August 3, 2011

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 383
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 200700002
ZONE CHANGE NO. 200700004
MOBILEHOME PERMIT NO. 201000003
PARKING PERMIT NO. 200800002
HOUSING PERMIT NO. 201000001
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 200700073
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 068400
APPLICANT: PRIME ENTERPRISES, LLC
900 S. SAN GABRIEL BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN GABRIEL, CA 91776
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT
FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (3-VOTE)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. Instruct County Counsel to prepare the necessary documents to approve General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and Zone Change No. 200700004, as recommended by the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission").

3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare the necessary findings to affirm the Commission's approval of Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, CUP No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.
PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

- Update the land use category and zoning on the subject property to allow the property owner to develop the property with multi-family condominium residences that are compatible with the existing surrounding uses, and allow market-rate and senior housing to be located closer to existing services, facilities, infrastructure and employment.

- Establish development standards that ensure future development on the subject property will be compatible with the goals and policies of the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan ("General Plan").

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

Fiscal Responsibility

The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Mobilehome Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map promote the goal of fiscal responsibility. The proposed residential development, located in an urban revitalization area, will efficiently utilize existing infrastructure investments and reduce the demand for extension of linear utilities and infrastructure to undeveloped land located on or beyond the urban fringe.

Improving Quality of Life

The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Mobilehome Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map also promote the County’s vision for improving the quality of life in Los Angeles County. The project allows for the redevelopment of an aging and nearly vacant mobile home park with 318-unit multi-family residential development with several amenities such as senior housing, a pool, playground, village green and community center. The project will result in a high-quality residential development that will overall improve the value and quality of life of the community.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Mobile Home Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map should not result in any new significant costs to the County, as the owner is bearing the full costs of new development and construction. No request for financing is being made.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

On October 20, 2010, the Commission conducted a public hearing on General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Parking Permit No. 200800002, CUP No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. The requests before the
Commission were to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre); change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Units Per Net Acre – Development Program); consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report; allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing within the proposed development; a Development Program overlay zone, with modifications to setbacks, building height, walls and fence height; and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined outfall; shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots; and the creation of six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings). On October 20, 2010, the Commission voted 5-0 to close the public hearing, adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, approve the Mobilehome Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map, and recommend to the Board approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change.

Pursuant to subsection C of Section 21.56.010 and subsection B.2 of Section 22.60.230 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"), the Mobilehome Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map are deemed to be called for review/appealed by your Board and shall be considered concurrently with the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change. A public hearing is required pursuant to Sections 22.16.200 and 22.60.240 of the County Code and Sections 65856 and 66452.5 of the Government Code. Notice of the hearing must be given pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. These procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090 and 65856 relating to notice of public hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et.seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. In accordance with State and County Environmental Quality guidelines, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") was prepared for this project, as the project will have less than significant or no impacts on the environment with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Notice is hereby given that the County of Los Angeles will consider a recommendation to adopt a MND. Based on the adoption of the MND, approval of the General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Mobilehome Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP and Vesting Tentative Tract Map will not have a significant impact on the environment.
IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Action on the proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Mobilehome Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP and Vesting Tentative Tract Map is not expected to have a negative impact on current services.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
Richard J. Bruckner

RJB:SA:SMT:jds

Attachments: Commission Resolutions, Findings and Conditions; Environmental Determination; Commission Staff Report and Correspondence; Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Exhibit “A”, Floor Plans and Elevations, Land Use Map

C: County Counsel
   Assessor
   Director, Department of Public Works
   Director, Department of Regional Planning
A RESOLUTION OF THE
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
RELATING TO GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 200700002

WHEREAS, Article 6 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California (commencing with Section 65350) provides for adoption of amendments to county general plans; and

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") has conducted a public hearing regarding General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 on October 20, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 is a request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

5. Zone Change No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

6. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

7. Parking Permit No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.
8. Housing Permit No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

9. CUP No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

(Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

10. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit, mobilehome permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board
of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.

12. The applicant's site plan, labeled Exhibit "A", depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A
16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   • North: Single-family residences
   • East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
   • South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
   • West: Single-family residences

17. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

18. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

19. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

20. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobilehome park closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

21. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobilehome park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include “community gardens” and “office park” features.
22. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and the applicant. During the hearing, the applicant presented the following points:

- Project replaces an "obsolete" mobilehome park
- Project provides a "campus-like" environment with many amenities
- Senior housing set-aside will allow seniors to remain in neighborhood
- Project design/access will direct traffic away from neighborhood streets
- Project reviewed by the Monrovia School District
- Paying an overall $2.6 million in developer fees and an estimated $900,000 per year in property taxes
- Current design reflects input gathered from several neighborhood meetings; reduced building heights and removed windows to improve privacy
- Reviewed by County environmental staff and the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), no significant impacts found
- Project falls within the proposed CEQA CO₂ (carbon emissions) standard for new development projects

In addition, opposing testimony was heard from three residents, who cited the following concerns:

- Overall environmental impacts (traffic, air, noise, aesthetic)
- Lack of community compatibility (overall size, building height)
- Approval will induce other mobilehome parks to be closed and redeveloped
- Project will reduce/eliminate privacy; should be redesigned with "one-story units"
- MND is insufficient; does not address "greenhouse gases"; MND is inappropriate for size and scale of project
- Plan amendment and zone change are inappropriate; not in the public health safety and general welfare

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development. The Commission asked County Counsel to clarify if the project should have completed an Environmental Impact Report or MND, to which County Counsel responded that the development reflected an MND. The Commission also indicated that it is "disappointed" to see a mobilehome park closed, and that mobilehome parks need to be "kept in the community". However, the Commission also stated that the developer "listened to the community" in designing the project and that it can be a "leadership project" for the community.

24. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004.
25. The plan amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. The plan amendment allows a project that promotes urban revitalization, increases the supply and diversity of housing, increases the supply of senior housing, and promotes the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development.

26. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.

27. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit “A”.

28. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related zone change, parking permit, CUP, and subdivision.

29. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

30. The recommended plan amendment is needed in order to fulfill and implement General Plan policies to provide high-quality multi-family and senior housing in older urban neighborhoods.

31. The particular amendment is appropriate and proper because the proposed location of the development efficiently utilizes existing infrastructure and services, is compatible with surrounding uses, and will improve the quality of the neighborhood.

32. Modified conditions warrant a revision to the General Plan. The area in question is in need of urban revitalization and conversion of a mostly vacant mobilehome park to a more beneficial land use.

33. Approval of the proposed plan amendment is in the best interest of the public health, safety and general welfare, as the area contains and/or the project proposes sufficient infrastructure and facilities to accommodate the development, to include street improvements, water supply, sewer connection, fire flow and fire access. The development is in conformity with good planning practices, as the development is necessary in order to fulfill General Plan goals related to urban revitalization and senior housing.

34. The plan amendment to Category 3 will allow new major development and investment in an older urbanized area in need of revitalization. Although adjacent portions along Live Oak Avenue are designated Category 1, most of the land uses along the north side of this corridor are commercial and not residential. Thus, the higher density is proposed adjacent to more intensive uses compatible with the proposed development. The project supports General Plan policy for increased multi-family housing in closer proximity to
existing services and facilities, such as auto repair, offices, a furniture store, public library, restaurant and other retail businesses. Furthermore, the project supports general policy direction to direct new development "in a more concentrated urban pattern" away from undeveloped areas where growth is less appropriate (see General Goals, p. G-12, and Open Space Element, p. OS-1). Lastly, no significant environmental impacts are anticipated, and potential impacts will be reduced to less than significant with appropriate project mitigation measures.

35. The applicant has satisfied the "Burden of Proof" for the requested plan amendment.

36. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP").

37. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

38. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

39. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

1. Hold a public hearing to consider the above recommended general plan amendment; and

2. Certify that the MND has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and the State and County Guidelines related thereto and reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and
3. Approve the MND and MMP prepared for the project and certify that it has reviewed and considered the information contained therein; and

4. Find that the recommended general plan amendment is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan; and

5. Adopt General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 amending the Land Use Policy Map of the General Plan as depicted on the Exhibit attached hereto and described hereinabove.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted unanimously by the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on October 20, 2010.

