

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ryan Pryor

**Date Submitted:** 10/10/2025 04:55 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0843

**Comments for Public Posting:** On behalf of Mission Hills Christian Church and Devonshire Montessori School, located less than 120 feet from the project site, I submit this objection to the proposed 55-space RV park at 10338 N. Lemona Avenue. Incompatibility With Sensitive Uses This parcel is wholly unsuited for an RV park. By definition, it abuts licensed childcare and an elementary school corridor. Because the entire lot lies within 300 feet of a preschool, it is structurally impossible to create a protective buffer that would insulate children from the risks posed by such a facility. No amount of cosmetic mitigation can cure this incompatibility. Failure to Meet Legal and Logistical Requirements Beyond setbacks, the site is categorically incapable of meeting the statutory and practical requirements imposed on RV parks: • Ingress and Egress: Narrow residential streets cannot safely accommodate 55 oversized vehicles entering and exiting daily, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up. • Emergency Access: California Title 25 requires spacing and unobstructed access for fire and life safety. Squeezing 55 pads onto this parcel renders compliance infeasible. • Management and Operations: The absence of adequate on-site management infrastructure, security, and circulation routes ensures chronic violations of planning performance standards. • Waste Disposal and Utilities: Safe, sanitary systems for sewage and graywater disposal cannot be installed or operated without imposing unacceptable risks on the adjacent schools and residences. • Legal Framework • Under the General Plan and LAMC §14.00, findings of “compatibility” must rest on substantial evidence. Here, evidence compels the opposite conclusion. • Under CEQA’s fair-argument standard, proximity to sensitive receptors, coupled with traffic, emissions, and safety hazards, requires preparation of a full Environmental Impact Report. • Approving a facility that cannot meet its own statutory spacing, safety, and operational requirements would be arbitrary, capricious, and legally indefensible. Requested Action The City must deny this application outright. To do otherwise would not only disregard planning law and CEQA, but would also sanction a facility that is logistically and legally impossible to operate in compliance with governing standards.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Natalie

**Date Submitted:** 10/10/2025 03:40 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0843

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose the proposed RV park in this residential area. Placing a transient-use development directly next to a school and with another school less than half a mile away is simply not appropriate. This raises serious concerns around safety, traffic, noise, and the overall character of our neighborhood. Our schools and families deserve thoughtful, long-term planning not incompatible land use decisions like this just to benefit the owners with more money coming into their pockets at the costs of our kids and neighborhood safety.