



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Richard J. Bruckner
Director

January 28, 2016

TO: Stephanie Pincett, Chair
Doug Smith, Vice Chair
David W. Louie, Commissioner
Curt Pedersen, Commissioner
Pat Modugno, Commissioner

FROM: Tyler Montgomery 
Land Divisions Section

**SUBJECT: PROJECT NO. R2014-02680-(5)
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 073065
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 201400126
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201400215
February 10, 2016 Continued Public Hearing
Agenda Item No. 7**

The above project is a proposal by the applicant, KB Home, to create one commercial lot and one residential condominium lot with 175 condo units on 14.5 gross (12.4 net) acres. The applicant is also requesting a conditional use permit ("CUP") for the development of residential townhomes in the C-2 (Neighborhood Business) Zone.

At the previous public hearing on November 4, 2015, the applicant requested that the public hearing be continued to February 10, 2016. This was to allow time for the applicant to meet with several local homeowners' associations ("HOAs"), as numerous area residents had expressed concern regarding the project. The applicant also proposed to prepare a market analysis regarding the viability of developing the entire site with commercial uses.

Since the distribution of the previous report, Regional Planning staff has received five (5) additional letters from area residents regarding the above project. All of these letters oppose the project, the most common reasons for which include the incompatibility of condominiums in a single-family residential neighborhood, the creation of traffic, and the desire that the land be developed in accordance with its commercial zoning. These letters are attached.

Staff has also received a letter from the applicant's representative, Mr. Aaron Clark (attached), requesting that the project be taken off calendar. The applicant has not yet scheduled the requested meetings, and a detailed market analysis is still in the process of being prepared. Further, the applicant may change the design of the project in response to the information received during this process, in which case it would need to return to Subdivision Committee for review.

Because these events are likely to take several months, staff concurs with the applicant's request to remove the project from the hearing calendar. When all is ready, a new public hearing notice will be sent out, and the project will return to the Commission.

**PROJECT NO. R2014-02680-(5)
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 073065
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 201400126**

**UPDATE MEMO
JANUARY 28, 2016
PAGE 2 of 2**

Enclosed:

Letter from Mr. Aaron Clark, applicant's representative (01/27/16)

Five (5) letters of opposition from area residents

01/28/16

KKS:TM

ARMBRUSTER GOLDSMITH & DELVAC LLP

LAND USE ENTITLEMENT □ LITIGATION □ MUNICIPAL ADVOCACY

AARON P. CLARK

12100 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 1600
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025

Tel: (310) 209-8800
Fax: (310) 209-8801

E-MAIL:
Aaron@AGD-LandUse.com

WEB: www.AGD-LandUse.com

January 27, 2016

Via E-Mail

Tyler Montgomery, AICP
Senior Regional Planning Assistant
Land Divisions Section
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

Re: Request for the Regional Planning Commission to take County Project No. R2014-02680-(5) off its public hearing calendar for subsequent re-noticing

Dear Mr. Montgomery:

As you know, our law firm represents Monteverde Development Company (owner of the 12.4-net-acre subject property) and KB HOME (the project "applicant"), collectively hereinafter referred to as "client", in the above-captioned matter, which pertains to a development application filed with your department requesting the Regional Planning Commission's ("RPC") approval of a Vesting Tentative Tract Map to create one 10.48-net-acre residential condominium lot ("Lot 1") and one 1.9-net-acre commercial lot ("Lot 2") on a previously-graded, predominately flat, vacant parcel of land located on Plum Canyon Road, between La Madrid Drive and Farrell Road, in unincorporated Saugus. Our client is also requesting a conditional use permit to develop Lot 1 with 175 for-sale, market-rate townhome units in the C-2 (Neighborhood Business) Zone. Lot 2 (the commercial lot) will be developed subsequent to the residential site. It is anticipated Lot 2 would be developed with neighborhood-serving commercial use under a separate development application. As proposed, the project is consistent with the One Valley One Vision Plan, underlying zoning and related development criteria for the site.