[Signature]
Rosie O. Ruiz
Commission Secretary
County of Los Angeles
Regional Planning Commission
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 1: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 144 AND 145, ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 18 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE E'LY LINE OF LOT 3 OF TRACT NO. 14525, AS SHOWN ON A MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 300, PAGE 29 AND 30 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY, SAID POINT BEING THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF SAID E'LY LINE WITH A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT NLY 250', MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE NLY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE, 100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15099, RECORDED IN BOOK 319, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY;

1. N.00° 14' 23"W. 630.34'
2. S.89° 45' 20"E. 734.04'
3. S.° 09' 27"E. 515.10' TO THE INTERSECTION WITH A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT NLY 250', MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE NLY LINE OF SAID LIVE OAK AVENUE
4. S.80° 40' 38"W. 438.62' TO A POINT DISTANT N.80° 40' 38"E. 20.25' FROM THE MOST WLY CORNER OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO SONES & FITZPATRICK, INC., A CORPORATION, AND DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED ON JUNE 8, 1949, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 132, IN BOOK 30256, PAGE 39, OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY
5. S.00° 14' 23"E. 253.07' TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE NLY LINE OF SAID LIVE OAK AVENUE
6. S.80° 49' 38"W. 81' TO THE SE CORNER OF LOT 5, OF TRACT NO. 14718, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY

CONTINUE TO PAGE 2.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: 'ZCOZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

PARCEL 1:
⑦ N.00° 14' 23"W. 253.07' TO THE NE CORNER OF SAID LOT
⑧ S.80° 49' 38"W. 222.68' TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.
AMENDMENT TO COUNTYWIDE GENERAL PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA COMMUNITY
PLAN AMENDMENT: 2007-00002
ON:
CATEGORY 1 TO CATEGORY 3
(PROPOSED: MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 12-22 DU/AC)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 2: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, 4 AND 5 OF TRACT NO. 14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS A WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST N'LY NWLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 2;
  1 S.00° 14' 23"E. 81.48'
  2—N.80° 49' 38"E. 20.25'
  3—S.0° 14' 23"E. 19.75'
  4—N.80° 49' 38"E. 106.85'
  5—S.09° 10' 22"E. 150'
  6—N.80° 49' 38"E. 70'
  7—N.0° 14' 23"W. 253.07'
  8—S.80° 49' 38"W. 222.68' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

LEGEND:
- PARCELS
- STREET / RIGHT OF WAY
- LOT LINE
- CUT DEED LINE
- EASEMENT LINE
- ZONE CHANGE AREA
- NAP NOT A PART

COUNTY ZONING MAP
150H281

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: C2C22D_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 3: THAT PORTION OF LOT 145 OF ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 18 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE N'LY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE, 100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15099, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 319, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT IS S.60° 49' 38"W. 387.53' FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE E'LY LINE OF MAYFLOWER AVENUE, 80' WIDE AS SHOWN ON MAP OF SAID TRACT NO. 155099;

1. N.00° 14' 23"W. 253.07'
2. S.60° 49' 38"W. 50.63'
3. S.00° 14' 23"E. 253.07'
4. N.60° 49' 38"E. 50.63' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
AMENDMENT TO COUNTYWIDE GENERAL PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA COMMUNITY
PLAN AMENDMENT: 2007-00002
ON:
CATEGORY 1 TO CATEGORY 3
(PROPOSED: MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 12-22 DU/AC)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 4: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, AND 4 OF TRACT NO. 14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS A WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST WLY LINE OF SAID LOT 2, DISTANT THEREON 5.09' 10'' 22'E. 30.00' FROM THE S'LY LINE OF THE ALLEY SHOWN ON SAID MAP;

1. N.09° 10' 22"W. 30.00'
2. N.80° 49' 38"E. 38.00'
3. N.0° 14' 23"W. 20.25'
4. N.80° 49' 38"E. 108.85'
5. S.09° 10' 22"E. 50.00' TO A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID N'LY LINE AND ELY PROLIFERATION THEREOF THAT PAsses THROUGH THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
6. S.80° 49' 38"W. 150.00' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF SAID ALLEY LYING E'LY OF A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH THE ELY LINE OF SAID ALLEY AND WHICH PAsses THROUGH A POINT IN THE S'LY LINE DISTANT WLY THEREON 25' FROM THE S'LY CORNER OF SAID PORTION WAS VACATED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, A CERTIFIED COPY OF WHICH WAS RECORDED ON JUNE 28, 1956, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 4448, IN BOOK 51557, PAGE 68, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: 1ZC01ZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
A RESOLUTION OF THE
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
RELATING TO ZONE CHANGE NO. 200700004

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") has conducted a public hearing regarding Zone Change No. 200700004, General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 on October 20, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. Zone Change No. 200700004 is a request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

5. General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

7. Parking Permit No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

8. Housing Permit No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.
9. Conditional Use Permit No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

(Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

10. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit mobilehome permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.
12. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit “A”, depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing onsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   • North: R-A
   • East: R-A, C-3
   • South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   • West: R-A

16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   • North: Single-family residences
   • East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
17. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
   - South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
   - West: Single-family residences

18. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

19. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from “cut-through” traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would “reduce property values” and “increase emergency vehicle activity”, respectively.

20. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

21. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobilehome closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

22. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobilehome park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased...
traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and the applicant. During the hearing, the applicant presented the following points:
   - Project replaces an "obsolete" mobilehome park
   - Project provides a "campus-like" environment with many amenities
   - Senior housing set-aside will allow seniors to remain in neighborhood
   - Project design/access will direct traffic away from neighborhood streets
   - Project reviewed by the Monrovia School District
   - Paying an overall $2.6 million in developer fees and an estimated $900,000 per year in property taxes
   - Current design reflects input gathered from several neighborhood meetings; reduced building heights and removed windows to improve privacy
   - Reviewed by County environmental staff and the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), no significant impacts found
   - Project falls within the proposed CEQA CO₂ (carbon emissions) standard for new development projects

In addition, opposing testimony was heard from three residents, who cited the following concerns:
   - Overall environmental impacts (traffic, air, noise, aesthetic)
   - Lack of community compatibility (overall size, building height)
   - Approval will induce other mobilehome parks to be closed and redeveloped
   - Project will reduce/eliminate privacy; should be redesigned with "one-story units"
   - MND is insufficient; does not address "greenhouse gases"; MND is inappropriate for size and scale of project
   - Plan amendment and zone change are inappropriate; not in the public health safety and general welfare

24. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development. The Commission asked County Counsel to clarify if the project should have completed an Environmental Impact Report or MND, to which County Counsel responded that the development reflected an MND. The Commission also indicated that it is "disappointed" to see a mobilehome park closed, and that mobilehome parks need to be "kept in the community". However, the Commission also stated that the developer "listened to the community" in designing the project and that it can be a "leadership project" for the community.

25. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the
Board approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004.

26. The zone change is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. The zone change allows a project that promotes urban revitalization, increases the supply and diversity of housing, increases the supply of senior housing, and promotes the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development.

27. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.

28. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit “A”.

29. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related plan amendment, parking permit, CUP, and subdivision.

30. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

31. The recommended zone change is needed in order to fulfill and implement General Plan policies to provide high-quality multi-family and senior housing in older urban neighborhoods.

32. The particular zone change is appropriate and proper because the proposed location of the development efficiently utilizes existing infrastructure and services, is compatible with surrounding uses, and will improve the quality of the neighborhood.

33. Modified conditions warrant a zone change. The area in question is in need of urban revitalization and conversion of a mostly vacant mobilehome park to a more beneficial land use.

34. Approval of the proposed zone change is in the best interest of the public health, safety and general welfare, as the area contains and/or the project proposes sufficient infrastructure and facilities to accommodate the development, to include street improvements, water supply, sewer connection, fire flow and fire access. The development is in conformity with good planning practices, as the development is necessary in order to fulfill General Plan goals related to urban revitalization and senior housing.

35. The zone change to R-3-22U-DP will facilitate needed urban revitalization by allowing attached multi-family residences to be constructed. The proposed zoning is consistent with neighboring C-3 zoning to the south (a comparable intensity of use). The 2.3 acres
of existing R-3-P zoning on the property is of the same intensity as the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning, and this area will contain a significant portion of the larger multi-family buildings being proposed. This demonstrates a thoughtful project design aimed at minimizing neighborhood impacts while at the same time achieving a significant investment in the community. Lastly, the DP-CUP required with the zone change will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area.

36. The applicant has satisfied the “Burden of Proof” for the requested zone change.

37. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) (“CEQA”), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (“MMP”).

38. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

39. This project does not have “no effect” on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

40. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission’s decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (“Regional Planning”), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

1. Hold a public hearing to consider the above recommended zone change; and

2. Certify that the MND has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and the State and County Guidelines related thereto and reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and
3. Approve the MND and MMP prepared for the project and certify that it has reviewed and considered the information contained therein; and

4. Find that the recommended zone change is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan; and

5. Adopt Zone Change No. 200700004 amending the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance as depicted on the Exhibit attached hereto and described herein above.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted unanimously by the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on October 20, 2010.

