Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Richard J. Bruckner
Director

March 15, 2012

TO: Alex Garcia, Hearing Officer

FROM: Samuel Dea
Section Head
Special Projects Section

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 3
PROJECT NO. PM070536-(5)
TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 070536
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 201100046

The above-mentioned item was presented to the Hearing Officer on March 6, 2012. The Hearing Officer continued the public hearing to March 20, 2012, to allow the Crescenta Valley Town Council ("Town Council") additional time to review the applicant's proposal. Los Angeles County Regional Planning staff ("staff") and the applicant attended the Town Council Land Use Committee ("Committee") meeting on March 8, 2012. At this meeting, the applicant presented the project and staff answered questions from the members of the Committee and the public. Twenty members of the public attended the meeting, four members of the public testified in opposition to the Project and one was impartial.

County staff answered questions from the Committee and members of the public regarding the subdivision process and the applicant's request. The following concerns were raised by the Committee and members of the public:

- That the buildings setbacks were not enough to buffer the proposed two-story homes from the existing residences in the neighboring lots.
- That detached condominiums would be inconsistent with the neighborhood character.
- That detached condominiums would have a negative impact on the property values of the properties in the community.
- That the subdivision of the parcel into three detached condominium units would significantly increase traffic on Cross Street.
- That the oak tree should be preserved if the tree is healthy.

The Committee discussed the applicant's request and determined to recommend to the Town Council not to support the parcel map. The Committee requested that County staff provide a copy of the arborist report and insurance documentation provided by the applicant, so the Committee can make a recommendation regarding the oak tree permit

to the Town Council on March 15. The Town Council is scheduled to meet on March 15, 2012, to make a recommendation regarding the project.

Since the March 6 Committee meeting, staff has received several emails with questions from the Town Council members and additional correspondence regarding the project. All additional correspondence is attached. One additional phone call was received from a local resident on March 12 in opposition to the project.

If you need further information, please contact Carolina Blengini of my staff at (213) 974-1522 or cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov. Department office hours are Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The Department is closed on Fridays.

SD:CB:cb

Attachments

Blengini, Carolina

From: duc truong [hidtruong@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 9:09 PM
To: Blengini, Carolina; cheryl@theCVcouncil.com
Cc: beyt@att.net; odyatlaw@aol.com; hidtruong@aol.com
Subject: 2446 Cross St. Project

Hi there,

I'm a resident in La Crescenta at 4535 Briggs Ave. I didn't get the mail letter about this project until March 8th. Not until 9pm tonight I opened the letter and found out the meeting at 6:30pm. I'd have been at the meeting if I had known it sooner.

Regardless, I want give my input on the land usage proposal. I'm against it for one reason. The reason is traffic. The Briggs is extremely busy. We don't need any more traffic.

Thank You
Duc

Blengini, Carolina

From: Cheryl Davis [cheryl@thecvcouncil.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 10:09 AM
To: Blengini, Carolina
Subject: FW: 2446 CROSS STREET, La Crescenta - Montrose - Keep the tree

Carolina - This email was received this morning regarding the oak tree.

--
Cheryl Davis
President
E: cheryl@thecvcouncil.com
C: (818) 970-0976

Crescenta Valley Town Council
PO Box 8676 | La Crescenta, CA 91224-0676 | USA
P: 818 248 9387 | www.thecvcouncil.com

---------- Original Message ----------
From: Louise Mitchell
[mailto:louise10002003@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 6:38 AM
To: contact@thecvcouncil.com
Subject: 2446 CROSS STREET, La Crescenta -
Montrose - Keep the tree

Please make the contractor work around the tree and not damage it so that would have to be removed which would be getting their way anyway!

Concerned homeowner,
Louise Mitchell

Blengini, Carolina

From: Blengini, Carolina
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 12:31 PM
To: 'cheryl@thecvcouncil.com'
Cc: Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.
Attachments: pm070536_zoning-map.pdf; PM070536 Arborist Report.pdf; PM040536 Insurance Letter.pdf

Dear Cheryl,

Per your request, I am providing some reference from the County Code and the Subdivision Map Act that further clarifies Mr. Bonner's request. The subdivision of his property into three detached condominium units (three single-family residences) is in compliance with the County Code and the Subdivision Map Act.

The R-1 zone permits single-family residences as the land use in the County (see an excerpt from the County Code below). The proposed project depicts three single-family residences:

> ***22.20.070 Permitted uses.***
>
> *Property in Zone R-1 may be used for:*
> *-- Adult residential facilities, limited to six or fewer persons.*
> *-- Family child care homes, large, subject to the procedures and standards provided in subsection A of Section 22.20.021.*
> *-- Family child care homes, small.*
> *-- Farmworker dwelling units, subject to the applicable provisions of Part 24 of Chapter 22.52.*
> *-- Foster family homes.*
> *-- Group homes, children, limited to six or fewer persons.*
> *-- Residences, single-family, subject to the standards provided in Section 22.20.105.*
> *-- Second units, subject to the provisions of Part 16 of Chapter 22.52.*
> *-- Small family homes, children.*
> *(Ord. 2010-0042 § 2, 2010; Ord. 2004-0030 § 6 (part), 2004; Ord. 2004-0012 § 3 (part), 2004; Ord. 85-0004 § 10, 1985; Ord. 82-0130 § 3 (part), 1982; Ord. 1494 Ch. 2 Art. 1 § 207, 1927.)*