The initial public hearing for this case was conducted by the RPC on November 4, 2015, at the conclusion of which the RPC moved to continue the public hearing to February 10, 2016. The continuance was granted by the RPC at our client's request, in order to provide the development team adequate time to address community concerns and to better educate residents in the project vicinity regarding the proposed project, its consistency with County planning criteria, goals and policies and the project's overall benefits. The continuance was also granted to allow our client time to cause a retail market feasibility study to be prepared, the primary purpose of which is to analyze the feasibility of a larger-scale community shopping center (containing up to 150,000 sq. ft. of retail) being developed on the site, either today or in the

future. For the reasons outlined below, at the February 10th continued public hearing, we respectfully request that the RPC act to remove this item from its public hearing calendar and that the project be subsequently re-noticed for a public hearing before the RPC at a future date.

Robert Charles Lesser & Co. Real Estate Advisors (“RCLCO,” a prominent real estate advisory firm) is in the process of finalizing a comprehensive Retail Market Feasibility Analysis for the site. RCLCO is also busy analyzing the jobs-housing balance implications of the proposed project and is studying the feasibility of potentially including “creative office” use within the approximate 2-acre portion of the site that is being reserved for future commercial development. It is anticipated these analyses will be completed in the near term, though likely not before the February 10th continued hearing date. Once completed, our client’s team will perform outreach regarding the project and RCLCO’s analyses to both the City of Santa Clarita (which has written a letter to the County expressing concerns regarding our client’s proposal to develop the majority of the site with residential townhomes in lieu of commercial uses) and to several HOA’s located nearby the project site, some members of which have also expressed concerns regarding the proposed project. So that we may complete these tasks, rather than have the RPC yet again continue this item at the February 10th continued public hearing, we believe it is prudent for the matter to be taken off the RPC’s hearing calendar, so that it can be re-noticed to the public once the above-described economic analyses have been completed and the necessary outreach has been performed.

Please accept this letter as our client’s formal request to have the RPC remove this item from its public hearing calendar at its February 10, 2016, continued public hearing, and that the project be subsequently re-noticed for a public hearing before the RPC at a future date, pending our client’s completion of the above-described tasks.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should wish to discuss this request.

Sincerely,



Aaron P. Clark,

Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac LLP

cc: Edel Vizcarra, Planning Deputy, 5th District

Tyler Montgomery

From: Wes Donahue [wesdonahue@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2016 3:21 PM
To: Tyler Montgomery
Subject: RE: TR073065 Update Memo

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Categories: Hearing correspondence

Dear Mr. Montgomery,

I am writing to inform you that, since the Nov. 4th planning commission meeting, there has been no communication (that I'm aware of) to either individual homeowners or our respective HOAs from KB Homes representatives regarding TR 073065. The next hearing is scheduled on Feb 10, 2016. Additionally, we have not seen any updates regarding the commercial feasibility analysis that was supposed to be prepared on behalf of KB Homes by Real Estate Advisors Co.

We want to be sure all area residents have the opportunity to become aware of the condo proposal and get a chance to respond with their concerns. As such, we are inquiring as to the possibility of hearing being held at the Santa Clarita Office of the Regional Planning Commission at 23757 Valencia Boulevard so that more residents might be able to attend.

Any updated information you may have would be appreciated.
Best regards,
Wes Donahue

From: Tyler Montgomery [<mailto:tmontgomery@planning.lacounty.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 3:55 PM
To: Aaron Clark <aaron@agd-landuse.com>
Cc: David Koontz <DKOONTZ@santa-clarita.com>; Wes Donahue <wesdonahue@gmail.com>
Subject: TR073065 Update Memo

An update memo regarding TR 073065 (Plum Canyon condos) was distributed to the Regional Planning Commission this afternoon. It is available on our department's web page at the link below:

http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/case/tr073065_rpc-memo_20151029.pdf

Sincerely,

Tyler Montgomery, AICP
Senior Regional Planning Assistant
Land Divisions Section
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles CA 90012
(213) 974-6433

Tyler Montgomery

From: Alex and Larisa Kaplinovsky [akkiev@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 11:17 AM
To: Tyler Montgomery
Subject: new condos

Categories: Hearing correspondence

Dear Mr. Montgomery

Please stop building condos in Plum Canyon area. Plum canyon is the main street for everyone to leave in case of fire or other disaster and if we have more traffic on the top the one we already have it will end up badly. In the fire we had in 2008, I think, when Sand canyon and Whites Canyon burned, I know for a fact, a lot of people that lived in this area at that time couldn't get out from here because Plum canyon was packed with cars and wasn't moving. My friends had to stay home with small children and watch fire burning behind their backyard fence. A lot of homes were built in the area since that time and traffic got much worse. And you want even more condos to come here. For many of these residents Plum canyon is still the only way to evacuate. With new condos in the area, God help us if fire as bad as last time comes. And in here it is very much possible. Think about what can happen before adding more condos or homes here. Are you really going to be responsible for what can happen. Also we can use some restaurants and stores in the area.