[Signature]
Rosie O. Ruiz
Commission Secretary
County of Los Angeles
Regional Planning Commission
CHANGE OF PRECISE PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT

ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE:

ON:

ZONING CASE: ZC 200700004

AMENDING SECTION: 22.16.230 OF THE COUNTY CODE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 1: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 144 AND 145, ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 18 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE E'LY LINE OF LOT 3 OF TRACT NO. 14528, AS SHOWN ON A MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 29, PAGE 412, OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY, SAID POINT BEING THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF SAID E'LY LINE WITH A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT N'LLY 250', MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE N'LLY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE, 100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15099, RECORDED IN BOOK 319, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY;

1. N.00° 14' 23"W. 630.34'
2. N.89° 45' 20"E. 734.04'
3. S.0° 27' 27"E. 515.10'
4. S.80° 40' 38"W. 438.82'
5. S.80° 40' 38"W. 253.07'
6. S.80° 49' 38"W. 81'

CONTINUE TO PAGE 2.
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CHANGE OF PRECISE PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT

ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE: ____________________________
ON: ____________________________
ZONING CASE: ZC 200700004

AMENDING SECTION: 22.16.230 OF THE COUNTY CODE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1
PARCEL 1:

7. N.00° 14' 23"W. 253.07' TO THE NE CORNER OF SAID LOT
8. S.80° 49' 38"W. 222.66' TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

LEGEND:
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RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
CHANGE OF PRECISE PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT

ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE: ___________________________

ON: ___________________________

ZONING CASE: ZC 200700004

AMENDING SECTION: 22.16.230 OF THE COUNTY CODE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 2: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, 4 AND 5 OF TRACT NO. 14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS A WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST NLY NWLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 2:

1. S. 00° 14' 23" E. 81.48'
2. N. 80° 49' 38" E. 20.25'
3. S. 0° 14' 23" E. 19.75'
4. N. 80° 49' 38" E. 108.85'
5. S. 09° 10' 22" E. 150'
6. N. 80° 49' 38" E. 70'
7. N. 0° 14' 23" W. 253.07'
8. S. 80° 49' 38" W. 222.68' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: ZCOIZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 3: THAT PORTION OF LOT 145 OF ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 18 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE N'LY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE, 100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15099, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 319, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT IS S.80° 49' 38"W. 387.53' FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE W'LY LINE OF MAYFLOWER AVENUE, 80' WIDE AS SHOWN ON MAP OF SAID TRACT NO. 155099;

1. N.00° 14' 23"W. 253.07'
2. S.80° 49' 38"W. 50.63'
3. S.00° 14' 23"E. 253.07'
4. N.80° 49' 38"E. 50.63' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 4: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, AND 4 OF TRACT NO. 14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS A WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST WLY LINE OF SAID LOT 2, DISTANT THEREOF S.09° 10' 22"E. 30.00' FROM THE S'LY LINE OF THE ALLEY SHOWN ON SAID MAP;
1. N.09° 10' 22"W. 30.00'
2. N.80° 49' 38"E. 38.00'
3. N.0° 14' 23"W. 20.25'
4. N.80° 49' 38"E. 108.85'
5. S.09° 10' 22"E. 50.00' TO A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID N'LY LINE AND E'LY PROLATION THEREOF THAT PASSES THROUGH THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
6. S.80° 49' 38"W. 150.00' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF SAID ALLEY LYING E'LY OF A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH THE E'LY LINE OF SAID ALLEY AND WHICH PASSES THROUGH A POINT IN THE S'LY LINE DISTANT WLY THEREON 25' FROM THE SE'LY CORNER OF SAID PORTION WAS VACATED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, A CERTIFIED COPY OF WHICH WAS RECORDED ON JUNE 28, 1956, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 4446, IN BOOK 51597, PAGE 68, OFFICIAL RECORDS.
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1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 on October 20, 2010. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 is a request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR") for the Santa Anita Village mobilehome park ("park"), pursuant to the Section 66427 of the Subdivision Map Act ("Map Act") and Title 8.57.300 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code").

3. The park is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

4. General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

5. Zone Change No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

6. Parking Permit No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

7. Housing Permit No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

8. CUP No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite).

9. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.
10. The owner intends to close the park in conjunction with the approval of the aforementioned land entitlements authorizing a 318-unit multi-family condominium development over the entire 12.1 gross acre park site. Closure of the park will allow the property to be developed according to the conditions of the approved entitlements.

11. Closure of the park requires that the applicant submit a CIR to Regional Planning. The CIR was prepared by Overland, Pacific, & Cutler, Inc. The relocation costs were calculated using the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission ("CDC") guidelines for Mobilehome Park Closure/Conversion, adopted in 1991 by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. The adopted CDC guidelines included information related to relocation benefits. The relocation benefits offered in the CIR were adjusted to reflect 2010 rates of inflation and cost of living increases by using the U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, California Consumer Price Index, which equated to a 59.7 percent increase from the 1991 rates listed in the CDC guidelines.

12. Under a third-party agreement with the County and the applicant, Epic Land Solutions, Inc. ("Epic") was retained to review the CIR and determine its compliance with State and County relocation regulations.

13. Upon review, Epic concluded that the CIR was found to be in compliance with all applicable regulations. In addition, Epic recommended the following:

   a. That photos of coaches that have to be relocated be included in the CIR to help document the conditions of the park prior to closure; and

   b. That additional information on temporary housing be included in the CIR for those households which may have a more difficult time finding a replacement.

These additional requirements and information have been attached in an addendum to the CIR.

14. Staff has reviewed the CIR and found it to be in compliance with State and County regulations. The CIR sufficiently addresses the availability of adequate replacement housing in other mobilehome parks and sufficiently addresses relocation costs for each resident of the mobilehome park. The CIR specifies steps to be taken by management to mitigate any adverse impact of the proposed closure on the residents who will be displaced.

15. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 8.57.300(D)3 of the County Code, the management and residents of the mobilehome park were appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail.

16. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is at the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section of Regional Planning.
BASING ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That the CIR contains all information required by Section 66427 of the Map Act and Title 8.57.300 of the County Code.

B. That upon review of the relocation benefits detailed in the CIR, finds that the benefits proposed are consistent with the County guidelines adopted in 1991.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Approves Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 and the CIR subject to the attached conditions.
CONDITIONS:

The Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park ("park") Closure Impact Report ("CIR") is approved, subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition No. 13. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 2, and Condition Nos. 3 and 4 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.

4. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten (10) days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 2.170.010.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
6. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

8. The permittee or successor in interest shall implement all mitigation measures as specified in the CIR and CIR Addendum, prepared by Overland, Pacific & Cutler, Inc., including but not limited to monetary and advisory assistance. Such mitigation measures are incorporated herein by reference.

9. The permittee or successor in interest shall convert, close, or cease the use of the park within 36 months after the date of final map recordation. If the permittee has failed to convert, close, or cease the use of the park within 36 months, the approval of the impact report shall become null and void. Thereafter, the permittee shall not convert, close or cease the use of the park until such time as a new impact report is approved. However, upon application of the management, filed with the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") on or before the date of expiration, the impact report may be extended by the Commission up to an additional 36 months. An application for an extension shall be subject to the notice and hearing procedures described in subdivision 3 of subsection (D) of Section 8.57.300.

10. Any time prior to the closure of the park, the Commission may, in its discretion, and upon good cause shown, initiate proceedings for the revocation or amendment of a CIR. Good cause may include, but is not limited to, change of circumstances that render the conditions or requirements of the CIR no longer necessary or appropriate, negligent or fraudulent misrepresentation of fact relating to the CIR, or noncompliance with the conditions of the CIR. Prior to revoking or amending a CIR, the Commission shall conduct a hearing in accordance with the procedures set forth in subdivision 3 of subsection (D) of Section 8.57.300. Upon revocation, the permittee or successor in interest shall not convert, close or cease the use of the park until such time as a new CIR is approved. Such revocation or amendment is subject to the same request for hearing as is provided in subdivision 5 of subsection (D) of Section 8.57.300.

11. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

12. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts
necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200 per inspection).

13. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Commission or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

14. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
FINDINGS OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FOR PARKING PERMIT NO. 200800002

1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Parking Permit No. 200800002 on October 20, 2010. Parking Permit No. 200800002 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073, Housing Permit No. 201000001, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

3. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

4. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

5. Parking Permit No. 200800002 is a request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

6. General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential — One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential — 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

7. Zone Change No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence — Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural — 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence — 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre — Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

8. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

9. Housing Permit No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.
10. CUP No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

   (Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

   (Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

   (Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

11. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

12. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit, mobilehome permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.
13. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit “A”, depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a “podium” structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

14. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

15. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

16. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

17. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
• South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
• West: Single-family residences

18. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

19. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

20. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

21. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

22. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and the applicant. During the hearing, the applicant presented the following points:
• Project replaces an "obsolete" mobilehome park
• Project provides a "campus-like" environment with many amenities
• Senior housing set-aside will allow seniors to remain in neighborhood
• Project design/access will direct traffic away from neighborhood streets
• Project reviewed by the Monrovia School District
• Paying an overall $2.6 million in developer fees and an estimated $900,000 per year in property taxes
• Current design reflects input gathered from several neighborhood meetings; reduced building heights and removed windows to improve privacy
• Reviewed by County environmental staff and the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), no significant impacts found
• Project falls within the proposed CEQA CO₂ (carbon emissions) standard for new development projects

In addition, opposing testimony was heard from three residents, who cited the following concerns:
• Overall environmental impacts (traffic, air, noise, aesthetic)
• Lack of community compatibility (overall size, building height)
• Approval will induce other mobilehome parks to be closed and redeveloped
• Project will reduce/eliminate privacy; should be redesigned with "one-story units"
• MND is insufficient; does not address "greenhouse gases"; MND is inappropriate for size and scale of project
• Plan amendment and zone change are inappropriate; not in the public health safety and general welfare

24. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development. The Commission asked County Counsel to clarify if the project should have completed an Environmental Impact Report or MND, to which County Counsel responded that the development reflected an MND. The Commission also indicated that it is "disappointed" to see a mobilehome park closed, and that mobilehome parks need to be "kept in the community". However, the Commission also stated that the developer "listened to the community" in designing the project and that it can be a "leadership project" for the community.

25. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, CUP No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004.

26. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.
27. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit “A”.

28. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related zone change, CUP, and subdivision.

29. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

30. Although three individual lots will not contain the minimum number of parking spaces required within the lot, the overall development will contain more than the required amount of parking. No offsite or shared parking is proposed or required. All required parking will be contained onsite, and designed in such a manner to be conveniently accessible to guests and conducive to a more sensitive project design, that, for example, does not propose large open parking lots or above-ground parking structures within the project site. These factors demonstrate the need of a parking permit to accommodate a well-designed project that minimizes impacts both in the surrounding area and within the development.

31. The applicant has satisfied the “Burden of Proof” for the requested parking permit.

32. The proposed use is subject to the development standards and requirements applicable to the R-3-22U-DP zone, as set forth in Sections 22.20.260 through 22.20.330 of the County Code, as well as the requirements of the DP zone, pursuant to Sections 22.40.030 through 22.40.080 of the County Code.

33. The applicant has submitted an application, site plan, and other information which complies with the requirements of Section 22.56.1010 of the County Code.

34. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) (“CEQA”), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (“MMP”).

35. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a
significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

36. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

37. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That there will be no need for the number of parking spaces required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52;

B. That there will be no conflicts arising from special parking arrangements allowing shared facilities, tandem spaces or compact spaces;

C. That off-site facilities, leases of less than 20 years, rear lot transitional parking lots and uncovered residential parking lots will provide the required parking for uses;

D. That the requested parking permit at the location proposed will not result in traffic congestion, excessive off-site parking or unauthorized use of parking facilities developed to serve surrounding property; and

E. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this ordinance.

 THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a parking permit as set forth in Sections 22.56.1020 and 22.56.1060, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

 THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Parking Permit No. 200800002 is approved, subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission.
CONDITIONS:

This grant authorizes shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots as shown on the Exhibit "A" dated January 7, 2009.

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition No. 9, 20 and 22. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 2, and Condition Nos. 3, 4 and 20 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.

4. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten (10) days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

   a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

   b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 2.170.010.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
6. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

8. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

9. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200 per inspection).

10. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

11. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.

12. The subject property shall be maintained in substantial conformance with the plans marked Exhibit "A." In the event that subsequent revised plans are required, the permittee shall submit four (4) copies of the proposed plans to the Director of Regional Planning for review and approval. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.

13. The subject property shall be developed, maintained, and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance, or to exercise reasonable
oversight of tenants or other so that development or activities not in full compliance are allowed to continue unabated, shall be a violation of these conditions.

14. All structures, walls and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings or signage that was not approved by Regional Planning. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the development on the premises or that do not provide pertinent information about said premises.

15. In the event of graffiti or other extraneous markings occurring, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

16. The permittee or successor in interest shall continuously maintain the property in a neat, clean, and healthful condition, free of litter and debris, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

17. A minimum of 746 automobile parking spaces, as depicted on the approved Exhibit “A” (dated January 7, 2009) or on an approved revised Exhibit “A”, shall be provided and continuously maintained on the subject property, developed to the specifications listed in Section 22.52.1060 of the County Code. The required parking spaces shall be continuously available for vehicular parking only and shall not be used for storage, automobile repair, or any other unauthorized use. No inoperable vehicles shall be parked or stored in any required parking spaces.

18. Within five days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,119.00) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

19. The mitigation measures set forth in the "Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation" section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee's compliance with the required mitigation measures.

20. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the
information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.
FINDINGS OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FOR HOUSING PERMIT NO. 201000001

1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Housing Permit No. 201000001 on October 20, 2010. Housing Permit No. 201000001 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073, Parking Permit No. 200800002 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

3. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

4. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

5. General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 is a request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Zone Change No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

7. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

8. Parking Permit No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

9. Housing Permit No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.
10. CUP No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

(Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

11. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

12. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.
13. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit “A”, depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a “podium” structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

14. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

15. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

16. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

17. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
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- South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
- West: Single-family residences

18. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

19. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

20. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

21. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

22. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and the applicant. During the hearing, the applicant presented the following points:
- Project replaces an "obsolete" mobilehome park
• Project provides a “campus-like” environment with many amenities
• Senior housing set-aside will allow seniors to remain in neighborhood
• Project design/access will direct traffic away from neighborhood streets
• Project reviewed by the Monrovia School District
• Paying an overall $2.6 million in developer fees and an estimated $900,000 per year in property taxes
• Current design reflects input gathered from several neighborhood meetings; reduced building heights and removed windows to improve privacy
• Reviewed by County environmental staff and the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), no significant impacts found
• Project falls within the proposed CEQA CO₂ (carbon emissions) standard for new development projects

In addition, opposing testimony was heard from three residents, who cited the following concerns:
• Overall environmental impacts (traffic, air, noise, aesthetic)
• Lack of community compatibility (overall size, building height)
• Approval will induce other mobilehome parks to be closed and redeveloped
• Project will reduce/eliminate privacy; should be redesigned with “one-story units”
• MND is insufficient; does not address “greenhouse gases”; MND is inappropriate for size and scale of project
• Plan amendment and zone change are inappropriate; not in the public health safety and general welfare

24. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development. The Commission asked County Counsel to clarify if the project should have completed an Environmental Impact Report or MND, to which County Counsel responded that the development reflected an MND. The Commission also indicated that it is “disappointed” to see a mobilehome park closed, and that mobilehome parks need to be “kept in the community”. However, the Commission also stated that the developer “listened to the community” in designing the project and that it can be a “leadership project” for the community.

25. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, CUP No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004.

26. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit “A”.
27. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related General Plan amendment, zone change, parking permit, CUP, and subdivision.

28. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

29. The proposed senior units are integrated into a multi-family residential development that is compatible with the surrounding area, and has a high-quality of design with many onsite amenities such as a community center, pool, spa, courtyards, guest parking, handicap parking and a village green, all conveniently accessible by seniors. The project site is a short walking distance away from facilities such as a public library and bus transit stops located on Live Oak Avenue. The 75 set-aside units reserved for seniors constitute more than 30 percent of the overall units within the development and will greatly assist the County in meeting its senior housing needs.

30. The applicant has satisfied the “Burden of Proof” for the requested housing permit.

31. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) (“CEQA”), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (“MMP”).

32. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

33. This project does not have “no effect” on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

34. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission’s decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (“Regional Planning”), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.
BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That the requested use at the location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

B. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.

C. That the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.

D. That the proposed project at the location proposed has been designed to be complementary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design.

E. That the proposed project will assist in satisfying housing needs, and is viable in terms of continuing availability to meet such housing needs.

THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a housing permit as set forth in Sections 22.56.1020 and 22.56.1060, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Housing Permit No. 201000001 is approved, subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission.
CONDITIONS:

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 14 and 16. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 2, and Condition Nos. 3, 4 and 14 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.

4. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten (10) days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

   a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

   b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

   The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 2.170.010.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

6. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall
terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

8. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200 per inspection).

9. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

10. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.

