

Communication from Public

Name: T Newman

Date Submitted: 07/29/2025 09:47 AM

Council File No: 24-0711-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Dear council, I am reiterating what is important to this matter: The proposed trailer park has been noted to have multiple violations which have been researched and noted, kindly see below: NO methane mitigation plan, OR permit :(No clearance is on file, which is in violation of LAMC §91.7103 and Ordinance No. 175790 The electrical system has been built where the ADA parking stall was originally approved, eliminating required accessibility which violates both federal ADA standards This infrastructure also encroaches into the required 10-foot buffer and 15-foot setback zones The developer falsely claimed compliance with landscaping rules by counting 10 public street trees located outside the property line, violating Performance Standard #3, which mandates on-site landscaping Confirming sheet P-1 shows 46 RV stalls, but Sheet P-4 depicts 49 utility pedestals—confirmable by counting the rectangular boxes on the electrical layout—indicating overbuilt infrastructure and fire/life safety risks :(Several of these pedestals also encroach into setback and buffer zones, again violating Performance Standard #2 LADBS approved these conflicting plans without reconciling discrepancies between P-1 (site layout) and P-4 (electrical), leading to multiple violations under the Public Benefit ministerial pathway, which requires full compliance with all 12 performance standards These failures warrant immediate revocation of the ministerial approval and referral for discretionary review to protect public safety and uphold city zoning laws Bottom line, this does not belong in our neighborhood and should of never gotten as far as it did Thank you for your ATTENTION to this VERY IMPORTANT matter Look forward to your input in taking this down

Communication from Public

Name: Chea Hoon Choe

Date Submitted: 07/29/2025 08:59 AM

Council File No: 24-0711-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I stand before you today not just on behalf of my neighbors—but on behalf of every Los Angeles resident who expects that our City Council will uphold the laws as they were written, and more importantly, as they were intended. We are here to address a critical issue: the conflicting language surrounding the permitting of RV parks in our city, and what that conflict means for neighborhoods like mine. Let me walk you through what we’re seeing: State law provides that an RV park may apply for a Conditional Use Permit—implicitly acknowledging that RV parks are not automatically compatible with all zones and should be evaluated case by case. Then we turn to the Los Angeles Municipal Code, which echoes this stance. The Code’s own definition of an RV park states clearly that the development of an RV park requires a CUP. That should be the end of the discussion. But it’s not—because another provision, later in the LAMC, states that RV parks may be constructed by right so long as they meet 12 performance standards—technical requirements that have nothing to do with land use compatibility, neighborhood character, or public process. Further, and more troubling is that this RV park is being built directly on top of nine recently capped oil and water wells—a fact that should trigger alarm bells for every one of us. And yet, this project is exempt from CEQA—the California Environmental Quality Act—meaning it bypasses the very environmental scrutiny that’s supposed to protect residents and future occupants. There has been no confirmation from the developer that the soil has been tested, nor that it is uncontaminated or even safe for human habitation. There is no evidence—none—that this site has been certified as suitable for families, seniors, or anyone else to live on. That’s not just oversight—that’s negligence. The answer is clear. The City, in its definition of an RV park, chose to require a Conditional Use Permit. Why? Because RV parks are not ordinary projects. They bring a mobile, transient population into fixed residential areas. They present unique challenges—traffic, safety, sanitation, land use compatibility—that absolutely warrant oversight and discretion. The CUP process is not just a legal formality. It is the only mechanism by which neighbors can be heard, where compatibility can be judged, and where the City can say “yes” or “no” based on the specifics of a site—not just a generic

compliance checklist. To ignore this requirement, or to interpret a later provision as overriding it, is to erase the very intent of the law—and the democratic principles behind it. If RV parks can now be constructed by right in residential zones, without a CUP, then we are setting a dangerous precedent—not just for Harbor City, but for every neighborhood in Los Angeles. This Council has a choice: you can uphold the legislative intent that has protected neighborhoods for decades, or you can open the door to by-right developments that will forever change the face of our communities. On behalf of my neighbors and every community facing this uncertainty, I urge you: clarify this conflict, reaffirm the requirement for a CUP, and ensure that development—especially development as impactful as an RV park—goes through the public, transparent, and fair process our laws intended. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Carolyn Fasold, James Fasold

Date Submitted: 07/29/2025 03:37 PM

Council File No: 24-0711-S1

Comments for Public Posting: To support McOsker's motion and PLUM oversight

Communication from Public

Name: Hansen Rory Champlin

Date Submitted: 07/29/2025 10:40 PM

Council File No: 24-0711-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed project involving the development of a so-called "RV park" in our residential neighborhood. While developed under the auspices of public benefit, it is clear that this project is in fact a thinly veiled attempt by the developer to introduce low-income or transitional housing into a stable residential area without the due diligence or transparency the community deserves. The proposal appears to have moved through the approval process without an environmental impact study or a comprehensive analysis of how such a project will affect local residents. This rubber-stamping approach and lack of oversight raises serious concerns, not only about the integrity of the process but also about the potential for long-term consequences that have not been adequately addressed. Among the most pressing issues are:

