

Communication from Public

Name: Steve D.

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 05:44 AM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: After living near Griffith Park for the past 15 years, I have witnessed firsthand the challenges animals face in trying to survive in our city, and I feel strongly about all issues regarding wildlife. I support a report back on how development is being managed in environmentally sensitive areas like the Mulholland Corridor. I support ordinances and implementation efforts that protect our natural resources like the future Wildlife Ordinance and want to know the status. I support analysis and any additional measures that conserve and manage the City's natural biological diversity. Thank you for listening and for sharing my concerns.
Steve D.

Communication from Public

Name: Lois Becker

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 08:34 AM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: Thank you, Council, for taking up the absolutely critical question of effective preservation of our precious wildland resources. Bel Air Skycrest (BASPOA) residents have been strong supporters of the Wildlife Pilot Study and Ridgeline Ordinance and many other worthy conservation efforts brought forth by the City. But too often these efforts have stalled along the way, or been weakened until they do not have the teeth to accomplish what was intended. And even when they do become law, there is the very real danger that they will not be implemented or enforced in the way they need to be. Given the rapid acceleration of climate change, the long term drought and other extreme weather conditions, and the increase in disastrous mega-wildfires, there is no time to lose in finally getting these long-languishing measures on the books (while also coming up with new ones) -- and making sure the necessary support and resources are in place so that all these best-laid plans can actually succeed. In our current dire situation "redundancy" of tools in our toolkit is not a negative. Rather, it is the only hope of accomplishing what must be accomplished. Relevant to this, on March 30, 2021, the Planning Director imposed a Memorandum which robbed us, without any clear rationale, of three of our most valued tools -- expert oversight of the Outer Corridor by the Mulholland DRB, public participation, and transparency/accountability -- key safeguards in the all-important decision process that shapes development in our environmentally sensitive hillsides. Our community has been speaking out about this devastating overstep of directorial authority since it happened and is deeply appreciative of the Council's taking it up at this time. This is of course particularly appropriate since the MDRB was a creation of the Council to begin with and it is the Council's power that has been illegally usurped by the Director! Please see attached Justification (and LAMC Sec 11.5.7 H) from our April 2021 appeal (rejected out of hand by the Planning Department). We cannot take the environmental threat to our city too seriously, and we are counting on you to set us, and City policy, back on course post-haste. Thank you so much for looking into these matters with a clear and critical eye and with the City's best interests at heart.

**Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan
Implementation Guidance Memorandum
of March 30, 2021**

**APPEAL by
BEL AIR SKYCREST PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION**

5. REASON FOR APPEAL

We are filing this appeal on behalf of Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners' Association (BASPOA) to **protest (in its entirety) the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Implementation Guidance Memorandum**, dated March 30, 2021 and signed by Planning Director Vincent P. Bertoni.

Planning Director is a civil service position, with responsibilities to the public. Yet Director Bertoni's Memorandum (Memo) appears to have been conceived and executed without input from any of the parties one might consider relevant—either the public, the relevant council offices (11, 5, 4, 2), or the Mulholland Design Review Board (MDRB or Board) itself. The Memorandum is, in fact, **completely antithetical to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan (MSPSP or Plan), which was carefully structured to ensure that any major decision about the parkway is a highly collaborative, democratic, stakeholder-inclusive effort, as required by Code.**

REASON FOR THE APPEAL

This Memo goes against the letter and spirit of the MSPSP in the following ways:

- 1) exceeds authority of legislative action taken by City Council in 1992; this type of action would require the proper legislative process**
- 2) reinterprets/misrepresents the MDRB's role in the design review process (removing non-visible projects from MDRB oversight clearly goes against the intentions of a 20-year public process formalized by a 1992 City Council decision)**
- 3) devalues public engagement in the Planning process**
- 4) lacks transparency and oversight for the Planning Department**
- 5) has implications for all Outer Corridor ("non-visible") projects and their impacts, reaching well beyond the Outer Corridor**

In a January 25, 2021 Spectrum News 1 article, Planning Director Vincent Bertoni tried to separate the Planning Department from the scandals which have been ravaging the City (a 34-count federal RICO conspiracy indictment alleging bribery and money-laundering uncovered by the FBI). In the interview he admitted that the department has "work to do in re-gaining the public trust" and concluded that "We are here to really provide a clean and open process for everyone."¹ Sadly, this Memo does not hold up to that promise.

