



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Richard J. Bruckner
Director

**CERTIFIED-RECEIPT
REQUESTED**

November 2, 2010

DIEUDONNE DOUCET
3087 NORTH CASITAS AVENUE
ALTADENA, CA 91001

Dear Dieudonne Doucet:

**SUBJECT: PROJECT NUMBER 95074-(5)
TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP CASE NO. 24294
OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 90239
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CASE NO. 96009
MAP DATE: APRIL 26, 1995**

Tentative Parcel Map No. 24294 ("PM 24294") and Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") Case No. 96009 were considered by Mr. Mitch Glaser, a Hearing Officer of Los Angeles County, on November 2, 2010.

After considering the evidence presented, the Hearing Officer in his action on November 2, 2010, **denied** PM 24294 and OTP Case No. 96009 in accordance with Section 21.16.060 (Public Hearings), Section 21.40.110 (Matters Required to Complete Submittal and Filing) and Section 22.56.060 (Denial for Lack of Information) of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"). A copy of the denial findings is attached.

The decision of the Hearing Officer regarding the tentative parcel map shall become final and effective on the date of the decision, and the CUP shall become final and effective on the day following the end of the appeal period, provided no appeal of the action taken has been filed with the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission within the following time period:

- In accordance with the requirements of the State Map Act and County Code, the tentative tract map may be appealed within 10 days following the decision of the Hearing Officer. **The appeal period for this project will end at 5:00 p.m. on November 15, 2010.**

**PROJECT NO. 95074-(5)
TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 24294
OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 96009
Denial Letter**

PAGE 2

- In accordance with the requirements of the County Code, the CUP may be appealed within 10 days following the decision of the Hearing Officer. **The appeal period for this project will end at 5:00 p.m. on November 15, 2010.**

The applicant or any other interested person may appeal the decision of the Hearing Officer regarding the project to the Regional Planning Commission. **If you wish to appeal the decision of the Hearing Officer to the Regional Planning Commission, you must do so in writing and pay the appropriate fee.** The appeal form is available on the Department of Regional Planning website (<http://planning.lacounty.gov>). The fee for appeal process is \$5,552.00 for the applicant and \$689.00 for non-applicant(s). Only one fee is required to appeal any portion of the project. If only one of these is appealed, the entire project is considered appealed and will be heard concurrently at the appeal public hearing. To initiate the appeal, submit your appeal letter and a check made payable to the "County of Los Angeles" to Commission Services, Room 1350, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012. Please be advised that your appeal will be rejected if the check is not submitted with the letter.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. Ramon Cordova of the Land Divisions Section of the Department of Regional Planning at (213) 974-6433 between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Our offices are closed Fridays.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
Richard J. Bruckner
Director

Susan Tae, AICP, Supervising Regional Planner
Land Divisions Section

SMT:rec

Enclosures: Findings

c: Subdivision Committee
Gilbert Engineering Company

**FINDINGS OF THE HEARING OFFICER
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROJECT NO. 95074-(5)
TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 24294**

1. The Hearing Officer of Los Angeles County, Mr. Mitch Glaser, considered Tentative Parcel Map No. 24294 ("PM 24294") on November 2, 2010. PM 24294 was considered concurrently with Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") Case No. 96009.
2. PM 24294 is a proposal to create three single-family parcels on 0.80 acres. The subject site is located at 3089 North Casitas Avenue, Altadena, within the Altadena Zoned District.
3. OTP Case No. 96099 is a related request to allow the encroachment into the protected zone of one oak tree.
4. The project was filed on April 26, 1995. The Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee ("Subdivision Committee") last met on May 22, 1995 to discuss the project. Several holds were placed on the project, including a request for a revised tentative map depicting private driveway and fire lane and access gate. The requested materials were never submitted and no activity has occurred on the project since that time. The last time extension for this project was granted by the Director of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") on February 4, 2002.
5. Since the applicant failed to provide the requested information and/or materials, there is insufficient information to determine the feasibility of the project design, general plan consistency or whether approval of the map would be in the public interest, pursuant to Section 21.40.160 (Advisory Agency Determination Authority) of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"). Because of this, the Subdivision Committee is unable to recommend a final action to the Advisory Agency.
6. Staff sent a letter to the applicant dated August 2, 2010 informing the applicant that pursuant to Section 21.16.060 (Public Hearings) and Section 21.40.110 (Matters Required to Complete Submittal and Filing) of the County Code, the case would be scheduled before a Hearing Officer for denial due to inactivity on November 2, 2010.
7. The August 2, 2010 letter also directed the applicant to contact Regional Planning staff within 30 days for the project to remain active, the applicant was also required to provide a revision to the tentative map and/or other requested information within 90 days of the date of the August 2, 2010 letter.

