

June 21, 2022

To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org, candy.rosales@lacity.org, oliver.netburn@lacity.org, gilbert.cedillo@lacity.org, Councilmember.Harris-Dawson@lacity.org, Councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, Councilmember.lee@lacity.org, Councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org

Re: Case File: CPC-2020-3140-CU-MCUP-DB-SPR-HCA / ENV-2020-3141-SCPE
Council File: **22-0297**

To the PLUM Committee:

I called in to the remote PLUM Committee meeting at 2:00pm and stayed on hold with my hand raised for more than 3 hours. **I was never called on to speak.** Please see attached screenshot on next page indicating the length of my calls.

As predicted the PLUM Committee erroneously approved the SCPE despite it failing to qualify. This project does not meet the requirements for a SCPE.

The property owner (or partial owner, his role remains unclear) continues to claim his business has fallen on hard times. This has nothing to do with this proposal's failure to qualify for a SCPE.

The property owner was paid \$12 million dollars to sell the TAIX property to Holland Partner Group, LLC. As his attorney informed the public, TAIX remains open today because the owner is currently receiving free rent. This has nothing to do with this proposal's failure to qualify as a SCPE.

The attorney who represents the property owner (or owners) uses public comment time to tell you how he and his client's "worked with the community" for years on this project in direct response to the "community". Yet, he can provide not a single date or event wherein this public outreach took place. Or with who. Or evidence of meetings or conversations. No one in the neighborhood is aware of a single effort made by these developers to even ask what this communities needs are.

The evidence in the record is what the DCP is required to consider when granting approvals. As seen in the record, there is a significant amount of evidence proving this property is historically significant. This alone removes SCPE as a possibility. And this is what these developers continue to rely on as their attempt at avoiding an environmental review, knowing it would result in flaws.

Your approval today of this highly controversial project only added to litigation costs and will cause more delays. Neither of which would be necessary if the City followed the rules from the start.

~jen

5:22

N 70%



1 669-254-5252 (3)

Create contact

Update contact

1 669-254-5252



Jun 21 (Tue) 3:28 PM

01:49:38
California



Jun 21 (Tue) 3:24 PM

00:03:46
California



Jun 21 (Tue) 2:00 PM

01:27:23
California