

Communication from Public

Name: Casey Maddren

Date Submitted: 05/14/2021 09:06 AM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: I am submitting the attached letter opposing CF 20-1359.

May 14, 2021

Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: CF 20-1359, 141 W. Avenue 34/CSCDA Revenue Bond Motion

Members of the City Council,

I am writing to say I strongly oppose Councilmember Cedillo's motion requesting the CSCDA to issue \$105,000,000 in bonds. **The motion falsely states that the funds will be used for the acquisition and improvement of an existing 67-unit residential structure. This structure does not exist.** The 2020 determination letter for the project proposed for this site describes the following existing uses:

The subject property is comprised of seven (7) lots measuring approximately 219,296 square-foot (5.03 acres) with a frontage of 685 feet along Avenue 34 and a frontage of 379 feet along Pasadena Avenue. The subject property is currently developed with industrial and commercial uses and associated surface parking lot.

There is no mention of the "existing 67-unit residential housing project" that Cedillo describes in his motion. Cedillo's fraudulent claim regarding the existing residential use appears to be part of an effort to steer funding toward a largely market rate project which will result in huge profits for the developer.

The Council must reject this motion.

Sincerely,
Casey Maddren
2141 Cahuenga Blvd., Apt. 17
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Communication from Public

Name: Miki Jackson

Date Submitted: 05/16/2021 08:58 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: Miki Jackson for AHF/HHR. We incorporate all testimony, comments, evidence and objections to this item and related matters. This development has serious problems and requires further investigation. There is evidence of toxic contamination from a previous use. This can presents a danger to any future occupants. The "affordable" units planned are not sufficient, they should be at least 30% of total units set aside, they should be for Low and extremely low income. The rate the "affordable" units are set at is far too high considering the median income of the area. The amounts of money being considered are too high. Please provide more transparency into these issues before going forward.

Communication from Public

Name: Dydia DeLyser

Date Submitted: 05/17/2021 02:53 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: Respected Council Members, I urge you to vote NO on spending public money on a project strenuously opposed by our neighborhood. I offer 4 reasons: 1. The project is neither approved nor yet built. Currently, an empty warehouse sits on that land, not housing. There is no housing on that site; this is not an expansion of already-built housing. 2. The proposed site sits adjacent to, and downstream from, a known toxic site; the soil at the proposed site has been mandated by the State of California to be tested, but such testing has not yet taken place. This presents a direct threat to our residents, particularly the children of Hillside Elementary School directly across the street. 3. The proposed project is out of keeping with the neighborhood in every way: the over 400 proposed units are mostly studio- and one-bedrooms of market rate while our median income is below \$40,000; the proposed project is 5 stories tall while our neighborhood is one of modest single-family homes on small lots lived in by multi-generational families. 4. Our neighbors have spoken before -- at planning meetings, by the hundreds. The residents of this low-income community of color stand articulately opposed to this development. We are not opposed to more housing. We are opposed to rent increases and higher costs for homeowners that will render this stable, family-oriented neighborhood unaffordable for the majority of those who live here. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/17/2021 10:54 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: safety concerns for the ppl around and also the ppl who would potentially live there if the project were to be approved to reiterate the traffic concerns, there are already multiple accidents on avenue 33 that i have 1st hand experience with . by adding at least 400 new people, it would be even more dangerous. also, there will be no section 8 housing. the developers admitted themselves during one of the meetings they had. i also hear that you have little mention of the retail areas that would be included with the apartments. there's also a bar on top of a spa within the PDF blueprints. so if you really wanted ppl to use the train station, it sounds more like you'd want people to use it more as a hotel or an AirBnB and less as an actual living space, when you include the minimal number of parking spaces. you check in for a few days and then check out. that's what happened with another "housing project" in chinatown that andrew brady also worked on. let's not forget there being a bar within the vicinity of TWO elementary schools. on top of that , telling us we should be grateful after intruding in our community is quite arrogant. you always emphasize on the past but never think about what happens in the future. we can't check if they reached out to hillside because they're bound by district law, as well as no outreach towards LALA despite Lala being on Avenue 33 AND the lala website being the best and most clear out of the ones representing the elementary schools. also, there are no mentions of the PAID CALLER WHO ACTUALLY ADMITTED TO BEING PAID. it's a bit clear who were the the paid callers too. also the very low income level, which they have it at, is something lincoln heights residents is at \$39k, an income level we barely meet. my family makes \$12k. by creating the avenue 34 apartments, you are creating homes for people not in this neighborhood. they are other people, from colleges like USC and UCLA, moving in. they are not from our neighborhood, which has a housing crisis-- that i will admit. but the housing crisis is not space. it is AFFORDABLE HOUSING. i know at least ten STUDENTS. MINORS. whose families have had to move due to the rent skyrocketing to \$2k. \$2k a month is \$24k just for rent annually. add in utilities, gas, food ,and you'd need a minimal income of about \$30k to live in our neighborhood. a lot of people don't make \$30k here, as much as you'd hope otherwise. do not turn the other

cheek. look at us, your constituents. i see your homes during the zoom meetings. it's nice and clean. big and spacious. your children likely have their own rooms. hah. rooms are a luxury to have. many of the apartments that will be built at 1-2 bedroom/studio apartments. imagine sharing a room with your child or grandchild for years, having to slave over rising prices that your salary simply can't keep up with. put yourself in our shoes. not to mention the trees they claim to build? sure, they might take care of them for a few months. and then leave them, if the trees live at all. there will be an underground parking lot. where will the roots of the trees go? what will you do when that problem inevitably occurs? we've hammered into you over and over again about the environmental impacts. there's a reason that land has been barren for years. i remember as a child walking past it with my father and asking him why the field was empty. he told me it was poisoned. i was 7. would you expose your child or grandchild to that? imagine letting someone's child or grandchild live on a poisoned plot of land that pipes will run through to provide water. listen to us. please. we live here. we know more than you'd expect us to. furthermore, why is so much state/city money being spent on that apartment complex, hm? that money could be well spent on actual low income housing. not the pretty pictures that avenue 34 apartments would like for you to believe. (and maybe you do believe them already)