The County Code also provides the definition of single-family residence (see excerpt from the Code below):

> ***22.08.180 R.***
>
> *-- Residence, Single-family. "Single-family residence" means a building containing one dwelling unit, or a mobilehome comprising one dwelling unit manufactured and certified under the National Mobilehome Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 on a permanent foundation system approved by the county engineer.*

The subject property can be developed with three single-family residences if a subdivision is approved. The applicant proposed a condominium subdivision in which the land use would be single-family residences. According to the Subdivision Map Act, the definition of Subdivision includes condominium projects (see excerpt from the Map Act below):

> ***66424.*** *"Subdivision" means the division, by any subdivider, of any unit or units of improved or unimproved land, or any portion thereof, shown on the latest equalized county assessment roll as a unit or as contiguous units, for the purpose of sale, lease or financing, whether immediate or future. Property shall be considered as contiguous units, even if it is separated by roads, streets, utility easement or railroad rights-of-way. "Subdivision" includes a condominium project, as defined in subdivision (f) of*

Section 1351 of the Civil Code, a community apartment project, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 1351 of the Civil Code.

Definition of Condominium by Section 1351 of the Civil Code:

(f) A "condominium project" means a development consisting of condominiums. A condominium consists of an undivided interest in common in a portion of real property coupled with a separate interest in space called a unit, the boundaries of which are described on a recorded final map, parcel map, or condominium plan in sufficient detail to locate all boundaries thereof (...).
http://law.onecle.com/california/civil/1351.html

I hope this answers your questions. Please keep in mind that condominium is a type of subdivision allowed by the Subdivision Map Act and Mr. Bonner's request is consistent with applicable zoning requirements.

I am also attaching the arborist report submitted by the applicant and the letter Mr. Bonner provided from the insurance company.

Regarding the density map, we don't have a density map prepared. But I am attaching the zoning map so you can see how the properties are zoned in the surrounding area.

Thank you,

From: Cheryl Davis [mailto:cheryl@thecvcouncil.com]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 10:38 AM
To: Blengini, Carolina; Dea, Samuel
Subject: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

Dear Carolina & Sam,

Thank you again for taking the time to attend last Thursday's CVTC Land Use Meeting. I have received several positive comments regarding your help with the code and clarification of terms.

As a follow-up, can you please forward:
1) The Arborist's Report
2) The documentation from Robert Bonner's insurer regarding removal of the oak tree
3) Any additional code sections that clarify the R-1/R-1-7500 issue as discussed?

4) In addition, can you please see Councilmember Thomas' email below, requesting a County Zone Density Graph? Please let me know if this question is better suited for someone else.

The Land Use Committee will re-convene this Thursday at 7:00 for a recommendation regarding the oak tree permit. Later that evening, the Town Council will hear the LUC's recommendations and vote on it's final recommendation to the Hearing Officer. We will be sure to get you that final recommendation letter no later than noon, Monday March 19, since Mr. Bonner's hearing was continued to March 20.

Thank you again for your time and help and please let me know if you have any questions!

--
Cheryl Davis
President
E: cheryl@thecvcouncil.com

C: (818) 970-0976

Crescenta Valley Town Council
PO Box 8676 | La Crescenta, CA 91224-0676 | USA
P: 818 248 9387 | www.thecvcouncil.com
-Please join us for our monthly meeting at 7:00 p.m. at the La Crescenta Library Community Room. The next meeting will be March 15, 2012.

---------- Original Message ----------
Subject: Re: Thu March 15 - Continuation LU Mtg 7:00, CVTC Meeting 7:30
From: "Robert Thomas" <robertthomas4cvtc@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Sun, March 11, 2012 10:49 pm
To: cheryl@thecvcouncil.com

HI Cheryl,
I understand that the minimum lot size for LA County area of La Crescenta is 5,000 square feet. So I suspect that the R-1-7500 is a "lower density" zone than the normal R1 zone. Is it possible to e-mail a County Zone Density Graph to the CVTC members? This may help them understand that the County has already helped to lower density in the area. Lowering it anymore for this one lot will set a precedent, and unfairly hurt one individual, instead of lowering the whole block if that is what the residences want.
Robert

Blengini, Carolina

From: Blengini, Carolina
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 12:34 PM
To: 'David.Blood@lw.com'
Cc: dblood@sbcglobal.net; davidoblood@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: 2446 Cross Street

Dear Mr. Blood,

Per your request, I am providing some reference from the County Code and the Subdivision Map Act that further clarifies Mr. Bonner's request. The subdivision of his property into three detached condominium units (three single-family residences) is in compliance with the County Code and the Subdivision Map Act.

