of Frontenac Avenue up to Rome Court and to the top of Mount Washington where the elementary school is located. Every day during the school year, a group of 30 young children walk along this path from Mount Washington Elementary to Carlin G. Recreation Center. In recent years, there has been a significant increase in car traffic and delivery trucks, with very little room to maneuver, and no room to turnaround even using privately owned driveways. There are patches of sidewalks on Frontenac Avenue, which allow for pedestrians, especially those with young children, to step out of the road and allow cars and trucks to safely pass. We live in a Very High Fire Hazard Zone, and the threat of fire is ever present as Frontenac sits at the top of Rainbow Canyon, making street improvement a major safety issue to provide access for emergency vehicles.

Presently the project at 621 Frontenac, is not conditioned to include street improvements, including sidewalk, curb and gutter, that are necessary to maintain the safety of the street and address the current unpermitted paving and asphalt berm fronting the property. We hope The Planning Land Use Committee can correct this and impose conditions that are consistent with the determination at 617 Frontenac, and at minimum, preserve the full extent of the Public Way.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,


Philip A. DeSanctis


Arline L. DeSanctis

September 20, 2021

City Council Members
City of Los Angeles
Case No: ZA-2019-4701-ZAD-SPP-1A
CEQA: ENV-2019-4702-CE

Dear Council Members,

I'm the resident (owner/occupier) at 546 Frontenac Ave., which is west of the proposed project. I want to add that I'm a California licensed Civil Engineer. My family and I pass the property every time we drive somewhere so we're very concerned that the existing street conditions adjacent to this property (which are substandard in and of itself and appear to be unpermitted) are brought up to city standards, as the city requires for new development. Accordingly for safety and functional reasons, I insist that the respective portion of the street be designed and constructed per the city's Standard Hillside Limited Street Plan which requires, in this case, an 8 foot dedication and the construction of a 14 foot half roadway width plus a 4 foot sidewalk. Presently the existing unpermitted temporary curb in front of and on the side of the property, as indicated in the developer's submitted Enlarged Site Plan, is only approximately 6 feet from the street center line (6 foot half roadway width) at the north end tapering to 10 feet from the street center line (10 foot half roadway width) at the south end. This places it approximately 4 feet short of the existing prededication property line at the north end tapering to being essentially on the existing prededication property line at the south end. This is mentioned to point out that the existing street condition isn't constructed to the full pre-dedication required 10 foot half way road width.

The City's respective Determination Letter (Item 7, page 2 of 24) does not condition the City Engineer to specifically require the street widening and sidewalk but only instructs that an 8 foot dedication be required. As a result of this wording it is my understanding that the City Engineer would not have to require the street widening and sidewalk. So I am demanding that Item 7 be revised to specifically state that a 14 foot half roadway width (including curb and gutter) plus a 4 foot sidewalk be required per city's Standard Hillside Limited Street Plan. In addition I would like Item 8 (page 2 of 24) of the Determination Letter removed as it appears to give the City Engineer the ability to waive the required 8 foot dedication which is unacceptable.

Sincerely,
Steven P. Dietrich, PE
546 Frontenac Ave.,
Los Angeles, CA