[redacted]

Public Comments Not Uploaded Appeal of Board of Building and Safety Commissioners Decision – Board File No. 250854 / 3842 & 3852 West Roble Vista Drive

Eric Zimmerman [redacted] Fri, Apr 10, 2026 at 11:41 AM
Reply-To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org
To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org
Cc: "justin.brand@lacity.org" <justin.brand@lacity.org>, raman.motions@lacity.org

Dear Members of the PLUM Committee,

Please find attached my formal written appeal of the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners' decision of March 10, 2026 (Board File No. 250854), approving an application to export 23,000 cubic yards of earth from 3842 & 3852 West Roble Vista Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027.

The Final Action Letter memorializing this decision was issued on April 9, 2026, and this appeal is being filed within 10 days of that notice.

Also attached is Exhibit A, documenting actual street width measurements at multiple points along Roble Vista Drive.

I respectfully request that the Committee hear this appeal at the earliest opportunity.
Sincerely,
Eric Zimmerman
3800 Roble Vista Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90027
[redacted]

2 attachments

Zimmerman_Appeal_Letter.docx
20K

Exhibit A Roble Vista Street Width Measurements.pdf
557K

Eric Zimmerman
3800 Roble Vista
[redacted]
April 10, 2026

Dear Members of the PLUM Committee,

My name is Eric Zimmerman, and I have been a resident of 3800 Roble Vista for the past four years, living in the duplex at the end of the cul-de-sac.

I have lived in Los Angeles for over 20 years, and in that time I have never felt the need to contact my city council representatives, until now. I want to be clear that I am a supporter of urban density and housing expansion in our city. My concerns here are not about opposing growth. They are about the misrepresentation of facts and what I believe to be a haphazard approval process that puts the safety of existing residents at risk.

I am writing to formally appeal the approved project at 3842 & 3852 West Roble Vista Drive — a proposed 29-unit, 8-story affordable housing building on a hillside cul-de-sac that requires the export of 23,000 cubic yards of earth. While I appreciate the time and consideration given during the initial hearing, there are critical issues related to both the accuracy of information presented and the fundamental feasibility of the project given the constraints of our street that remain unresolved.

1. Pattern of Misrepresentation by Representatives for the Developer

During the hearing process, several statements made by representatives for the developer were materially inaccurate:

- **Street Width Misrepresentation:** The developer's representatives stated that Roble Vista is 26 feet wide. The street measures consistently closer to 20–21 feet — a greater than 30% overrepresentation. With on-street parking factored in, the actual drivable width in several sections narrows to approximately 14-15 feet—a single, narrow lane. This is a significant discrepancy that directly impacts any evaluation of traffic flow, safety, and feasibility.
- **Community Feedback Mischaracterized:** The developer's representatives portrayed themselves as highly collaborative and actively engaged with the community throughout this process. However, I can only speak for myself — at no point has anyone from the developer's team contacted me directly, and the concerns I have raised have not been meaningfully addressed in any capacity.
- **Failure to Provide Critical Data:** Despite repeated requests, questions raised regarding street congestion and traffic impact have been wholly ignored and remain unanswered. Additionally, over a two-month period the developer has failed to provide the expected number of daily dump truck trips associated with the hauling of approximately 23,000 cubic yards of soil

Taken together, these issues raise serious concerns about the reliability of the information used to evaluate and approve this project.

2. Questions Regarding CEQA Exemption Eligibility

The project was granted a statutory exemption from environmental review under Public Resources Code § 21080.66 (Case No. ENV-2025-3598-SE). However, a review of the City's own ZIMAS mapping system reveals a significant cluster of official environmental and safety designations that raise serious questions about whether this exemption was properly applied.

According to ZIMAS, the project site carries all of the following designations: Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (**Yes**); Wildland Urban Interface (**Yes**); Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (**Yes** — Hollywood Fault, 0.079 km away); Hillside Area under the Zoning Code (**Yes**); Special Grading Area (**Yes**); 300-Foot Habitat Buffer (**Yes**); Biological Resource Potential (**Medium**); and a Universal Planning Review status of **Needs Review**. The zoning designation of R2-1XL places the site in Height District 1XL, which limits buildings to a **maximum of 6 stories and 75 feet** — yet the proposed building is 8 stories. The General Plan Land Use designation is Low Medium Residential.