The R-1 zone permits single-family residences as the land use in the County (see an excerpt from the County Code below). The proposed project depicts three single-family residences:

> ***22.20.070 Permitted uses.***
>
> *Property in Zone R-1 may be used for:*
> *-- Adult residential facilities, limited to six or fewer persons.*
> *-- Family child care homes, large, subject to the procedures and standards provided in subsection A of Section 22.20.021.*
> *-- Family child care homes, small.*
> *-- Farmworker dwelling units, subject to the applicable provisions of Part 24 of Chapter 22.52.*
> *-- Foster family homes.*
> *-- Group homes, children, limited to six or fewer persons.*
> *-- Residences, single-family, subject to the standards provided in Section 22.20.105.*
> *-- Second units, subject to the provisions of Part 16 of Chapter 22.52.*
> *-- Small family homes, children.*
> *(Ord. 2010-0042 § 2, 2010; Ord. 2004-0030 § 6 (part), 2004; Ord. 2004-0012 § 3 (part), 2004; Ord. 85-0004 § 10, 1985; Ord. 82-0130 § 3 (part), 1982; Ord. 1494 Ch. 2 Art. 1 § 207, 1927.)*

The County Code also provides the definition of single-family residence (see excerpt from the Code below):

> ***22.08.180 R.***
>
> *-- Residence, Single-family. "Single-family residence" means a building containing one dwelling unit, or a mobilehome comprising one dwelling unit manufactured and certified under the National Mobilehome Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 on a permanent foundation system approved by the county engineer.*

The subject property can be developed with three single-family residences if a subdivision is approved. The applicant proposed a condominium subdivision in which the land use would be single-family residences. According to the Subdivision Map Act, the definition of Subdivision includes condominium projects (see excerpt from the Map Act below):

> ***66424****. "Subdivision" means the division, by any subdivider, of any unit or units of improved or unimproved land, or any portion thereof, shown on the latest equalized county assessment roll as a unit or as contiguous units, for the purpose of sale, lease or financing, whether immediate or future. Property shall be considered as contiguous units, even if it is separated by roads, streets, utility easement or railroad rights-of-way. "Subdivision" includes a condominium project, as defined in subdivision (f) of Section 1351 of the Civil Code, a community apartment project, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 1351 of the Civil Code.*

Definition of Condominium by Section 1351 of the Civil Code:

> *(f) A "condominium project" means a development consisting of condominiums. A condominium consists of an undivided interest in common in a portion of real property coupled with a separate interest in space called a unit, the boundaries of which are described on a recorded final map, parcel map, or condominium plan in sufficient detail to locate all boundaries thereof (...).*
> http://law.onecle.com/california/civil/1351.html

I hope this answers your questions. Please keep in mind that condominium is a type of subdivision allowed by the Subdivision Map Act and Mr. Bonner's request is consistent with applicable zoning requirements.

Thank you.

From: David.Blood@lw.com [mailto:David.Blood@lw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2012 1:13 PM
To: Blengini, Carolina
Cc: dblood@sbcglobal.net; davidoblood@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: 2446 Cross Street

Thank you for the response. I will review and consider in advance of the meeting on Thursday.

From: Blengini, Carolina [mailto:cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2012 11:46 AM
To: Blood, David (LA)
Cc: dblood@sbcglobal.net; davidoblood@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: 2446 Cross Street

Hi David,

The proposed subdivision is to create three detached condominium units on a 0.536-acre (or 23,345 sf) property in the R-1-7,500 zone. The use of the property would be three detached single-family dwelling units. A condominium is a type of subdivision where the owner of the unit has an undivided interest in common of the property, this type of ownership is also known as common interest. The purpose of this subdivision is merely to establish what type of ownership future purchasers of these single-family units will have.

Based on the County Code and the Subdivision Map Act, a subdivision application is necessary for someone to create three detached condominium units on the Cross Street property. These condominium units are subject to all applicable regulations and development standards for single-family units required by the R-1 zone. For more information on the condominium subdivision map refer to section 66427, Article 1 (General Provisions), Chapter 2 (Maps) of the Subdivision Map Act or see excerpt below.

```
66427. (a) A map of a condominium project, a community apartment
project, or of the conversion of five or more existing dwelling units
to a stock cooperative project need not show the buildings or the
manner in which the buildings or the airspace above the property
shown on the map are to be divided, nor shall the governing body have
the right to refuse approval of a parcel, tentative, or final map of
the project on account of the design or the location of buildings on
the property shown on the map that are not violative of local
ordinances or on account of the manner in which airspace is to be
divided in conveying the condominium.
(b) A map need not include a condominium plan or plans, as defined
in subdivision (e) of Section 1351 of the Civil Code, and the
governing body may not refuse approval of a parcel, tentative, or
final map of the project on account of the absence of a condominium
plan.
(c) Fees and lot design requirements shall be computed and imposed
with respect to those maps on the basis of parcels or lots of the
```