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/17/2021 11:15 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: VOTE NO ON ITEM #4 AVE.34 PROJECT. DO NOT GIVE TAX DOLLARS TO THIS PROPOSED PROJECT ON LAND THAT HAS NOT BEEN PROVEN SAFE TO BUILD ON. AVE.34 LAND SITE IS UNDER INVESTIGATION BY THE DEPT. OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL (DTSC), ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, (EPA) AND THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AGENCY. LAWS EXIST TO PREVENT FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE TO THIS LOW INCOME COMMUNITY THAT HAS ALREADY SUFFERED INCREDIBLE BURDENS OF POOR HEALTH FROM GOVERNMENT NEGLECT: AND POOR DECISION MAKING. CALIF. ASSEMBLY BILL AB1763 (WRITTEN FOR TOC -TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITY PROJECTS) FORBIDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO APPROVE PROJECTS THAT WILL RESULT IN HARM TO COMMUNITY RESIDENTS. THE 14th AMENDMENT STATES:TO DEPRIVE RESIDENTS EQUAL JUSTICE, EQUAL PROTECTION AND LIVABILITY IS UNLAWFUL! PLEASE USE HONESTY, GOOD JUDGEMENT, THOUGHTFULNESS AND INTEGRITY TO PROTECT RESIDENTS WHO WILL HAVE THEIR LIVES JEOPARDIZED IF YOU APPROVE THIS PROJECT ON LAND THAT HAS NOT BEEN PROVEN SAFE FROM TOXIC SOIL, WATER AND AIR CONTAMINANTS! THANKS FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION!

Communication from Public

Name: Lucy Moreno

Date Submitted: 05/17/2021 11:40 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: Al los concejales de la ciudad de Los Angeles y a el representante del Distrito 1 Gil Cedillo, Por favor les pedimos VOTEN NO en el Punto 4 de la Agenda, PROTEJAN la salud de nuestras familias antes de otorgar a estos desarrolladores deshonestos millones de deducciones en impuestos.

Communication from Public

Name: Arroyo Seco

Date Submitted: 05/18/2021 08:28 AM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: We want to make it very clear. This project at Ave 34 and the project a few blocks away at Pasadena Ave and Figueroa (THE ARROYO aka:NELA PLAZA) will not be tolerated. See this petition and view the public comment, many comments from last February already lodged with the NELA PLAZA project. <http://chnng.it/shSC6KTH> To Gil Cedillo, You will be disgracefully removed office if these projects go through. You are forcing organizers to expose your deals to your constituents as you sell off and turn your back on the community. The Lincoln Heights and Arroyo Seco Corridor have voiced their multifaceted positions on these 5-7 story projects in our neighborhood. We are organized, growing and very serious.

Communication from Public

Name: Amy Ludwig

Date Submitted: 05/18/2021 09:56 AM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council, I ask you to vote “NO” on Agenda Item 4. You should work to ensure the safety of our neighborhood before giving these dishonest developers millions in tax breaks. I run a college-access nonprofit that helps girls from low-income families in Lincoln Heights to reach college and graduate. Our students' families are already struggling from job loss due to the pandemic, encroaching pressures of gentrification that raise their rents far above their wages, poorly funded schools, and lack of health care. The last thing they need is this enormous development of expensive apartments, designed for people who will not take public transportation, but will continue displacing longtime residents and families. Although this motion uses the guise of public subsidies to fight homelessness, it will instead build more than 400 market-rate apartments for private profit on a contaminated brownfield at taxpayer expense. There are currently people experiencing homelessness who have made homes built against the wall of 141 W Avenue 34. These people will be directly displaced by this demolition, exacerbating rather than helping to solve their situation. The 14% of units in this project that will be “affordable” will be rented at a tier that requires income higher than the median income in Lincoln Heights. This will not serve the needs of our community. Lincoln Heights is already one of the most economically and environmentally overburdened communities in Los Angeles, and this development would further the environmental injustice already visible here. For the healthy future of our students and their families, please vote “NO” on Agenda Item 4. Thank you, Amy Ludwig Executive Director, MOSTe

Communication from Public

Name: Dahma

Date Submitted: 05/18/2021 10:14 AM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in solidarity with Lincoln Heights community. I would like to remind the council that median income of Lincoln Heights residents is well below \$25k/year. 62.4% of kids in Lincoln Heights live below the federal poverty line. The city desperately needs to serve the people in Lincoln Heights, especially those living below the poverty line. However, the project outlined in item 4 is not for affordable apartment units. The funds would go to build a luxury apartment of 67 250 sq ft closet sized apartments that cost at least \$980 to rent and which tenants would need to make at least \$34k to qualify. I urge the council to redirect these funds to build housing that is more appropriate for Lincoln Heights residents, such as realistically affordable multi-family houses.

Communication from Public

Name: Luis

Date Submitted: 05/18/2021 04:08 PM

Council File No: 20-1359

Comments for Public Posting: No on Agenda Item 4. The motion deceptively calls this “an existing 67-unit residential housing project.” It is actually an unbuilt 468-unit luxury apartment + 16,400 sq-ft commercial retail project. The property is the subject of a State investigation for toxic contamination from a former industrial dry cleaner, diesel refueling, and electrical manufacturing. City Planning is barred from clearing its construction while that investigation is underway. The project could release airborne toxins impacting neighbors and Hillside Elementary School which is directly across the street. See the letter below for more details, and feel free to share this email widely.