The combination of these designations — all drawn from the City's own official records — strongly suggests that this site has significant environmental sensitivities that warranted full CEQA review rather than a blanket exemption. I respectfully request that the Committee confirm that each of these factors was properly evaluated as part of the exemption determination, and that all supporting documentation be made available for public review.

Additionally, it should be noted that any determination that fire risk would be addressed through the installation of sprinklers fails to account for the construction period itself, during which no sprinklers are operational and the site sits within a designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. This gap in fire safety during construction has not been adequately addressed.

3. Lack of Adequate Traffic and Circulation Analysis

One of the most significant gaps in the review process is the absence of a clear and credible traffic and circulation analysis that reflects real-world conditions on Roble Vista.

Key questions remain unanswered:

- Has any traffic or circulation study been conducted that accounts for the addition of approximately 29 residential units (including ADUs), and associated visitor, delivery, rideshare, and service traffic?
- Have projected daily trips and peak-hour volumes been evaluated against the actual capacity and configuration of the street?
- Have turning radii, cul-de-sac functionality, and emergency vehicle access been formally assessed?

The project materials include imagery that is misleading and does not reflect the true condition of the street. Even the portion depicted does not function as a two-lane roadway today. Further down, the street narrows and terminates in a tight cul-de-sac.

In practice, due to its narrow width and the presence of parked vehicles, Roble Vista functions as a single-lane roadway. Vehicles must routinely yield, reverse, or wait for clearance to pass. The cul-de-sac at the end is constrained, requiring all vehicles to travel to the terminus to turn around. Even under current conditions, residents regularly experience congestion and maneuvering challenges.

Additionally:

- On-street parking is already extremely limited
- The pavement is deteriorating, with portions actively crumbling
- Traffic backups already occur without any new development or **minor** construction activity

Notably, the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners itself found it necessary to reverse the Department's original staging recommendation — changing it from on-site to off-site only — suggesting that even the reviewing body recognized that the street cannot accommodate the operational demands of this project. This mid-process correction raises further doubt about the adequacy of the original traffic and circulation analysis.

4. Safety and Emergency Access Concerns

Beyond general congestion, there are serious safety implications that have not been adequately addressed:

- Whether emergency vehicles (fire trucks, ambulances) can reliably access and maneuver on the street under both current and future conditions
- Whether the existing cul-de-sac turning area can accommodate increased traffic volumes
- Whether the roadway can safely support the combined load of resident, visitor, delivery, service, and construction vehicles

These are not theoretical concerns—they are daily realities for those of us living on the street. Significantly, the Board itself added a requirement for a pedestrian crossing guard at the entrance and exit of the project site for the duration of hauling operations — a condition that was absent from the original proposal. This addition is a direct acknowledgment by the Board that the original safety measures were inadequate to protect pedestrians on our street.

5. Request for Transparency and Re-Evaluation

If any studies, analyses, or conditions related to the following have been conducted or imposed as part of this project, I respectfully request that they be shared:

- Traffic volume
- Street capacity
- Turning radii
- Emergency vehicle access
- Hauling trip frequency and duration

Given the discrepancies in the representatives' statements and the lack of clarity around these critical issues, I urge the Committee to re-evaluate the approval of this project with a more accurate understanding of existing conditions.

I would also strongly encourage members of the Committee or their staff to visit Roble Vista in person. Experiencing the street firsthand would provide essential context that cannot be captured in plans or renderings.

For additional context, I have included photographs (Exhibit A) documenting the actual width of the street. Please note that when viewing the tape measure in the photos, the accurate measurement is displayed in the lighter, smaller font—not the larger bold number. On the satellite photo, the yellow drawn lines are roughly where the photos were taken.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Eric Zimmerman

3800 Roble Vista

[redacted]

Exhibit A - Roble Vista Street Width Measurements

Measurement Points (approximations):