surface of the land shown thereon as included in the project.
(d) Nothing herein shall be deemed to limit the power of the legislative body to regulate the design or location of buildings in a project by or pursuant to local ordinances.
(e) If the governing body has approved a parcel map or final map for the establishment of condominiums on property pursuant to the requirements of this division, the separation of a three-dimensional portion or portions of the property from the remainder of the property or the division of that three-dimensional portion or portions into condominiums shall not constitute a further subdivision as defined in Section 66424, provided each of the following conditions has been satisfied:
(1) The total number of condominiums established is not increased above the number authorized by the local agency in approving the parcel map or final map.
(2) A perpetual estate or an estate for years in the remainder of the property is held by the condominium owners in undivided interests in common, or by an association as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 1351 of the Civil Code, and the duration of the estate in the remainder of the property is the same as the duration of the estate in the condominiums.
(3) The three-dimensional portion or portions of property are described on a condominium plan or plans, as defined in subdivision (e) of Section 1351 of the Civil Code.

I hope this clarifies your questions, but please let me know if it is still not clear.

Thank you.

Carolina Blengini
Planner
Special Projects Section
Department of Regional Planning
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
http://planning.lacounty.gov
213-974-1522

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.

From: David.Blood@lw.com [mailto:David.Blood@lw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2012 11:03 AM
To: David.Blood@lw.com; Blengini, Carolina
Cc: dblood@sbcglobal.net; davidoblood@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: 2446 Cross Street

Carolina,

Thank you for recommending the continuance of hearing to permit our local community to discuss this matter.

I am still very confused about how three houses can be built on a single lot and it still be classified as R-1. Please point me to the legal justification for that conclusions – it is not apparent in any of the materials that I have seen so far.

Thank you,

David

From: Blood, David (LA)
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2012 10:05 AM
To: cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov
Cc: Dena Blood; 'davidoblood@yahoo.com'
Subject: 2446 Cross Street

Carolina,

I left you a voice message, but just in case email is easier for you . . .

Last fall I purchased the home at 2502 Cross Street (next door to the subject property above).

I bought the home in reliance on the current zoning on that street (R-1-7500). We purchased that lot in lieu of other options for large lots in La Crescenta because of the number of larger lots still located on Cross Street (more than 10 lots on the street are greater than 15,000 sq feet, and the 5 lots are greater than ½ acre). We have undergone a significant remodel of the home trying to restore it to the old glory it must have had when it was built 90 years ago. Needless to say that has been a costly effort.

I did not know of any plan to build condominiums next door until I saw the notice posted a couple of weeks ago, and I have been trying to do my own research these past weeks to make sure I understand what is going on. Had I know about those plans I likely would not have purchased the property (certainly not at the price I paid), and I certainly would have reduced my restoration plans on that old home.

I am very confused why the plan requires condominiums and not just a subdivision of the lot (which I also would be concerned about, but perhaps understand a bit more). I have some VERY significant concerns about the impact of condominiums next door on the quiet enjoyment of my own property and the value of my property.

I have had some of my neighbors reach out to me expressing their concerns as well since the notice was posted – when they asked me about it, I have encouraged them to attend the hearing, which I will also attend. Those I spoke to indicated concern about getting to a downtown meeting on the morning of a regular work day.

I have spoken with our local town council representatives and understand there may be a follow-on meeting, or perhaps the hearing could be delayed and rescheduled locally in La Crescenta? If so, I will attend that meeting as well. Please let me know if you are the right person for me to speak to in advance of those meetings/hearings to get additional information – and if not you, who should I contact? I am just not able to find satisfactory answers to my question on my own research.

My complete contact information is below. Thank you for your attention and consideration of my concerns.

Thank you,

David

David and Dena Blood

2502 Cross Street

La Crescenta, CA 91214

Home: 818-248-4804

Cell: 626-437-0449

Work (direct dial): 213-891-8637

****

To comply with IRS regulations, we advise you that any discussion of Federal tax issues in this e-mail was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by you, (i) to avoid any penalties imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) to promote, market or recommend to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

For more information please go to http://www.lw.com/docs/irs.pdf

****

This email may contain material that is confidential, privileged and/or attorney work product for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Latham & Watkins LLP

Blengini, Carolina

From: Blengini, Carolina
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 8:28 AM
To: 'mike@thecvcouncil.com'
Cc: Odalis Suarez; Cheryl Davis; Harry Leon; Young Suh; Robbyn Battles; Dennis van Bremen; Todd Thornbury; Robert Thomas; Danette Erickson; Frank Beyt; Charles Beatty; Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

All the material provided to the hearing officer is available online including the staff report. Please find a link below to the case material:
http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/pm070536/

Do you mean subsections (c) and (d) below?

Regarding subsection (c), 'that the site is not physically suitable for the type of development', the site has enough area to accommodate three single-family residences contingent upon the approval of a subdivision, and the project meets all the applicable setbacks and standard requirements of the R-1-7,500 zone.