¹ "LA City Planning Focuses on Transparency, Vision in Wake of Huizar Probe", Spectrum News 1, Natalie Brunell, Jan 25, 2021

The MSPSP was created to preserve the Mulholland Scenic Parkway, its environs and natural resources—and by extension the whole of the Santa Monica Mountains—in as wild and natural a state as possible, while respecting the rights of property owners and the need for “sensitive development.” It’s a difficult balancing act, and one that the Mulholland Design Review Board has been dealing with through a thoughtful, just and transparent process for almost three decades.

In the 1960s (long before “Wildland-Urban Interface” came into common use), a project was floated that would have turned Mulholland Drive—our two-lane country road running along the top of the Santa Monicas—into a four-lane highway. Had that project gone through, there can be no doubt that Mulholland and the surrounding landscape would be quite unrecognizable today, characterized by far more development and far less open space, less wildlife, less native habitat, far fewer recreational trails and parklands, and far fewer houses that blend with the surroundings.

Fortunately, community stakeholders and environmentalists recognized the threat this highway posed to some of the City’s most valuable resources and found an ally in visionary Councilmember Marvin Braude (joined a few years later by then Councilmember Zev Yaroslavsky), who led the charge to create the *Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan*. By the early 1970s, a Citizens Advisory Committee had been appointed to take the creation of the Specific Plan out of the political realm, and that committee discussed, wrestled with, and labored over their charge for the next 20 years. In 1992, the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan was officially adopted by the Los Angeles City Council and the first MDRB went to work as the gatekeeper to Parkway development.

The Plan worked. Under the MDRB’s thoughtful watch, the MSPSP has shown itself to be a practical and effective tool kit for understanding the policies and provisions of development on the scenic parkway and for implementing mitigation measures to address potential significant impacts. In this way the MSPSP’s value lies in preserving not just a slender ribbon of road but the balance between sensitive urban (rural residential) development and wildlands throughout both Inner and Outer Corridors. The inclusion of the Outer Corridor, extending by definition beyond structures that are technically visible from Mulholland, was clearly intentional and absolutely essential to the Plan as originally approved by City Council, because what we see when we drive or bike or walk on Mulholland Drive is not mere scenery—not just some painted Hollywood façade with nothing behind it—but one of the world’s largest pristine, ecologically complex, protected Mediterranean ecosystems, home to over 1,000 plant species and some 500 bird, reptile, amphibian and mammal species.

To give just one example of our unique situation: Los Angeles is one of only two megacities in the world where big cats—mountain lions in LA, leopards in Mumbai, India—live *within the city limits!* And the Mulholland Scenic Parkway is a vital part of the big cats’ habitat and a key wildlife corridor along which they move.

Of course aesthetics are an important element of the Plan, but they are not the only element. Other elements that must be considered include hiking trails, accessibility for public access, streetlights, and grading impacts. Careful reading makes it clear that the drafters of the MSPSP had more on their minds than mere set dressing. As the *MSPSP Guidelines* clearly state:

In 1992, the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, Ordinance No. 167, 943, was adopted by the Los Angeles City Council in response to public concerns that the majestic views *and natural character* of the Mulholland Drive setting were *threatened by unrestricted development*. The ordinance created the Mulholland Scenic Parkway, *including both the Inner and Outer Corridors, which established land use controls and a design review process* tailored to ensure that development within the Parkway is compatible with the unique character of the Santa Monica Mountains.

