

Communication from Public

Name: Erich Randolph
Date Submitted: 05/05/2026 12:40 PM
Council File No: 26-0412
Comments for Public Posting: Please see the attached letter.

May 5, 2026

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
clerk.cps@lacity.org Clerk.PLUMCommittee@lacity.org

**Re: Support for CEQA Appeal; 4230 N. Saltillo Street;
Case Nos.: ZA-2023-1206-ZAD-DRB-SPP-MSP-HCA; ENV-2023-1207-CE; Council File No. 26-0412
("Project")**

City Council and PLUM Committee Members:

We are writing as the homeowners directly next to the lot at 4230 N. Saltillo Street in the Woodland Hills and Topanga area.

Because we live right alongside this property, any changes there will impact us pretty directly. The lot is small, on a slope, and packed with mature oak trees. Those trees are not just part of the landscape. They are a big part of what is holding everything together on that hillside and creating some separation between properties.

We understand there is a plan to remove two of the oak trees. Even that feels significant given how tight the space is and how interconnected everything looks. From living next to it, it is hard to imagine removing any trees without affecting the others, whether that is through root disturbance, soil changes, or overall stability.

Our biggest concern is what this could mean for our home. We are right there on the slope, so any tree removal and grading or excavation raises real questions for us around erosion or ground movement. This is not just a general concern. It is something that could directly affect our property.

There is also the environmental side of this. We see animals moving through here all the time, including deer, coyotes, and recently even a mountain lion in our driveway. This area clearly functions as part of a natural corridor, and those oak trees play a role in that.

Beyond that, these trees do a lot day to day that is easy to take for granted. They provide shade that keeps this area noticeably cooler, especially during the hotter months, and they help with air quality and how water moves through the hillside when it rains. They have been here a long time, and once they are gone, they are not something that can realistically be replaced in any meaningful way.

We also understand there are environmental review considerations for a project like this, and given the number of concerns, including tree removal, slope conditions, and fire risk, we hope a more thorough review is required before anything moves forward.

We understand development happens, but this particular lot feels especially sensitive given its size, slope, and the number of large, mature trees on it. From where we sit, it does not seem like a situation where changes can be made without wider impact.

We ask that all of this is carefully considered before moving forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Erich and Michelle Randolph

4224 Saltillo St.
Woodland Hills CA 91364

Communication from Public

Name: Jenna Cavelle
Date Submitted: 05/05/2026 12:57 PM
Council File No: 26-0412
Comments for Public Posting: Please see the attached letter.

**Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee**

May 3, 2026

Chris Morrow and Jenna Cavelle

21301 Castillo Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
cmorrow8@gmail.com
cc: jennacavelle@mac.com

VIA EMAIL AND ELECTRONIC UPLOAD

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
clerk.cps@lacity.org
Clerk.PLUMCommittee@lacity.org

Re: CEQA Appeal – 4230 N. Saltillo Street

Case Nos.: ZA-2023-1206-ZAD-DRB-SPP-MSP-HCA; ENV-2023-1207-CE
Council File No. 26-0412

Dear Councilmembers and PLUM Committee:

We are residents of Woodland Hills living in close proximity to the proposed development at 4230 N. Saltillo Street (“Project”). We write to formally object to the City’s reliance on a categorical CEQA exemption and to strongly urge that the appeal be granted.

The record demonstrates substantial evidence of significant environmental impacts, which legally precludes the use of a categorical exemption under CEQA. Proceeding without full environmental review would constitute a failure to comply with CEQA’s core mandate to disclose and mitigate environmental harm.

1. Public Safety and Fire Risk – Inadequate Access and Egress

The Project is located within a designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Existing access routes, including Saltillo Street, are substandard—narrow, constrained, and lacking sufficient clearance for emergency vehicles. The addition of new residential density on an already inadequate roadway network creates a foreseeable and unacceptable risk to life safety. In the event of wildfire, restricted access will impede evacuation and delay emergency response. This is precisely the type of “significant impact” CEQA is intended to evaluate. The City cannot lawfully ignore these conditions or defer analysis through an exemption.

2. Unusual Circumstances Exception – Environmental Sensitivity

The Project site contains sensitive natural features, including mature oak trees and functioning habitat space. The proposal’s intensity—effectively maximizing buildable area with minimal open space—would result in the permanent degradation of these resources.

Under CEQA Guidelines §15300.2(c), the “unusual circumstances” exception applies where a project presents a reasonable possibility of significant environmental effects. The combination of hillside terrain, fire risk, and sensitive ecological resources clearly meets this threshold. The City’s attempt to apply a categorical exemption is therefore improper.

3. Overdevelopment and Loss of Open Space

The proposed design reflects a wall-to-wall development approach that is incompatible with the environmental and topographical constraints of the site. Adequate open space is not a discretionary luxury in hillside communities—it is a functional necessity for fire defensibility, slope stability, and ecological continuity.

The elimination of meaningful open space increases both environmental and safety risks and represents a fundamental land use incompatibility.

4. Construction Impacts – Dust, Debris, Noise, and Ongoing Disturbance

The Project will generate significant construction-related impacts, including excessive dust, debris, and prolonged noise exposure. We are already subjected to persistent construction noise in this area, and this proposed development is located in our immediate vicinity—less than 500 feet from our residence.

Given the constrained access, steep terrain, and proximity to existing homes, there is substantial evidence that noise and construction disturbance will be significant, continuous, and inadequately mitigated. CEQA requires analysis of these impacts, particularly where they materially affect the use and enjoyment of nearby residences. The City has failed to meaningfully evaluate how these impacts will be managed under real-world conditions.

5. Cumulative Impacts

This Project cannot be evaluated in isolation. The surrounding area is already experiencing increased development pressure, further straining inadequate infrastructure and compounding fire risk. CEQA requires analysis of cumulative impacts, which has not been performed.

In sum, there is substantial evidence in the record supporting a fair argument that the Project may result in significant environmental impacts. Under well-established CEQA law, this alone is sufficient to require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The City’s reliance on a categorical exemption is legally indefensible under these circumstances. We respectfully request that the City grant the appeal, set aside the CEQA exemption, and require full environmental review consistent with CEQA.

Sincerely,



Chris Morrow
Jenna Cavelle