Regarding subsection (d), 'that the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development', the project is consistent with the maximum density allowed by the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan (General Plan) and it has enough area (22,500 square feet) to meet the minimum area required by the R-1-7,500 zone.
The property is designated as Category 1 (Low Density Residential - One to Six Dwelling Units per Gross Acre) on the Land Use Policy Map of the General Plan. According to the General Plan, the maximum number of residential units permitted for the 0.6-acre (gross) subject property is 3.6 or three. Therefore, the applicant's proposal to develop three dwelling units is consistent with the General Plan.
The property is consistent with the minimum area required by the R-1-7,500 Zone. The net area of the property is 23,348 square feet and the minimum required area for three dwelling units is 22,500 square feet.

Thanks,

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Claessens [mailto:Mike@thecvcouncil.com]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 5:41 PM
To: Blengini, Carolina
Cc: Mike; Odalis Suarez; Cheryl Davis; Harry Leon; Young Suh; Robbyn Battles; Dennis van Bremen; Todd Thornbury; Robert Thomas; Danette Erickson; Frank Beyt; Charles Beatty; Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

Okay. Has the County (your section say or some other) investigated and made staff recommendations for use by the hearing officer re each provision below? If yes, if you haven't already, can you send those to us?

Also, In subsection (b) and (c) below, what does the term "physically suitable" mean? Can issues such as non-conformity to the neighborhood (no other detached condominium subdivisions) and increased density (no other 3-unit developments) make a project "physically unsuitable?" Please advise.
Thanks again,
Mike

> According to the Subdivision Map Act, Section 66474 (Grounds for

> denial of tentative or parcel map), there are certain findings that
> need to be made for denial of a parcel map. Below is an excerpt from
> the Subdivision Map
> Act:
>
> 66474. A legislative body of a city or county shall deny approval of a
> tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not
> required, if it makes any of the following findings:
>
> (a) That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general
> and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.
> (b) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not
> consistent with applicable general and specific plans.
> (c) That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development.
> (d) That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density
> of development.
> (e) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements
> are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially
> and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.
> (f) That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is
> likely to cause serious public health problems.
> (g) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements
> will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for
> access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision. In
> this connection, the governing body may approve a map if it finds that
> alternate easements, for access or for use, will be provided, and that
> these will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by
> the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or
> to easements established by judgment of a court of competent
> jurisdiction and no authority is hereby granted to a legislative body
> to determine that the public at large has acquired easements for
> access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.
> (Amended by Stats. 1982, Ch. 518.)
>
>
>
> Carolina Blengini
> Planner
> Special Projects Section
> Department of Regional Planning
> 320 W. Temple Street
> Los Angeles, CAÂ 90012
> http://planning.lacounty.gov/Â
> 213-974-1522
> Â
> Â
> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments,
> from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official
> and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It
> contains information that may be confidential, privileged, work
> product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law.
> If you have received this message in error, be advised that any
> review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction
> of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify
> us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in
> error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.
> Â

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Mike [mailto:mike@thecvcouncil.com]
> Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 4:34 PM
> To: Blengini, Carolina
> Cc: Mike; Odalis Suarez; Cheryl Davis; harry@thecvcouncil.com; Young
> Suh; Robbyn Battles; Dennis van Bremen; Todd Thornbury; Robert Thomas;
> Danette Erickson; Frank Beyt; Charles Beatty; Dea, Samuel
> Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.
>
> Okay, if that is the case, can issues such as non-conformity to the
> neighborhood (no other detached condominium subdivisions) and
> increased density (no other 3-unit developments), be valid factors
> upon which to base a denial of the subdivision map? Please advise.
>
>> Hi Mike,
>>
>> A subdivision is a discretionary process. Therefore, this project is
>> subject to a public hearing and input from the public, as well as
>> other factors, is taken into consideration by the hearing officer
>> before taking action.
>>
>> Mr. Bonner's project complies with all the requirements from the
>> R-1-7,500 and the Subdivision Map Act for a subdivision, by that I
>> mean that he is not requesting any change or relief from the
>> standards. Nevertheless, it needs to go through the discretionary
>> subdivision process.
>>
>> Thank you.
>>
>>
>>
>> Carolina Blengini
>> Planner
>> Special Projects Section
>> Department of Regional Planning
>> 320 W. Temple Street
>> Los Angeles, CAÃ,Â 90012
>> http://planning.lacounty.gov/Ã,
>> 213-974-1522
>> Ã,
>> Ã,
>> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any
>> attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for
>> the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is
>> addressed. It contains information that may be confidential,
>> privileged, work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law.
>> If you have received this message in error, be advised that any
>> review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction
>> of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify
>> us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in
>> error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.
>> Ã,
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Mike [mailto:mike@thecvcouncil.com]
>> Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 3:52 PM
>> To: Blengini, Carolina
>> Cc: Odalis Suarez; Cheryl Davis; Mike Claessens;