The Specific Plan encourages *environmentally* and aesthetically...*sensitive development*.” And a paragraph or two later: “...the Specific Plan sets standards for projects proposed for the Scenic Parkway...[that] include *environmental protection measures, grading limits, and building standards applicable to Inner and Outer Corridors of the Parkway*. [Emphasis added.]
—*Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Guidelines*, p. 3

Visibility vs. non-visibility is really a false distinction, because projects in the Outer Corridor have a very real presence and very real impacts which reach far beyond the Outer Corridor boundaries. Even when the proposed structures cannot be seen from Mulholland, the light can pollute our night skies, the noise can drown out the birdsong, our air can be filled with ugly and unhealthy pollution. Under-regulated overdevelopment strains roads and other infrastructure to the breaking point, with serious safety implications, increasing an area’s susceptibility to mega-wildfires and impeding emergency access and evacuation when these fires and other disasters occur.

Furthermore, applicants have been known to claim that a project is not visible from Mulholland when in fact it is. Case in point: Curtis School. At the August 5, 2020 MDRB meeting Curtis claimed non-visibility from Mulholland. But a member of the Board had driven along Mulholland prior to the meeting and seen that its large campus, site of the proposed Project, was, in fact, clearly visible from Mulholland east of the 405 Freeway: How did Planning allow the application to come before the MDRB with this error? ²

At the April 7, 2021 MDRB meeting, Planning Staff went into considerable detail about the sophisticated technology they use to evaluate visibility, in an apparent attempt to assure the Board and the public that nothing would get past their new mapping system. But in the Curtis case it did get past and had to be corrected and revealed by a member of the Board. This is how checks and balances work.

HOW YOU ARE AGGRIEVED BY THE DECISION

The MSPSP and MDRB are a high functioning example of democracy at the local government level. As civilian volunteers with special expertise in design fields (three architects sit on the current board), MDRB board members are uniquely suited to their role. They are appointed by various Council Offices and public agencies. They are not politicians, not developers. They work with applicants to make projects code compliant and to make them better. They interface with City Planning and various public agencies such as the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (SMMC). And they welcome public comment at their meetings. Their greatest contribution is the commitment, generosity and integrity

² This was not the only problem with the Curtis application, which was, in fact, lacking in many elements that are explicitly required by Code: no descriptions of buildings, no elevations, no landscape plans, no findings. It left the Board, the SMMC, and citizen stakeholders wondering how Planning could have allowed an application to come before the MDRB in such an incomplete and sorry state.

with which they approach the work. Residential communities across the Santa Monica Mountains trust them.

To be clear, BASPOA has had a lot of experience with the MDRB because Bel Air Skycrest happens to border on the less than two-mile long anomaly known as the *Mulholland Institutional Corridor*. During that 20-year period when the MSPSP was being birthed, a number of institutions were allowed to take up conditionally permitted operations along this short stretch of the Parkway. The City has been struggling to balance the development of these institutions with the directives of the Specific Plan ever since. For 30 years the MDRB has provided a much-needed forum through which we as stakeholders could learn about and track the institutions' growth. The twice monthly MDRB agendas have often been our first notice of projects in the Mulholland area, and the meetings themselves our first and often best chance to evaluate and respond to possible impacts on our community, knowing our concerns would be taken seriously as part of a formal and civilized public process, with the MDRB on more than one occasion facilitating much-needed mitigations.

With the Outer Corridor no longer under MDRB jurisdiction, stakeholders may not even find out about many projects until it is too late. And without benefit of the MDRB review process, Planning Staff won't know what conditions to put on projects, because they will have a much curtailed process and much less interaction with the public than the MDRB offers. The same problem will no doubt apply to government agencies such as the SMMC and MRCA, which rely on these same meetings in their roles as stewards of wildlife, wildlife movement/corridors, parklands, trails, and other public resources.

At the April 7, 2021 MDRB meeting, perhaps in an attempt to soften the insult to the MSPSP process, planners tried to downplay the number of Outer Corridor projects, saying there are far fewer of these than there are Inner Corridor projects. As evidence Planning volunteered that only three of the 12 projects in the current queue are located in the Outer Corridor. Significantly, they did not volunteer the identities of these three Outer Corridor projects—a perfect example of the kind of non-transparency the public can expect from Planning going forward.