8. The applicant or engineer did not contact staff within the given time frame which was by September 2, 2010 (or submit the requested materials which was by November 2, 2010).
9. During the November 2, 2010 Hearing Officer public meeting, staff made a brief presentation summarizing the process for denial of a project due to inactivity.
10. During the November 2, 2010 Hearing Officer public meeting, the project applicant was not present. There were no testifiers in support of or in opposition to the project.
11. During the November 2, 2010 Hearing Officer public meeting, the Hearing Officer denied Tentative Parcel Map No. 24294 due to inactivity.

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact presented above, Tentative Parcel Map No. 24294 is DENIED.

DRAFT

**FINDINGS OF THE HEARING OFFICER
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROJECT NO. 95074-(5)
OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 96009**

1. The Hearing Officer of Los Angeles County, Mr. Mitch Glaser, considered Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") Case No. 96009 on November 2, 2010. OTP Case No. 96009 was considered concurrently with Tentative Parcel Map No. 24294 ("PM 24294").
2. OTP Case No. 96009 is a request to allow the encroachment into the protected zone of one oak tree. The subject site is located at 3089 North Casitas Avenue, Altadena within Altadena Zoned District.
3. PM 24294 is a related request to create three single-family parcels on 0.80 acres.
4. The project was filed on April 26, 1995. The Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee ("Subdivision Committee") last met on May 22, 1995 to discuss the project. Several holds were placed on the project, including a request for a revised tentative map depicting private driveway and fire lane and access gate. The requested materials were never submitted and no activity has occurred on the project since that time. The last time extension for this project was granted by the Director of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") on February 4, 2002.
5. Since the applicant failed to provide the requested information and/or materials, there is insufficient information to determine the feasibility of the project design, general plan consistency, or whether approval of the map would be in the public interest, pursuant to Section 22.56.060 (Denial For Lack Of Information) of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"). Because of this, the Subdivision Committee is unable to recommend a final action to the Advisory Agency.
6. Staff sent a letter to the applicant dated August 2, 2010, informing the applicant that pursuant to Section 22.56.060 (Denial For Lack Of Information) of the County Code, the case would be scheduled before a Hearing Officer for denial due to inactivity on November 2, 2010.
7. The August 2, 2010 letter also directed the applicant to contact Regional Planning staff within 30 days for the project to remain active. If the project is to remain active, the applicant was also required to provide a revision to the tentative map and/or other requested information within 90 days of the date of the August 2, 2010 letter.

8. The applicant or engineer did not contact staff within the given time frame which was by September 2, 2010 (or submitted the requested materials by November 2, 2010).
9. During the November 2, 2010 Hearing Officer public meeting, staff made a brief presentation summarizing the process for denial of a project due to inactivity.
10. During the November 2, 2010 Hearing Officer public meeting, the project applicant was not present. There were no testifiers in support of or in opposition to the project.
11. During the November 2, 2010 Hearing Officer public meeting, the Hearing Officer denied Oak Tree Permit Case No. 96009 due to inactivity.

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact presented above, Oak Tree Permit Case No. 96009 is DENIED.

DRAFT