11. The permittee or successor in interest shall enter into a covenant with the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission ("CDC") and Regional Planning to set aside 75 dwelling units for "seniors" as defined in California Civil Code Section 51.3. The 75 units set-aside shall be entirely contained within Building No. 24 as depicted on the Exhibit "A" (dated January 7, 2009), shall contain the same interior finishes and overall visual and architectural quality as non-set aside units, and shall be set aside for senior condos for a period of 30 years.

12. Within five days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,119.00) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

13. The mitigation measures set forth in the "Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation" section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached
Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee’s compliance with the required mitigation measures.

14. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.
FINDINGS OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 200700073

1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073 on October 20, 2010. CUP No. 200700073 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. CUP No. 200700073 is a request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,870 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

   (Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

   (Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

   (Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.

d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

5. General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Zone Change No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program (“DP”) designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

7. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CiR").

8. Parking Permit No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

9. Housing Permit No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

10. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.

12. The applicant's site plan, labeled Exhibit "A", depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each
designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
   - South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
   - West: Single-family residences

17. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached
multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

18. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

19. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

20. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

21. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include “community gardens” and “office park” features.

22. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and the applicant. During the hearing, the applicant presented the following points:
   - Project replaces an "obsolete" mobilehome park
   - Project provides a "campus-like" environment with many amenities
   - Senior housing set-aside will allow seniors to remain in neighborhood
   - Project design/access will direct traffic away from neighborhood streets
   - Project reviewed by the Monrovia School District
• Paying an overall $2.6 million in developer fees and an estimated $900,000 per year in property taxes
• Current design reflects input gathered from several neighborhood meetings; reduced building heights and removed windows to improve privacy
• Reviewed by County environmental staff and the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), no significant impacts found
• Project falls within the proposed CEQA CO₂ (carbon emissions) standard for new development projects

In addition, opposing testimony was heard from three residents, who cited the following concerns:
• Overall environmental impacts (traffic, air, noise, aesthetic)
• Lack of community compatibility (overall size, building height)
• Approval will induce other mobilehome parks to be closed and redeveloped
• Project will reduce/eliminate privacy; should be redesigned with “one-story units”
• MND is insufficient; does not address “greenhouse gases”; MND is inappropriate for size and scale of project
• Plan amendment and zone change are inappropriate; not in the public health safety and general welfare

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development. The Commission asked County Counsel to clarify if the project should have completed an Environmental Impact Report or MND, to which County Counsel responded that the development reflected an MND. The Commission also indicated that it is “disappointed” to see a mobilehome park closed, and that mobilehome parks need to be “kept in the community”. However, the Commission also stated that the developer “listened to the community” in designing the project and that it can be a “leadership project” for the community.

24. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, CUP No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004.

25. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.

26. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit “A”.
27. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related zone change, parking permit, and subdivision.

28. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

29. The CUP will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. The requested modifications to required yard setbacks are necessary because the orientation of the proposed lots are suited to the project and do not follow a typical street pattern. Wall/fence heights greater than typically allowed are necessary in order to maintain security and privacy around the project site. Building heights greater than typically allowed are necessary in order to accommodate density and design features in a manner that will be compatible with surrounding development.

30. Regarding the grading CUP, much of the required grading is for excavation of an underground parking facility to provide the necessary amount of onsite resident and guest parking. This avoids large open parking lots and/or above-ground parking structures within the project site that would have a greater visual impact on the surrounding community. The CUP will ensure that proposed grading is done in an orderly manner and in substantial conformance with the original project proposal.

31. The applicant has satisfied the "Burden of Proof" for the requested CUP.

32. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP").

33. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

34. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.
35. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That the requested use at the location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

B. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.

C. That the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.

THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a CUP as set forth in Sections 22.52.1870 and 22.56.2820, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, CUP No. 200700073 is approved, subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission.
CONDITIONS:

1. This grant authorizes a multi-family residential development in the R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence - 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre - Development Program) zone for six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres, as depicted on the approved Exhibit "A" (dated January 7, 2009) or an approved revised Exhibit "A", subject to all of the following conditions of approval.

2. Approval of Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073 is contingent upon the approval of Parking Permit No. 200800002 and Housing Permit No. 201000001, and also contingent upon the approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004 by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board").

3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 10, 44 and 46. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 3, Condition Nos. 5, 6 and 44 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

4. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or entity making use of this grant.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

6. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if it finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the subject property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its terms and conditions to the transferee or lessee of the subject property.

8. The subject property shall be developed and maintained in full compliance with the conditions of this grant, and any law, statute, ordinance or other regulation applicable to
any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

9. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the property is being used in violation of any condition of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200.00 per inspection).

10. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate in the defense.

11. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000.00 from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to the permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

   a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation; and

   b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code (“County Code”) Section 2.170.010.

12. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

13. The subject property shall be graded, developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the approved vesting tentative tract map and the approved Exhibit “A”, dated January 7, 2009, or an approved revised Exhibit “A”.
14. The development of the subject property shall conform to the conditions approved for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

15. All development shall comply with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property, except as specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions, including the approved Exhibit "A," or a revised Exhibit "A" approved by the Director of Regional Planning ("Director of Planning").

16. Permission is granted for the following:

a) Building setbacks according to the following:
   1. Lot No. 1: A rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   2. Lot No. 2: A side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   3. Lot No. 3: A rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   4. Lot No. 4: A rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   5. Lot No. 5: A rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   6. Lot No. 6: A side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

b) Building heights according to the following:
   1. Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: A maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   2. Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: A maximum height of 37 feet.
   4. Building No. 25: A maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

c) Walls and fences according to the following:
   1. Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   2. Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   3. Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   4. Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

17. No grading permit shall be issued prior to the recordation of a final map except as authorized by the Director of Planning.

18. A minimum of 746 automobile parking spaces, as depicted on the approved Exhibit "A" (dated January 7, 2009) or on an approved revised Exhibit "A," shall be provided and continuously maintained on the subject property, developed to the specifications listed in Section 22.52.1060 of the County Code. The required parking spaces shall be continuously available for vehicular parking only and shall not be used for storage, automobile repair, or any other unauthorized use. The permittee shall provide for
continual enforcement in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions ("CC&Rs") to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

19. A minimum of 12 guest parking spaces must be handicapped-accessible, and at least two of the 12 accessible spaces must be "van-accessible". Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the permittee shall submit to the Director of Planning for review and approval three copies of a revised Exhibit "A" showing the required accessible parking spaces.

20. The permittee shall submit a copy of the project CC&Rs to Regional Planning for review prior to final map approval. A copy of these conditions shall be attached to the CC&Rs.

21. The permittee shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for the continuous maintenance of the common areas, including the driveways, landscaping and the lighting system along all walkways and outdoor seating areas, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

22. The permittee shall reserve in the CC&Rs the right for all residents within the condominium project to use the internal driveway system for access and the guest parking spaces throughout the subdivision.

23. The permittee shall state in the CC&Rs that parking of recreational vehicles and outside storage shall not be allowed within the development.

24. The permittee shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for graffiti removal. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage by 6:00 am the next day. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.

25. All structures, walls and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the use of the premises or that do not provide pertinent information about said premises. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

26. Information contained within the CC&Rs required by these conditions shall not be modified in any way without prior authorization from Regional Planning.

27. All utilities shall be placed underground.

28. All structures shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Building and Safety of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("Public Works").

29. Detonation of explosives or any other blasting devices or material shall be prohibited unless all required permits have been obtained and adjacent property owners have been notified.

30. All grading and construction on the subject property and appurtenant activities, including engine warm-up, shall be restricted to Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and
6:00 p.m., and Saturday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. No Sunday or holiday operations are permitted.

31. The permittee shall implement a dust control program during grading and construction to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and the Director of Public Works.

32. The permittee shall, upon commencement of any grading activity allowed by this permit, diligently pursue all grading to completion.

33. No construction equipment or vehicles shall be parked or stored on any existing public or private streets.

34. The permittee shall obtain all necessary permits from Public Works and shall maintain all such permits in full force and effect throughout the life of this permit.

35. All construction and development within the subject property shall comply with the applicable provisions of the Building Code and the various related mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire, grading and excavation codes as currently adopted by the County.

36. The permittee shall utilize water-saving devices and technology in the construction of this project consistent with Los Angeles County Building and Plumbing Codes.

37. The permittee shall comply with the green building and drought-tolerant landscaping provisions of the Los Angeles County Green Building Program (the project is LID exempt). Prior to the issuance of building permits, the permittee shall submit building and landscaping plans as a Revised Exhibit "A" demonstrating compliance with the County's green building and drought-tolerant landscaping ordinances.

38. The property shall be developed and maintained in compliance with all applicable requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. Adequate water and sewage facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of said department.