The Board, by the way, did not agree with the Staff's assessment. They pointed out that while it might be true at this particular moment in time that there are fewer projects in the Outer Corridor, it cannot possibly be true in general, because the Outer Corridor covers a much larger area than the Inner Corridor.

The drafters of the MSPSP understood that process is something that happens over time. The public needs adequate notice. We need time to research and process information, to communicate with peers and write strongly-worded letters to our representatives. We need opportunities to attend and speak at meetings and hearings on the matters that concern us. Curtailing the design review process in this way robs us of precious time and opportunities and denies us our voice.

What has happened to our democracy? The citizens are being denied our voice. This is how we are aggrieved.

SPECIFICALLY THE POINTS AT ISSUE

- The Director erred by interpreting LAMC § 11.5.7(H)(3) (Specific Plan Procedures) instead of consulting the specific provisions of the MSPSP.
- The Planning Director exceeded his authority and in doing so has usurped the legislative-authority of the City Council and denied the public its right to participation.
- MDRB meetings are often the public's first notification and opportunity to give meaningful input into a Code-mandated process, that will now not be available for certain projects.
- In an October 15, 1998 memorandum the City Council clarified that *all* projects in the Inner Corridor and Outer Corridor need to be reviewed by the MDRB.
- The MDRB is a Code-mandated advisory body, the City's *first* reviewing body for projects in and around the Parkway, a *quasi-judicial body* responsible for *mandatory review* for purposes of (1) *Project Permit Compliance* and (2) *CEQA compliance*. It is about environmental stewardship and sensitive development that maintains a balance between wildland preservation and balanced development. This change removes that process for certain projects.
- Planning Staff offered a rationalization blaming COVID and being understaffed—but those are temporary problems and this would be a permanent, precedent-setting change not authorized by any elected body. This type of change cannot be unilaterally made per a memo that misinterprets the Code.
- If changes are needed to the MSPSP or the review procedure those changes must be processed through a Specific Plan Revision as outlined in the Municipal Code.

WHY YOU BELIEVE THE DECISION MAKER ERRED OR ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION

This Memo was issued in a very non-transparent way, with no outreach. The Planning Director is “interpreting” something that is over 30 years old, and he’s **mis**interpreting it. He is conflating an early memo from the Citizens Advisory Committee with the greatly revised Plan that was ultimately adopted/enacted by the City Council. His interpretation is not supported by the language of the Specific Plan. So he is changing the law, which is not his job.

The City has a charter and a process that must be followed, and in the case of this Memorandum the Planning Director did not follow it. He does not have the authority to enact laws. He needs to withdraw the Memo and bring it through the proper legislative process. It is essential that citizens and voters be allowed to weigh in, as required by Code.

The Specific Plan is as relevant today as when it was enacted. That is its great strength. It was intended to protect something of timeless value. Without it there would be no open space left, no wildlife, no native habitat, no recreational trails, no development consistent with surroundings. The drive to develop never goes away, and neither does the need for accountability. *Both* Corridors need the protection of a transparent and impartial process, and the MSPSP provides that. Good process is all about checks and balances, and this Memorandum takes them away.

H. Interpretations of Specific Plans. The Director shall have authority to interpret specific plans when there is a lack of clarity in the meaning of their regulations.

1. **Application Procedure.** To request a specific plan interpretation, an applicant shall file an application with the Department of City Planning pursuant to the application procedure set forth in Paragraph (a) of Subdivision 2 of Subsection B of this section. The application shall include a reference to the specific plan regulation(s) for which clarification is requested and a narrative description of why a clarification is necessary for the project or subject property involved.

2. **Director's Decision.** Upon receipt of a deemed complete application, the Director's written interpretation shall be subject to the same time limit to act, transmittal requirement and effective date of decision as set forth in Paragraphs (a) through (c) of Subdivision 4 of Subsection C.