>> harry@thecvcouncil.com; Young Suh; Robbyn Battles; Dennis van Bremen;
>> Todd Thornbury; Robert Thomas; Danette Erickson; Frank Beyt; Charles
>> Beatty; Dea, Samuel
>> Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.
>>
>> Hi Carolina:
>> Thanks so much for your help and the information you have been sending.
>>
>> If Mr. Bonner can build three detached condominium units on his
>> property BY RIGHT, what is he seeking from the Planning Dept's Zoning
>> Administrator? Does the Zoning Administrator (and by extension does
>> the Town Council) have any discretion to recommend denial of the
>> requested sub-division? If the Zoning Administrator has no
>> discretion, why are we going through this process? Why doesn't the
>> County simply approve the map without our input? Please advise.
>> Thanks,
>> Mike Claessens
>>
>>
>>> Hi Odalis,
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> I agree with you that Mr. Bonner could not construct three
>>> single-family residences if the parcel is not subdivided pursuant to
>>> the Subdivision Map Act. However, Mr. Bonner is proposing a
>>> subdivision of a parcel of land that has enough area to accommodate
>>> three single-family residences per the requirements of the R-1-7,500
>>> zone.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Thanks,
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> From: ODYATLAW@aol.com [mailto:ODYATLAW@aol.com]
>>> Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 3:05 PM
>>> To: Blengini, Carolina
>>> Cc: cheryl@thecvcouncil.com; mike@thecvcouncil.com;
>>> harry@thecvcouncil.com; youngseoksuh@hotmail.com;
>>> robbyn@thecvcouncil.com; dkvan@sbcglobal.net; spaboy@sbcglobal.net;
>>> robertthomas4cvtc@sbcglobal.net; danette7@charter.net; beyt@att.net;
>>> charlesbt@sbcglobal.net
>>> Subject: Re: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Caroline thank you for the information, however, I still disagree
>>> that three dwellings can be approved on an R-1 lot.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> WHERE DOES IT SAY YOU CAN HAVE MORE THAN ONE SFR ON ONE LOT IN R-1

>>> ZONE.
>>> THEY STILL HAVE NOT PROVIDED THAT. THEY ARE TRYING TO MAKE
>>> SOMETHING FIT
>>>   WHERE IT DOES NOT.
>>>
>>>   I STILL DISAGREE THAT THERE CAN BE MORE THAN ONE DWELLING ON AN R1
>>> ZONE.
>>>   THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH LOT AREA IN TITLE 22 AS FOLLOWS:
>>>
>>>
>>>   > 22.20.240 Lot area.
>>>   > A person shall not erect, construct, occupy, use, alter or
>>> enlarge more
>>>   > than one building or structure per required area on any lot or
>>> parcel of
>>>   > land
>>>   > in Zone R-2, except:
>>>   > A. Outbuildings permitted in Zone R-2;
>>>   > B. One single-family residence together with outbuildings
>>> customary to
>>>   > such use permitted in Zone R-1, if there are no other buildings or
>>>   > structures
>>>   > thereon, may be used:
>>>   > 1. On a lot or parcel of land having the required area;
>>>   > 2. On each area equal to half the required area but in no event
>>> less than
>>>   > 2,500 square feet;
>>>   > C. A two-family residence together with outbuildings customary to
>>> such
>>>   > use
>>>   > permitted in Zone R-2, if there are no other buildings or structures
>>>   > thereon, may be used on a lot or parcel of land having the
>>> required area
>>>   > and an
>>>   > area not less than:
>>>   > 1. 4,000 square feet if no number follows the zoning symbol,
>>>   > 2. The area designated by the number following the zoning symbol.
>>> (Ord.
>>>   > 1494 Ch. 2 Art. 1 Ãƒâ€™Ãƒâ€šÃ‚Â§ 215.2, 1927.)
>>>   >
>>>   >
>>>   > THANKS
>>>   > ODALIS
>>>   >
>>>
>>>
>>> Carolina Blengini
>>> Planner
>>> Special Projects Section
>>> Department of Regional Planning
>>> 320 W. Temple Street
>>> Los Angeles, CAÃƒâ€šÃ‚Â 90012
>>> http://planning.lacounty.gov/Ãƒâ€š
>>> 213-974-1522
>>> Ãƒâ€š
>>> Ãƒâ€š
>>> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any

>>> attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended
>>> for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it
>>> is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential,
>>> privileged, work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure
>>> under applicable law.
>>> If you have received this message in error, be advised that any
>>> review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or
>>> reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited.
>>> Please notify us immediately by reply email that you have received
>>> this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.
>>> Ãƒâ€š
>>>
>>
>>
>> --
>> Mike Claessens
>> mike@theCVCouncil.com
>> (818)324-8283
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> --
> Mike Claessens
> mike@theCVCouncil.com
> (818)324-8283
>
>
>

Blengini, Carolina

From: Robbyn Battles CV Town Council [robbyn@thecvcouncil.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 8:44 AM
To: Blengini, Carolina; mike@thecvcouncil.com
Cc: 'Odalis Suarez'; 'Cheryl Davis'; 'Harry Leon'; 'Young Suh'; 'Dennis van Bremen'; 'Todd Thornbury'; 'Robert Thomas'; 'Danette Erickson'; 'Frank Beyt'; 'Charles Beatty'; Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

Carolina,

I'd like to thank you for taking so much time to help clarify this project. I feel this has been a very educational process with regard to how you look at zoning, density and a sub-division. This will certainly help me the next time a project similar to this is proposed within the community.