39. Upon approval of this grant, the permittee shall contact the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden to determine what facilities may be necessary to protect the property from fire hazard. Any necessary facilities including, but not limited to water mains, fire hydrants, and fire flow facilities, shall be provided to the satisfaction of and within the time periods established by said Department.

40. Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit, a site plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Director of Planning indicating that the proposed construction and/or associated grading complies with the conditions of this grant and the provisions of the County Code. The site plan shall also include plans that depict architectural details of window treatments, façade and roofing materials, for all proposed structures.

41. Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit, the permittee shall submit to the Director of Planning for review and approval three copies of a landscape plan. The landscape plan shall show size, type, and location of all plants, trees, and watering facilities. The landscape plan shall also contain a note indicating the timing of the required planting and planting deadlines as described herein. All landscaping shall be
maintained in a neat, clean, and healthful condition, including proper pruning, weeding, removal of litter, fertilizing and replacement of plants when necessary. To the maximum extent feasible, drip irrigation systems shall be employed.

Timing of Planting. Prior to the issuance of building permits for any construction the applicant shall submit a landscaping and phasing plan for the landscaping associated with that construction to be approved by the Director of Planning. This phasing plan shall establish the timing and sequencing of the required landscaping.

The planting shall begin at least 90 days prior to occupancy of the first unit within the building. The required planting of new trees, shrubs and/or ground cover, and all remaining project landscaping, shall be completed within six months following the date of issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first unit.

42. Within three days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,119.00) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

43. Pursuant to Chapter 22.72 of the County Code, the subdivider or successor in interest shall pay a fee (currently $259,170.00) to the Los Angeles County Librarian prior to issuance of any building permit.

44. The mitigation measures set forth in the “Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation” section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program (“MMP”). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee’s compliance with the required mitigation measures.

45. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.

46. The following development program conditions shall apply:
d) No building or structure of any kind except a temporary structure used only in the developing of the property according to the development program shall be built, erected, or moved onto any part of the property.

e) No existing building or structure which under the program is to be demolished shall be used.

f) No existing building or structure which, under the program, is to be altered shall be used until such building or structure has been so altered.

g) All improvements shall be completed prior to the occupancy of any structures within each phase of development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

h) Where one or more buildings in the projected development are designated as primary buildings, building permits for structures other than those so designated shall not be issued until the foundations have been constructed for such primary building or buildings.
1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 on October 20, 2010. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, and Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

5. General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Zone Change No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-322U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

7. Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

8. Parking Permit No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

9. Housing Permit No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 market rate units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.
10. CUP No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

(Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.

12. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit “A”, depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering
single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed
to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the
adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of
two townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and
village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center
is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private
driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences.
The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two
four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units),
subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use.
One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal
circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved
widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-
loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of
sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access
to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to
screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the
drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use
category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is
proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units).
The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as
part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit,
bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the
proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with
the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
- North: R-A
- East: R-A, C-3
- South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot
  Area)
- West: R-A

16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
- North: Single-family residences
- East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
- South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
- West: Single-family residences

17. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached
multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections
22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

18. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

19. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

20. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

21. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

22. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and the applicant. During the hearing, the applicant presented the following points:
   - Project replaces an "obsolete" mobilehome park
   - Project provides a "campus-like" environment with many amenities
   - Senior housing set-aside will allow seniors to remain in neighborhood
   - Project design/access will direct traffic away from neighborhood streets
   - Project reviewed by the Monrovia School District
- Paying an overall $2.6 million in developer fees and an estimated $900,000 per year in property taxes
- Current design reflects input gathered from several neighborhood meetings; reduced building heights and removed windows to improve privacy
- Reviewed by County environmental staff and the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), no significant impacts found
- Project falls within the proposed CEQA CO₂ (carbon emissions) standard for new development projects

In addition, opposing testimony was heard from three residents, who cited the following concerns:
- Overall environmental impacts (traffic, air, noise, aesthetic)
- Lack of community compatibility (overall size, building height)
- Approval will induce other mobilehome parks to be closed and redeveloped
- Project will reduce/eliminate privacy; should be redesigned with "one-story units"
- MND is insufficient; does not address "greenhouse gases"; MND is inappropriate for size and scale of project
- Plan amendment and zone change are inappropriate; not in the public health safety and general welfare

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development. The Commission asked County Counsel to clarify if the project should have completed an Environmental Impact Report or MND, to which County Counsel responded that the development reflected an MND. The Commission also indicated that it is "disappointed" to see a mobilehome park closed, and that mobilehome parks need to be "kept in the community". However, the Commission also stated that the developer "listened to the community" in designing the project and that it can be a "leadership project" for the community.

24. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, CUP No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004.

25. Approval of this subdivision is conditioned on the subdivider's compliance with the attached conditions of approval as well as the conditions of approval for Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, and CUP No. 200700073.

26. The subdivider has demonstrated the suitability of the subject property for the proposed use. Establishment of the proposed use at such location is in conformity with good zoning practice. Compliance with the conditions of approval will ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and consistency with all applicable General Plan policies.
27. The proposed subdivision and the provisions for its design and improvement are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

28. The site is physically suitable for the density and type of development proposed, since it has access to a County-maintained street and will be served by public sewer and public water supplies to meet anticipated needs.

29. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvements will not cause serious public health problems, since sewage disposal, storm drainage, fire protection, and geological and soils factors are addressed in the conditions of approval.

30. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantial and avoidable injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject property is not located in a Significant Ecological Area and does not contain any stream courses or high value riparian habitat.

31. The design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities therein.

32. The division and development of the property in the manner set forth on this map will not unreasonably interfere with the free and complete exercise of public entity and/or public utility rights-of-way and/or easements within this map, since the design and development as set forth in the conditions of approval and shown on the tentative map provide adequate protection for any such easements.

33. Pursuant to Article 3.5 of the Subdivision Map Act, the proposed subdivision does not contain or front upon any public waterway, river, stream, coastline, shoreline, lake or reservoir.

34. The housing and employment needs of the region were considered and balanced against the public service needs of local residents and available fiscal and environmental resources when the project was determined to be consistent with the General Plan.

35. The subject tract map has been submitted as a "vesting" tentative map. As such, it is subject to the provisions of Sections 21.38.101 through 21.38.080 of the County Code (Subdivision Ordinance).

36. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the
Mitigation Monitoring Program.

37. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

38. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

39. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, the MND is approved and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is approved, subject to the attached conditions of the Commission, including recommendations of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee.
CONDITIONS:

1. Conform to the applicable requirements of Title 21 and Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"), including the requirements of the R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence - 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre - Development Program) zone. Also, conform to the requirements of Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001 and the Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND").

2. Recordation of the final map is contingent upon approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004 by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board").

3. Permission is granted to adjust lot lines on the final map to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

4. Permission is granted to record multiple final maps. The boundaries of the final unit maps shall be to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee ("Subdivision Committee"). Each final unit map to record shall comply on its own, or in combination with previously recorded final unit maps, with the parking and lot area requirements of the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, Parking Permit No. 200800002 and CUP No. 200700073. Prior to approval of each final unit map, the subdivider or successor in interest shall submit the following:

   a. A phasing map indicating the boundaries of the current final map, the boundaries and status of all previously filed final unit maps and the expected boundaries and phasing of all future final unit maps; and

   b. A summary sheet indicating the number and type of all lots shown, including parking breakdown by phase, on the current and previous final maps.

5. The subdivider or successor in interest shall label the interior driveways as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane" on the final map.

6. The subdivider or successor in interest shall construct or bond with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("Public Works") for driveway paving in widths as shown on the approved Exhibit "A", dated January 7, 2009, to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("Fire").

7. The subdivider or successor in interest shall submit a copy of the project Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions ("CC&Rs") to Regional Planning for review and approval prior to final map approval. Those provisions required by the County to be contained in the CC&Rs shall be identified as such, and shall not be modified in any way without prior authorization from Regional Planning.

8. The subdivider or successor in interest shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for the continuous maintenance of all common areas, including the driveways, landscaping and the lighting system along all walkways and outdoor seating areas, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.
9. The subdivider or successor in interest shall reserve in the CC&Rs the right for all residents within the condominium project to use the internal driveway system for access and the guest parking spaces throughout the subdivision.

10. The subdivider or successor in interest shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for graffiti removal. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage by 6:00 am the next day. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.

11. The subject property shall be developed and maintained in substantial compliance with the approved Exhibit Map dated January 7, 2009.

12. The subdivider or successor in interest shall place a note or notes on the final map, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, that this subdivision is approved as a condominium project for a total of 318 residential units whereby the owners of the units of air space will hold an undivided interest in the common areas, which will in turn provide the necessary access, and utility easements for the units.

