

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

FEBRUARY 21, 2012 HEARING OFFICER PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11 a, b, c, and d

PROJECT NO. 99-239- (5)

SECOND AMENDMENT TO VESTING TENTATIVE

TRACT MAP NO. 53138

OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 201200001

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MODIFICATION NO. 201100160

ADDENDUM TO FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

REPORT NO. 99-239

Kress, Donald

From: Mark Watters [mwatters525@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 5:00 PM
To: Kress, Donald
Subject: Deerlake Ranch Modification Hearing

Dear Mr. Kress:

This letter is in reference to the upcoming C.U.P. Modification hearing no. 201 100 160 seeking approval for modifications to the Deerlake Ranch development, CUP 99-239-5.

As you know, I serve as chairman of the Deerlake Ranch/Vistas at Indian Oaks monitoring committee, a six-person committee made up of concerned citizens in the community appointed by Supervisor Mike Antonovich. The committee has held several public meetings during the past several years allowing the developers of these two projects to report on their progress and for members of the community to ask questions and voice concerns. I have recently been informed that, due to the receipt of six letters of protest, the Hearing Officer will be required to deny approval for these modifications. Although the hearing will still take place, I am told, but that in accordance with Los Angeles County Code Section 22.56.1630 (A) the decision by the Hearing Officer must be to deny approval.

While I am passionate in believing the public should have access and influence in all aspects of our government and its operations, I am dismayed that all it takes to force the denial of approval to the modifications is for a minimum of only two people to write a one sentence letter of protest. Hans Girard was kind enough to forward me copies of these letters. To my surprise and dismay, none of them offer any details as to what part or parts of the proposed modifications they were protesting. They apparently do not have to show any knowledge of the development, its history, or its impacts both good and bad. According to Los Angeles County Code Section 22.56.1630 (A), all it takes is one sentence stating their protest and the Hearing Officer is required to deny approval. This is a terribly inadequate law! A letter of protest should have to state why the writer is protesting. To be taken seriously, it should provide information that shows that its author knows something about the project they are protesting. It is clear to me that five of these letters were corralled by the author of the sixth one and the five minutes it took for these people to write their letters is all that it takes to, effectively, stop the process.

For the past eleven years I have been active, as have been many others, in voicing my concerns, opinions, suggestions and yes, protests regarding the Deerlake Ranch development. It has been most rewarding for me to see how such an undertaking is carried out. I feel I know this project as well as anyone in the community and this apparent forced

outcome, in my opinion, is not serving the public's best interest.

I would never want to deny a citizen the right to protest but the current process denies the public the opportunity to hear the debate. The debate between knowledgeable individuals, held in a public forum before trained and experienced government officials and staff. The fact that it takes so little effort to stop this process, after so much time, energy and money has been spent is simply wrong and I am very disappointed. As always, I am honored and most willing to volunteer as much time as I can to see that both sides are represented and will continue to do so.

Most Sincerely,

Mark Watters

Mark Watters

Watter Music, Inc.

21115 Devonshire St. #166

Chatsworth, CA 91311

818-359-1521