Robbyn Battles
Corresponding Secretary
E: robbyn@thecvcouncil.com

Crescenta Valley Town Council
PO Box 8676 ç La Crescenta, CA 91214 ç USA
P: 818 248 9387 ç www.thecvcouncil.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Blengini, Carolina [mailto:cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 8:28 AM
To: mike@thecvcouncil.com
Cc: Odalis Suarez; Cheryl Davis; Harry Leon; Young Suh; Robbyn Battles; Dennis van Bremen; Todd Thornbury; Robert Thomas; Danette Erickson; Frank Beyt; Charles Beatty; Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

All the material provided to the hearing officer is available online including the staff report. Please find a link below to the case material:
http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/pm070536/

Do you mean subsections (c) and (d) below?

Regarding subsection (c), 'that the site is not physically suitable for the type of development', the site has enough area to accommodate three single-family residences contingent upon the approval of a subdivision, and the project meets all the applicable setbacks and standard requirements of the R-1-7,500 zone.

Regarding subsection (d), 'that the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development', the project is consistent with the maximum density allowed by the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan (General Plan) and it has enough area (22,500 square feet) to meet the minimum area required by the R-1-7,500 zone.
The property is designated as Category 1 (Low Density Residential - One to Six Dwelling Units per Gross Acre) on the Land Use Policy Map of the General Plan. According to the General Plan, the maximum number of residential units permitted for the 0.6-acre (gross) subject property is 3.6 or three. Therefore, the applicant's proposal to develop three dwelling units is consistent with the General Plan.

Blengini, Carolina

From: Mike Claessens [Mike@thecvcouncil.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 9:41 AM
To: robbyn
Cc: Blengini, Carolina; 'Mike Claessens'; 'Odalis Suarez'; 'Cheryl Davis'; 'Harry Leon'; 'Young Suh'; 'Dennis van Bremen'; 'Todd Thornbury'; 'Robert Thomas'; 'Danette Erickson'; 'Frank Beyt'; 'Charles Beatty'; Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

Yes, I agree with Robbyn. Carolina, you have been very helpful, patient and more than gracious. Thank you.

That being said, it seems to me that it is the height of cynicism for the County to ask the Town Council for a recommendation concerning the approval of this 3-unit condo project in a neighborhood where there is no other development that is even remotely similar when, in fact, it is a forgone conclusion that the County will approve the project because it is consist with the County's General Plan.

Asking us to essentially "rubber-stamp" what the County has already decided to do only puts us at odds with our community and I, for one, really resent it.

> Carolina,
>
> I'd like to thank you for taking so much time to help clarify this
> project. I feel this has been a very educational process with regard
> to how you look at zoning, density and a sub-division. This will
> certainly help me the next time a project similar to this is proposed
> within the community.
>
>
> Robbyn Battles
> Corresponding Secretary
> E: robbyn@thecvcouncil.com
>
> Crescenta Valley Town Council
> PO Box 8676 Ã§ La Crescenta, CA 91214 Ã§ USA
> P: 818 248 9387 Ã§ www.thecvcouncil.com
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Blengini, Carolina [mailto:cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 8:28 AM
> To: mike@thecvcouncil.com
> Cc: Odalis Suarez; Cheryl Davis; Harry Leon; Young Suh; Robbyn
> Battles; Dennis van Bremen; Todd Thornbury; Robert Thomas; Danette
> Erickson; Frank Beyt; Charles Beatty; Dea, Samuel
> Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.
>
> All the material provided to the hearing officer is available online
> including the staff report. Please find a link below to the case material:

Blengini, Carolina

From: ODYATLAW@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 9:52 AM
To: mike@thecvcouncil.com; robbyn@thecvcouncil.com
Cc: Blengini, Carolina; cheryl@thecvcouncil.com; harry@thecvcouncil.com; youngseoksuh@hotmail.com; dkvan@sbcglobal.net; spaboy@sbcglobal.net; robertthomas4cvtc@sbcglobal.net; danette7@charter.net; beyt@att.net; charlesbt@sbcglobal.net; Dea, Samuel
Subject: Re: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

I would also, like to thank the planners for providing us information and assisting in this matter. However, I still do not see how this proposed project is consistent with the general plan and title 22. This project is three units on one lot. The lot remains one lot with different property interests. Even the informational web page of the county states. (at http://planning.lacounty.gov/faq/res/)

"Residential and Agricultural FAQ

For properties zoned R-1, R-A, A-1, A-2

Can I build a house on the property? Can I add onto my existing house? What must I do?

These zones allow **one house (single-family residence) on a lot**. ..."

To me this project is just a non conforming way to get around a land division. I think the focus on the general plan as to density is somewhat unpersuasive, since the general plan also considers conformity to the neighborhood and other land issues. Unfortunately, this may start an unwanted trend.... Anyway, I think I have already beaten the dead horse enough....