13. The subdivider or successor in interest shall remove all existing structures (including mobilehome park units and any accessory structures) on the subject property. The subdivider or successor in interest shall submit a copy of a demolition permit or other proof of removal prior to final map approval, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

14. The subdivider or successor in interest shall plant at least 99 trees (one tree for every 5,000 square feet of the net project area) of a non-invasive species throughout the landscaped and common areas of the subject project. The location and the species of said trees shall be incorporated into a site plan or landscape plan. Prior to final map approval, the site/landscaping plan shall be approved by Regional Planning, and a bond shall be posted with Public Works or other verification shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Regional Planning to ensure the planting of the required trees.

15. Within three days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,119.00) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

16. The mitigation measures set forth in the "Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation" section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee's compliance with the required mitigation measures.
17. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.

18. Pursuant to Chapter 22.72 of the County Code, the subdivider or successor in interest shall pay a fee (currently $259,170.00) to the Los Angeles County Librarian prior to issuance of any building permit.

19. No grading permit may be issued prior to final map recordation unless otherwise authorized by the Director of Regional Planning.

20. The subdivider or successor in interest shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this tract map approval, or related discretionary approvals, whether legislative or quasi-judicial, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 66499.37 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall promptly notify the subdivider or successor in interest of any claim, action or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense. If the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the subdivider shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

21. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the subdivider or successor in interest shall within 10 days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000.00, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department’s cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to the subdivider or the subdivider’s counsel. The subdivider shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

   a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the subdivider shall deposit additional funds to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation;

   b. At the sole discretion of the subdivider, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the subdivider according to the County Code Section 2.170.010.

Except as expressly modified herein above, this approval is subject to all those conditions set forth in the CUP, housing permit, parking permit, MMP and the attached reports recommended by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, consisting of the Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, and Public Health.
The following reports consisting of 17 pages are the recommendations of Public Works.

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Details and notes shown on the tentative map are not necessarily approved. Any details or notes which may be inconsistent with requirements of ordinances, general conditions of approval, or Department policies must be specifically approved in other conditions, or ordinance requirements are modified to those shown on the tentative map upon approval by the Advisory agency.

2. Easements are tentatively required, subject to review by the Director of Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

3. Easements shall not be granted or recorded within areas proposed to be granted, dedicated, or offered for dedication for public streets, highways, access rights, building restriction rights, or other easements until after the final map is filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s Office. If easements are granted after the date of tentative approval, a subordination must be executed by the easement holder prior to the filing of the final map.

4. In lieu of establishing the final specific locations of structures on each lot/parcel at this time, the owner, at the time of issuance of a grading or building permit, agrees to develop the property in conformance with the County Code and other appropriate ordinances such as the Building Code, Plumbing Code, Grading Ordinance, Highway Permit Ordinance, Mechanical Code, Zoning Ordinance, Undergrounding of Utilities Ordinance, Water Ordinance, Sanitary Sewer and Industrial Waste Ordinance, Electrical Code, and Fire Code. Improvements and other requirements may be imposed pursuant to such codes and ordinances.

5. All easements existing at the time of final map approval must be accounted for on the approved tentative map. This includes the location, owner, purpose, and recording reference for all existing easements. If an easement is blanket or indeterminate in nature, a statement to that effect must be shown on the tentative map in lieu of its location. If all easements have not been accounted for, submit a corrected tentative map to the Department of Regional Planning for approval.

Rev. 02-19-2009
6. Adjust, relocate, and/or eliminate lot lines, lots, streets, easements, grading, geotechnical protective devices, and/or physical improvements to comply with ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the date the County determined the application to be complete all to the satisfaction of Public Works.

7. Quitclaim or relocate easements running through proposed structures.

8. Prior to final approval of the tract/parcel map submit a notarized affidavit to the Director of Public Works, signed by all owners of record at the time of filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office, stating that any proposed condominium building has not been constructed or that all buildings have not been occupied or rented and that said building will not be occupied or rented until after the filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

9. Place standard condominium notes on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

10. Label driveways and multiple access strips as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane" and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

11. Reserve reciprocal easements for drainage, ingress/egress, sewer, water, utilities, right to grade, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the common private driveways to the satisfaction of Public Works.

12. Remove existing buildings prior to final map approval. Demolition permits are required from the Building and Safety office.

13. If unit filing occurs, reserve reciprocal easements for drainage, ingress/egress, utilities, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the private driveways and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

14. The boundaries of the unit final maps shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Departments of Regional Planning and Public Works.

15. The first unit of this subdivision shall be filed as Tract No. 68400-01, the second unit, Tract No. 68400-02, and the last unit, Tract No. 68400.

16. A final tract map must be processed through the Director of Public Works prior to being filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.
17. Prior to submitting the tract map to the Director of Public Works for examination pursuant to Section 66442 of the Government Code, obtain clearances from all affected Departments and Divisions, including a clearance from the Subdivision Mapping Section of the Land Development Division of Public Works for the following mapping items; mathematical accuracy; survey analysis; and correctness of certificates, signatures, etc.

18. A final guarantee will be required at the time of filing of the final map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s Office.

19. Within 30 days of the approval date of this land use entitlement or at the time of first plan check submittal, the applicant shall deposit the sum of $2,000 (Minor Land Divisions) or $5,000 (Major Land Divisions) with Public Works to defray the cost of verifying conditions of approval for the purpose of issuing final map clearances. This deposit will cover the actual cost of reviewing conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permits, Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Vesting Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Oak Tree Permits, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, CEQA Mitigation Monitoring Programs and Regulatory Permits from State and Federal Agencies (Fish and Game, USF&W, Army Corps, RWQCB, etc.) as they relate to the various plan check activities and improvement plan designs. In addition, this deposit will be used to conduct site field reviews and attend meetings requested by the applicant and/or his agents for the purpose of resolving technical issues on condition compliance as they relate to improvement plan design, engineering studies, highway alignment studies and tract/parcel map boundary, title and easement issues. When 80% of the deposit is expended, the applicant will be required to provide additional funds to restore the initial deposit. Remaining balances in the deposit account will be refunded upon final map recordation.

Prepared by John Chin
Phone (626) 458-4918
Date 02-09-2009
STORM DRAIN\HYDROLOGY SECTION CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, PHONE: (626) 458-4921

1. Comply with the requirements of the Drainage Concept, which was conceptually approved on __07/14/08__ to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

__________________________  ______________________________
Name                          Date  1/22/2009    Phone (626) 458-4921
Christopher Sheppard
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 68400
SUBDIVIDER Diamond Development/Prim Enterprises
ENGINEER B&E Engineers
GEOLOGIST Geocon
SOILS ENGINEER Geocon

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 1/07/09 (revised) Exhibit A
LOCATION Arcadia
GRADING BY SUBDIVIDER [Y] (Y or N) 132,780 c.y.
REPORT DATE
REPORT DATE 6/12/07

TENTATIVE MAP FEASIBILITY IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL FROM A GEOLOGIC STANDPOINT

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS APPLICABLE TO THIS DIVISION OF LAND:

- The Final Map does not need to be reviewed by GMED.
- Soils engineering reports may be required prior to approval of building or grading plans.
- The Soils Engineering review dated 2-2-09 is attached.

Reviewed by

Date January 28, 2009

Please complete a Customer Service Survey at http://dpw.lacounty.gov/go/gmedsurvey
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
GEO TECHNICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION

SOILS ENGINEERING REVIEW SHEET

Address: 900 S. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803
Telephone: (626) 458-4925
Fax: (626) 458-4913

Tentative Tract Map 68400
Location South Arcadia
Developer/Owner Prime Enterprises, LLC
Engineer/Architect B&E Engineers
Soils Engineer Geocon (P.N. A8455-06-01A)
Geologist

Review of:
Revised Tentative Tract Map and Exhibit Dated by Regional Planning 11/7/09
Soils Engineering Report Dated 9/12/07
Previous review sheet dated 6/2/08

ACTION:
Tentative Map feasibility is recommended for approval, subject to conditions below:

REMARKS:
At the grading stage, submit two sets of grading plans to the Soils Section for verification of compliance with County codes and policies.

Prepared by Lukas Przybylo Reviewed by

No. C67563 EXP 9/30/09


NOTICE: Public safety, relative to geotechnical subsurface exploration, shall be provided in accordance with current codes for excavations, inclusive of the Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 11.48, and the State of California, Title 8, Construction Safety Orders.

P:\geotechnical\Soils Review\Lukas\612801TM-60400, South Arcadia, TTM-A_S.
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO GRADING PLAN APPROVAL:

1. Provide approval of:
   
   a. The latest drainage concept/hydrology/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP)/Low Impact Development (LID) plan by the Storm Drain and Hydrology Section of Land Development Division.
   
   b. The grading plan by the Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division (GMED).