- Environmental Impact:** The absence of a formal environmental impact report is deeply troubling. The potential effects on local infrastructure, traffic patterns, air and water quality, and neighborhood aesthetics should not be dismissed or overlooked. Without proper due diligence, it is impossible to determine if the project can achieve even the most basic performance requirements.
- Home Values:** Property values in the area will be negatively impacted, a reality that will disproportionately affect homeowners who have invested their savings and futures in this community.
- Public Safety:** There is legitimate concern that the introduction of transient or loosely monitored populations could lead to increases in crime and decrease the overall sense of safety in the neighborhood. It has been well documented and reported to this council the numerous problems at other sites affiliated with this developer.
- Lack of Community Input:** The lack of transparency and community engagement in the planning process undermines trust in our local government and violates the spirit of public participation that is vital in land use decisions. While we understand the need to address housing shortages in the city, placing such a facility in the heart of an established residential area without proper planning, community consensus, or environmental review is unacceptable.

True public benefit must consider the well-being of both current residents and those that may utilize this facility. I urge the Council to halt this project until a full environmental review is conducted,

and all relevant impacts—including public safety, property values, and quality of life—are properly studied and disclosed to the public.

Communication from Public

Name: Mark Eldridge - Harbor City Resident

Date Submitted: 07/29/2025 05:30 PM

Council File No: 24-0711-S1

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Mark, I'm a 20-year resident of Green Meadows West. Our neighborhood is a low-density safe, peaceful neighborhood of single family homes. Last year I was outraged to learn about this ill-conceived plan to place high density occupied recreational vehicles on a former oil well plot. There was no community input and no discretionary review and we feel this was completely inappropriate and potentially fraudulent behavior from the developers and approvers. I represent my neighbors, a diverse group of people from multiple nationalities, languages and age groups, including senior citizens and single mothers that don't have the resources to stand up and reject this high density RV project. Many neighbors today didn't have time or financial resources to take off work, to be away from their children, or simply cannot travel due to their health, especially on short notice! They all share the same frustration and fear against this outrageous RV plan, and the lack of basic respect towards our Harbor City neighborhood. We are here to address this critical issue: the conflicting language surrounding the permitting of RV parks in our city, and what that conflict means for neighborhoods like mine. This affects every Council Members Districts as this situation can happen to anybody at any time. The impact to Los Angeles residents is enormous. 46 recreational vehicles of any type of damaged condition are to be crammed into a small space the size of 2 1/2 houses! Not on lot with adjoining apartments, not near mobile homes, but right in the middle of a single family home neighborhood. State law provides that an RV park may apply for a Conditional Use Permit—which acknowledges that RV parks are not automatically compatible with all zones and should be evaluated case by case. The Los Angeles Municipal Code confirms this position. The LA Municipal Code's own definition of an RV park states clearly that the development of an RV park requires a CUP. That should be the end of the discussion. However, later addition to the LAMC states that RV parks may be constructed by right so long as they meet 12 performance standards—technical requirements that have nothing to do with land use compatibility, neighborhood character, or public process. This RV park is being built directly on top of nine recently capped oil and water wells, with open air RVs with propane and potentially smokers walking around with open flame. And yet,

this project is exempt from CEQA—the California Environmental Quality Act—meaning it bypasses the very environmental scrutiny that’s supposed to protect residents and future occupants. There has been no confirmation from the developer that the soil has been tested, nor that it is uncontaminated or even safe for human habitation. There is no evidence—none—that this site has been certified as suitable for families, seniors, or anyone else to live on. That’s not just oversight—that’s negligence. Why is the city prioritizing a developer with convenience and rush to profit over community voices? The answer is clear that the developers DO NOT have this right for unregulated, unmonitored projects. The City, in its definition of an RV park, chose to require a Conditional Use Permit. Why? Because RV parks are not ordinary projects. They bring a mobile, transient population into fixed residential areas. They present unique challenges—traffic, safety, sanitation, land use compatibility—that absolutely warrant oversight and discretion. Additionally, leading consultants in the RV industry stress that their vehicles are for temporary living and travel, these are NOT mobile homes which are permanent housing! RVs are for travel, just like tents are! The CUP process is not just a legal formality. It is the only mechanism by which neighbors can be heard, where compatibility can be judged, and where the City can say “yes” or “no” based on the specifics of a site—not just a generic compliance checklist. To ignore this requirement, or to interpret a later provision as overriding it, is to erase the very intent of the law—and the democratic principles behind it. If RV parks can now be constructed by right in residential zones, without a CUP, then we are setting a dangerous precedent for every neighborhood in this Council's jurisdiction. All of you will be facing similar issues in the coming months. How will you support Council Members, please uphold the legislative intent that has protected single story family housing in Los Angeles neighborhoods for decades, or you can open the door to greedy, for-profit developments that will forever change the moral fabric and safety of our neighborhoods. On behalf of my neighbors and every community facing this uncertainty, I urge you: clarify this conflict, reaffirm the requirement for a CUP, and ensure that development—especially development as impactful as an RV park—goes through the public, transparent, and fair process our laws intended. Thank you, Mark Eldridge