3. **Appeals.** The City Planning Commission shall hear appeals on Director interpretations which affect an entire specific plan area or any of its subareas, and the Area Planning Commission shall hear appeals on Director interpretations which are applicable only on a site specific basis. The procedures for filing and processing appeals of Director interpretations shall otherwise be the same as those set forth in Subdivision 6 of Subsection C of this section.

Communication from Public

Name: Gregg Nevills

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 09:56 AM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: A big thank you to the Council for introducing a motion that would provide the time needed to report how the sensitive ecology at Mulholland Corridor is being managed and monitored. Understanding what is taking place in this essential natural resource helps in constructing the best strategies to ensure that the wildlife in this area are protected and are able to flourish. I am all for additional ways to assist in the management of this unique ecology that supports its diversity and maintains its habitat for all species that call it home.

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Kay
Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 01:35 PM
Council File No: 21-1286
Comments for Public Posting: Please support this motion! Protections for our remaining wildlife need the oversight. Thanks so much. Susan Kay MD

Communication from Public

Name: sophie Weil
Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 01:54 PM
Council File No: 21-1286
Comments for Public Posting: Please protect our environment and wildlife, this is a comment to protect our remaining wildlife.

Communication from Public

Name: Garrett Weinstein

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 02:00 PM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers: The Governing Board of the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, at its December 1, 2021 meeting, adopted the attached resolution in support of the motion under consideration. Thank you for your time and consideration.

MOUNTAINS RECREATION AND CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

December 1, 2021
Resolution No. 21-178

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE MOUNTAINS RECREATION AND CONSERVATION AUTHORITY SUPPORTING CITY OF LOS ANGELES COUNCIL MOTION CF 21-1286 FOR THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO REPORT BACK ON THE UNILATERAL REMOVAL OF NON-VISIBLE PROJECTS FROM MULHOLLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REVIEW, WILDLIFE PILOT STUDY, RIDGELINE PROTECTION ORDINANCE, HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION REGULATIONS, AND ON AN ASSESSMENT OF LAND APPROPRIATE FOR CONSERVATION AS DETERMINED BY TRUSTEE AGENCIES SUCH AS THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AND THE SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY

WHEREAS, Five members of the Los Angeles City Council have introduced a broad motion to spur the City Planning Department to focus and report on the progress of multiple initiatives critical to the eastern Santa Monica Mountains;

WHEREAS, The motion represented by Council File (CF) Number 21-1286 requires the Planning Department to report back on the unilateral removal of non-visible projects from Mulholland Design Review Board review, Wildlife Pilot Study, Ridgeline protection Ordinance, Hillside Construction Regulations, and on an assessment of land appropriate for conservation as determined by trustee agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy;

Resolved, That the Governing Board of the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) hereby:

1. FINDS that the proposed action will result in significant public benefits in the Santa Monica Mountains;
2. FINDS that the proposed action is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act;
3. ADOPTS the staff report and recommendations dated December 1, 2021;
4. AUTHORIZES supporting City of Los Angeles Council Motion CF 21-1286 for the Planning Department to report back on the unilateral removal of non-visible projects from Mulholland Design Review Board review, Wildlife Pilot Study, Ridgeline

Protection Ordinance, Hillside Construction Regulations, and on an assessment of land appropriate for conservation as determined by trustee agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy;

5. AUTHORIZES any budget amendments as necessary; and
6. AUTHORIZES the Executive Officer or his designee to do any and all acts necessary to carry out this resolution and any recommendations made by the Governing Board.



Chairperson

AYES: Muñoz, Paranick, Hasenauer, Lange

NOS: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: none

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the governing board of the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, duly noticed and held according to law on December 01, 2021.

