

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jim Heimler

**Date Submitted:** 01/16/2026 03:19 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1486

**Comments for Public Posting:** Before any new projects in the Girard Track are even reviewed for consideration, please verify all exiting routs for the existing approved and allowed housing units. remember every existing home is allowed an ADU with no parking, trash cans on the street, parking almost wherever anyone wants to park (even under no parking signs), soil and landscaping encroachments into public way, parking signage that is inconsistent, and delivery vehicles blocking street access. The city has yet to enforce parking by street sign or street corners. In some case the city adds a sign where the law is already speed out. blind turns it is ok to park and obstruct limited views. what does all this mean? Well, the Girard Track has no evacuation plans. All issues brought up make exiting even less safe. If the city starts adding more vehicle trips in the verify limited exit options we have now how do we get out? is it safe to live in the Girard? Once the insurance companies hear what's being proposed and the risks to them who will have to pay when emergency evacuations do not allow space and time for us to get out. who will take the responsibility for life? I moved here 38 years ago. density has increased due mostly to ADU additions. Drivers now are buying the biggest cars and let them project into the streets. Collector and substandard streets all are affected. it is more dangerous today living in the canyon then it was then. It should be the other way around. the city must do its due diligence on all these matters before any new large project is even reviewed!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mason Devon

**Date Submitted:** 01/12/2026 10:11 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1486

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a home owner for over 21 years in the Girard tract in Woodland Hills and am opposing proposed 398-unit development at the Woodland Hills Country Club: THIS IS NOT A RETAIL OR COMMERCIAL AREA: The site's A-1 Agricultural zoning and "Open Space" designation does not principally permit "office, retail, or parking" and the site fails the "commercial corridor" frontage requirements because the Applicant requires a discretionary waiver to avoid mandatory sidewalk dedications. The discretionary waiver to avoid mandatory sidewalk dedications due to historic trees will violate the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) under federal law which requires clear, accessible public routes, including sidewalks, connecting streets to bus stops. The golf course site is also larger than 20-acres without the tentative tract application, which also necessarily requires full EIR review. CONGESTION AND ROAD CONDITIONS: The proposed project will increase congestion in the neighborhood where there are many substandard narrow streets that are only 1.5 cars wide. If there was an emergency fire evacuation, a single abandoned car could be life threatening and cause the entire road to be impassable. LOSS OF OPEN SPACE AND HARM TO WILDLIFE: The site contains recognized and protected habitat for protected species and wetlands. The golf course as a whole, with its trees and water features, is an integral portion of the Santa Monica Mountains ecosystem, particularly for raptors and small to medium sized mammals including bobcats. The mass concentration of lighting the proposed project would bring with multi-story buildings, almost 900 parking spaces, headlights from the 900 cars, and street lighting. The project essentially proposes a 24-hour shopping mall level of direct lighting and human presence impact in an area that is accessible to State-listed threatened evolutionarily significant mountain lions, bobcats and grey foxes. That level of light emittance within the Zone, and in proximity to abundant open public and private open space, would be a permanent, unmitigable significant biological impact. INCONSISTENT WITH THE SPECIFIC PLAN: Girard Tract Specific Plan is still relevant and enforceable and the project is "inconsistent" with both the Girard Tract Specific Plan and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. The Girard Tract Specific Plan cites updates as recent as May 2003, only 22 years

prior to the application date. The Project requires demolition of an historic site and landscaping structures. There is substantial evidence that the development will impact historic resources, including the William Bell-designed course and protected pepper trees. The intent of AB 2011, AB 2243, and AB 893 are for underused commercial properties to be developed into dense housing without community review, not open green spaces in the center of Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone neighborhoods. For the above reasons, a project such as this should never be allowed based on quick "ministerial" approval. Therefore, I am requesting that the Project undergo full CEQA review, including preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and an Evacuation Capacity Study. It seems that every politician whom I am a constituent of is passing the blame to each other. This is criminal and our community is prepared to take this to court!

Mason Devon

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mason Devon

**Date Submitted:** 01/12/2026 11:36 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1486

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am opposed to proposed 398-unit development at the Woodland Hills Country Club: This is definitely NOT a commercial corridor and is at risk for safe evacuation in case of fire due to congestion it would present! It also has protected trees and is a wildlife corridor, water shed and would impact the community in a negative way. It seems some politician is getting their palms greased with campaign monies from developers and the developers are taking advantage by complying with low income housing to put a feather in the politicians cap! It is not the appropriate space for developing. This will be investigated by the lawyers we will hire to sue the city as well as press coverage, I can promise you that.