With respect

The current resident of Plum canyon area.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Tyler Montgomery

From: Jess Segovia [segovia702@icloud.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2015 6:28 PM
To: Tyler Montgomery
Subject: Opposition to KB's plans to build condos in plum canyon

Categories: Hearing correspondence

My wife and I are homeowners at 19433 Graham Lane. We strongly oppose KB's efforts to construct condos in the land currently zoned for businesses. La Madrid cannot handle the dozens of cars that would be parking there should condos be built. The streets around the condos and townhomes across plum canyon are always overflowing with cars. Given that there is no parking on plum canyon, they would all have to park on la Madrid and neighboring streets.

We purchased our home with the full understanding that businesses would be constructed there. We may have chosen to purchase in Valencia otherwise.

In addition, KB has stopped maintaining that piece of land; as it had been sprayed regularly to prevent brush growth. The brush is now growing there. It is no longer a well kept piece of land.

Please us know when the next public hearing will be. We will be in attendance.

Thanks,

Jess Segovia and Larika Clark

Tyler Montgomery

From: jandjhollander@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 7:27 AM
To: Tyler Montgomery
Subject: Condos on Plum cyn

Categories: Hearing correspondence

Dear Mr. Montgomery,

I'm writing this email in opposition to KB's plan to build condos on Plum Canyon road in Saugus. Currently I live on the corner house on Castille Ln. and La Madrid. My backyard backs up to Plum canyon and most of the day I can not open my windows and enjoy the fresh air because of the traffic noise. This has been something that has bothered me since I have lived here, however I have accepted the fact that I live on a busy road. Now KB intends on building more condos near an already saturated community. These condos will bring hundreds of new cars using Plum canyon. This will no doubtably produce more traffic noise, pollution, and congestion. It takes me 15 minutes in the morning to drive to Saugus High School, to drop off a student via bouquet canyon, which is only 2.8 miles away. This would prove that Bouquet canyon can not handle any more traffic. Another issue is that there are already town homes across the street and apartment homes 2 blocks away. The condo residents across the street seem to find it convenient to park in front of my home and walk across Plum canyon because they are not given enough parking spaces. This creates problems for the residents on Castille street that want to have guests over. If KB builds condos, I guarantee they will not give the condo residents enough parking spaces. This will force them to park in front of other homes. I know this may not be a huge deal to some, but picture over the weekend having cars parked in front of your house for days at a time without moving.

I have lived in this valley since 1978 and my family and I enjoy living here in Saugus. When we moved to our new home 2 years ago, it was with the understanding that there were just going to be single family homes along with some retail stores and/or a park built in this location. Condominiums were not part of this development. We would very much want it to stay this way.

Thanks for taking the time to read my email.

Respectfully,

John Hollander

19402 Castille Ln
Saugus, CA 91350
661-993-7955

Tyler Montgomery

From: Ryan Drake [famous58@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 3:50 PM
To: Tyler Montgomery
Subject: No Condos in Plum Canyon Ranch

Categories: Hearing correspondence

Dear Mr. Montgomery,

I am writing today to voice my opposition for the Plum Canyon condo project (R2014-02680 / TR 073065). As a resident of the St. Clare community, my home is located directly adjacent to this project. One of the reasons I purchased this home was due to the zoned and proposed commercial services that would be available within in walking distance of my home. With the proposed rezoning and massive reduction of the commercial area, the options will be severely limited, to the size of one store instead of multiple stores, small business and restaurants. In addition, residential parking in the area is already at capacity. While codes allow for a certain number of spaces those codes include garage parking. We all know that no one parks in their garages, which forces tenants of condos to park in surrounding areas and creates a nightmare for surrounding homeowners. I know this as I currently live next to a large condo complex and this is a continued issue. So much so that the county recently revised restrictions along Heller Circle to allow parking.

I respectfully request that the Regional Planning Commission deny this land use change and support the long-term interest of my community.

Thank you for your consideration,
Ryan Drake
St. Clare Resident