Date: December 1, 2021



Executive Officer

Communication from Public

Name: Leslie Monsour

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 02:51 PM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers: As a longtime resident of Laurel Canyon and a stakeholder of LA's Santa Monica Mountains, I speak for the Stanley Hills Drive Community of Neighbors in expressing my full support of CF-21-1286 and our ongoing, vehement opposition to the destructively misguided "Bertoni memo." The current motion (CF-21-1286), as written to the Planning Department by Council Representatives, Blumenfield, Raman, Bonin, Koretz, and Krekorian, simply requires vitally needed reports on the fragile ecosystems and biodiversity of the remaining fragmented open space in the hills and parklands of our local Santa Monica Mountains, in order to protect the health and well-being of ALL residents of Los Angeles. Protecting open space is a crucial aspect of reducing the city's carbon footprint. Preserving a healthy indigenous ecosystem protects ALL citizens by improving the air we breathe and the local climate we live in. It preserves the unique character of our city and the mountain range that benefits the environment in countless ways. Please, please, let us be responsible in our stewardship of this irreplaceable gem. Over the years, we've worked very hard with our hillside representatives, as well as the city's zoning administrators, planning commissioners, Councilmembers, Parks and Recreation officers, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy to respect and recognize the importance of open space in this city of cars and construction. Please honor our past efforts now by joining us in supporting this motion. Sincerely yours, Leslie Monsour and the Stanley Hills Drive Community of Neighbors Proud supporter of Citizens for Los Angeles Wildlife (CLAW) 2062 Stanley Hills Drive Los Angeles, CA 90046

Communication from Public

Name: Randi Feilich

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 12:35 PM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: As a property owner in Hollywood Hills West, I support a report back on how development is being managed in environmentally sensitive areas like the Mulholland Corridor. In addition, I support ordinances and implementation efforts that protect our natural resources like the future Wildlife Ordinance and want to know the status. Finally, I support analysis and any additional measures that conserve and manage the City's natural biological diversity. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Patrick Walsh

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 11:08 AM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: I adamantly support this measure and the work it would do to address much needed improvement for Mulholland Scenic Parkway and overall the natural habitat of Los Angeles that we must do a better job at preserving, rehabilitating and protecting.

Communication from Public

Name: rebekka taubman

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 05:52 PM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: Please pass this Motion. We need animal to be able to live.

Communication from Public

Name: Mark Levin, Save Our Canyon

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 09:26 PM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: Our organization, SAVE OUR CANYON, represents over 1,000 concerned residents of the Santa Monica Mountains. We strongly support the motion (CF-21-1286) presented by Paul Koretz, Bob Blumenfeld, Nithya Raman, and Mike Bonin to report back on how the Specific Plan is in substantial compliance with the inter to manage development in environmentally sensitive areas. The integrity of the Santa Monica Mountains is essential to the Los Angeles region. We must take action to preserve and protect the biodiversity of this region for future generations. The time to act on this is now.

Communication from Public

Name: Terry Saucier

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 05:29 PM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: I fully support CF-21-1286 and urge you to do so too. The Director of Planning Vince Bertoni's March 30 unilateral implementation of the Guidance Memorandum (memo) destroys a 30-year practice of public review and guidance by the Mulholland Design Review Board (MDRB). The MDRB oversight has provided much needed baseline review for both the inner and outer corridors of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan (MSPSP). Bertoni's memo affects more than 50% of the area previously included: an area that impacts 5 city council districts and eliminates public participation and review for an area twice the size of Griffith Park – more than 9,000 acres of mountain habitat. LA is a biodiversity hotspot, with unique flora and fauna which are of great ecological significance. It needs more protection, not less.

Communication from Public

Name: Joanna Beacom

Date Submitted: 12/02/2021 03:46 PM

Council File No: 21-1286

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to "SUPPORT" motion CF 21-1286 and ask you to firmly oppose Planning Director Bertoni's broad-stroke policy memo which clearly aims to silence the public's voice and halt the Mulholland Design Review Board's assessment process. This process has been in effect since 1998 for good reason; it was far-sighted planning. Now is not the time to adopt short-sighted policies that will imperil dwindling local habitat and open spaces for wildlife, Angelenos, and natural resources which benefit our extraordinary city. Thank you for your consideration.