Odalis

In a message dated 3/13/2012 9:41:27 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Mike@thecvcouncil.com writes:

> Yes, I agree with Robbyn. Carolina, you have been very helpful, patient and more than gracious. Thank you.
>
> That being said, it seems to me that it is the height of cynicism for the County to ask the Town Council for a recommendation concerning the approval of this 3-unit condo project in a neighborhood where there is no other development that is even remotely similar when, in fact, it is a forgone conclusion that the County will approve the project because it is consist with the County's General Plan.
>
> Asking us to essentially "rubber-stamp" what the County has already decided to do only puts us at odds with our community and I, for one, really resent it.

Blengini, Carolina

From: Blengini, Carolina
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 10:43 AM
To: 'mike@thecvcouncil.com'; robbyn
Cc: 'Odalis Suarez'; 'Cheryl Davis'; 'Harry Leon'; 'Young Suh'; 'Dennis van Bremen'; 'Todd Thornbury'; 'Robert Thomas'; 'Danette Erickson'; 'Frank Beyt'; 'Charles Beatty'; Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

It's our responsibility to provide as much information as we can on the project and the applicable regulations.

I would like to emphasize that the information we are providing is based on an analysis of the project considering applicable State and County land use regulations. The County has not taken action on this matter. Again, this is a discretionary process and it is the Hearing Officer responsibility to consider all the information and recommendation presented by staff and the input from the public in his decision making process. The Town Council recommendation letter, if received, will be presented to the hearing officer as well a copy of all the correspondence and a memo summarizing the last week's Land Use Committee/Town Council meeting. You are also welcome to attend the hearing on March 20 and testify.

Thank you,

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Claessens [mailto:Mike@thecvcouncil.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 9:41 AM
To: robbyn
Cc: Blengini, Carolina; 'Mike Claessens'; 'Odalis Suarez'; 'Cheryl Davis'; 'Harry Leon'; 'Young Suh'; 'Dennis van Bremen'; 'Todd Thornbury'; 'Robert Thomas'; 'Danette Erickson'; 'Frank Beyt'; 'Charles Beatty'; Dea, Samuel
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

Yes, I agree with Robbyn. Carolina, you have been very helpful, patient and more than gracious. Thank you.

That being said, it seems to me that it is the height of cynicism for the County to ask the Town Council for a recommendation concerning the approval of this 3-unit condo project in a neighborhood where there is no other development that is even remotely similar when, in fact, it is a forgone conclusion that the County will approve the project because it is consist with the County's General Plan.

Asking us to essentially "rubber-stamp" what the County has already decided to do only puts us at odds with our community and I, for one, really resent it.

> Carolina,
>
> I'd like to thank you for taking so much time to help clarify this
> project. I feel this has been a very educational process with regard
> to how you look at zoning, density and a sub-division. This will
> certainly help me the next time a project similar to this is proposed
> within the community.
>

Blengini, Carolina

From: Robert Thomas [robertthomas4cvtc@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 11:38 AM
To: mike@thecvcouncil.com; robbyn; Blengini, Carolina
Cc: Odalis Suarez; Cheryl Davis; Harry Leon; Young Suh; Dennis van Bremen; Todd Thornbury; Danette Erickson; Frank Beyt; Charles Beatty; Dea, Samuel
Subject: Additional Information RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.

Hi CVTC:

Thank you to the L.A. County Staff. We appreciate all that you do for us.

I did a little research regarding properties on the south side of Cross Street that are adjacent to Commercial and R3 properties facing Foothill Blvd..

I found two (2) instances within the same block in which three (3) seperate houses are on Flag lots that are similar to what the proposed project may visually look like, and also may be similar in density.

2430 Cross Street (Front House)
2432 Cross Street (Middle House)
2434 Cross Street (Back House)

2424 Cross Street (Front House)
2426 Cross Street (Middle House)
2428 Cross Street (Back House)

As a professional real estate broker (30 years) in the business, it is my opinion that property values have not been adversely affected because of these structures.

Please consider this information when making your decision.

Sincerely,
Robert Thomas
818-247-9000 Office/Cell

--- On **Tue, 3/13/12, Blengini, Carolina** ***<cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov>*** wrote:

From: Blengini, Carolina <cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: RE: Info requested re: PM070536 - 2446 Cross St.
To: mike@thecvcouncil.com, "robbyn" <robbyn@thecvcouncil.com>
Cc: "Odalis Suarez" <odyatlaw@aol.com>, "Cheryl Davis" <cheryl@thecvcouncil.com>, "Harry Leon" <harry@thecvcouncil.com>, "Young Suh" <youngseoksuh@hotmail.com>, "Dennis van Bremen" <dkvan@sbcglobal.net>, "Todd Thornbury" <spaboy@sbcglobal.net>, "Robert Thomas" <robertthomas4cvtc@sbcglobal.net>, "Danette Erickson" <danette7@charter.net>, "Frank Beyt" <beyt@att.net>, "Charles Beatty" <charlesbt@sbcglobal.net>, "Dea, Samuel" <sdea@planning.lacounty.gov>
Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2012, 5:42 PM

It's our responsibility to provide as much information as we can on the project and the applicable regulations.

I would like to emphasize that the information we are providing is based on an analysis of the project