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL MAP RECORDATION:

2. Submit a grading plan for approval. The grading plan must show and call out the following items, including but not limited to: construction of all drainage devices and details, paved driveways, elevation and drainage of all pads, SUSMP and LID devices (if applicable), and any required landscaping and irrigation not within a common area or maintenance easement. Acknowledgement and/or approval from all easement holders may be required.

3. A maintenance agreement or CC&Rs may be required for all privately maintained drainage devices, slopes, and other facilities.

Name: Jason Flood
Date: 2/17/09
Phone: (626) 458-4921

P:\dp\public\SUBFCHECK\Grading\Tentative Map Reviews\068400 rev3.doc
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Dedicate the right to restrict vehicular access on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue.

2. Dedicate vehicular access rights on Lovejoy Street and the alley. If the Department of Regional Planning requires the construction of a wall, complete access rights shall be dedicated.

3. Align the proposed "A" Driveway at Mayflower Avenue with Ashmont Avenue.

4. Label all interior streets as private driveway and fire lane.

5. Locate the entry gate (or the key pad if one is provided) a minimum of 50 feet beyond the right of way of Mayflower Avenue on "A" Driveway, and construct a minimum 32-foot radius turnaround preceding the gated entrance to the satisfaction of Public Works. The minimum gate setback shall be increased, if necessary, to accommodate adequate stacking distance as determined in each case by the traffic engineering consultant at final engineering to the satisfaction of Public Works.

6. All egress traffic from "A" Driveway shall be restricted to right turn only.

7. The proposed entry driveway details on "A" Driveway are not approved. Redesign the raised median and approach area (including curb returns) along "A" Driveway to allow the best channelization of egress traffic on to the south bound of Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

8. Terminate the raised median nose along "A" Driveway at the right of way line without encroaching to the public right of way on Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

9. The entry gate on "D" Driveway at the frontage of Live Oak Avenue is restricted for egress only and it shall be located a minimum of 20 feet beyond the right of way of Live Oak Avenue.

10. The entry gate on "U" Driveway at the frontage of Live Oak Avenue is restricted for emergency use only and it shall be located a minimum of 20 feet beyond the right of way of Live Oak Avenue.

11. Close any unused driveway with standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue.
12. Repair any displaced, broken, or damaged curb, gutter, driveway apron, and pavement along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

13. Construct 5 foot minimum (conventional section) sidewalk along the property frontage on Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Execute a maintenance covenant for the landscaping or include in the CC&R provision for the maintenance of landscaping along the street frontage to the satisfaction of Public Works.

14. Plant street trees along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Existing trees on Mayflower Avenue in the dedicated right of way shall be removed and replaced if not acceptable as street trees.

15. Underground all existing service lines and distribution lines that are less than 50 KV and new utility lines to the satisfaction of Public Works and Southern California Edison. Please contact Construction Division at (626) 458-3129 for new location of any above ground utility structure in the parkway.

16. Prior to final map approval, enter into an agreement with the County franchised cable TV operator (if an area is served) to permit the installation of cable in a common utility trench to the satisfaction of Public Works, or provide documentation that steps to provide cable TV to the proposed subdivision have been initiated to the satisfaction of Public Works.

17. Comply with any additional requirements, if any, as a means of mitigating any traffic impacts as identified in the traffic study approved by Public Works.

18. Provide a left-turn lane on Mayflower Avenue at "A" Driveway to the satisfaction of Public Works.

19. Comply with the following street lighting requirements:

   a. Provide street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Submit street lighting plans as soon as possible for review and approval to the Street Lighting Section of the Traffic and Lighting Division. For additional information, please contact the Street Lighting Section at (626) 300-4726.
have been energized, and the developer has requested a transfer of billing at least by January 1 of the previous year, the Lighting District can assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the street lights by July 1 of any given year. The transfer of billing could be delayed one or more years if the above conditions are not met.

20. Submit a detailed 1" = 40' scaled signing and striping plan for Mayflower Avenue and Live Oak Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

21. Comply with the mitigation measures identified in the attached February 9, 2009 and September 13, 2007, letters from our Traffic and Lighting Division to the satisfaction of Public Works.

Prepared by Allan Chan

Phone (626) 458-4921

Date 02-09-2009
February 9, 2009

Mr. Bruce Chow
Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers
236 East Colorado Boulevard, Suite 200
Pasadena, CA 91106

Dear Mr. Chow:

SANTA ANITA VILLAGE PROJECT
NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURE
RESIDUAL TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (DECEMBER 3, 2008)
TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 68400
ARCADIA AREA

As requested, we have reviewed the above-mentioned analysis for the proposed Santa Anita Village project located at 4241 East Live Oak Avenue in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles area of Arcadia.

The analysis addresses residents' concerns that the proposed driveway located on Mayflower Avenue may generate cut-through traffic on Ashmont Avenue. To minimize project-related traffic from exiting the project site directly onto Ashmont Avenue, the project proposes to construct a channelized island on the project driveway, which will restrict eastbound left-turn and through movements. The analysis concludes this proposed neighborhood traffic management measure will not result in any significant traffic impacts at the study intersections previously evaluated in the February 13, 2007, traffic study.

We generally agree with the analysis that the redistribution of project traffic, as well as, the cumulative traffic generated by the project and other related projects will not have a significant impact to County roadways or intersections in the area.
If you have any further questions regarding the review of this document, please contact Mr. Isaac Wong of our Traffic Studies Section at (626) 300-4796.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Works

WILLIAM J. WINTER
Assistant Deputy Director
Traffic and Lighting Division

cc: City of Irwindale (Jose Loera)
    City of Monrovia (Doug Benash)
    Department of Regional Planning (Rudy Silva)

bc: Land Development (Hunter, Wong)
September 13, 2007

Mr. David S. Shender
Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers
234 East Colorado Boulevard, Suite 400
Pasadena, CA 91101

Dear Mr. Shender:

SANTA ANITA VILLAGE PROJECT
TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS REVIEW (FEBRUARY 13, 2007)
TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 68400
ARCADIA AREA

As requested, we have reviewed the above-mentioned document for the Santa Anita Village development located on the west side of Mayflower Avenue generally between Larkfield at Live Oak Avenues in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles area of Arcadia.

The proposed project includes the construction of 334 attached townhouses. The project is estimated to generate approximately 2,422 net new vehicle trips daily, with 158 and 214 net new vehicle trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively.

We generally agree with the study that the traffic generated by the project alone, as well as the cumulative traffic generated by the project and other related projects, will not have a significant impact to County roadways or intersections in the area. We also generally agree that the project will not have a significant impact on the Congestion Management Program-monitored intersections, arterials, or freeways in the area.

The project shall submit a 40-foot-scale revised site plan of the project showing access locations in relationship to adjacent intersections and driveways shall be submitted Mr. Matthew Dubiel of our Land Development Review Section for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.

FILE COPY
We recommend the applicant consult with Caltrans as well as the Cities of Irwindale and Monrovia to obtain their concurrence with any potential California Environmental Quality Act impacts within their respective jurisdictions.

If you have any further questions regarding the review of this document, please contact Mr. Todd Liming of our Traffic Studies Section at (626) 300-4826.

Very truly yours,

DONALD L. WOLFE  
Director of Public Works

WILLIAM J. WINTER  
Assistant Deputy Director  
Traffic and Lighting Division

cc:  Caltrans (Cheryl Powell)  
      City of Irwindale (Jose Loera)  
      City of Monrovia (Doug Benash)  
      Department of Regional Planning (Rudy Silva)

bc:  Land Development (Hunter, Wong)
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. The subdivider shall provide a replacement sewage disposal system for the existing sewer house laterals serving lots fronting Live Oak Avenue and shall provide continuous and uninterrupted sewer service, including but not limited to operation and maintenance of the private sewer house laterals until such time the outlet sewer system is accepted for public use. A bond shall be posted to the satisfaction of Public Works.

2. The subdivider shall install and dedicate main line sewers and serve each building with a separate house lateral or have approved and bonded sewer plans on file with Public Works.

3. If necessary, the subdivider shall comply with current sewer easement vacation procedures and shall post a sewer easement vacation bond to the satisfaction of Public Works.

4. If necessary, install off-site sewer house laterals to serve existing lots fronting Live Oak Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

5. Comply with the mitigation measures as identified in the approved sewer area study (PC 12053AS, dated 12-09-2008) to the satisfaction of Public Works. The sewer area study shall be invalidated should the total number of dwelling units, increase, the density increases, dwelling units occur on previously identified building restricted lots, change in the proposed sewer alignment, increase in tributary sewershed, change of the sewer collection points, or the adoption of a land use plan or a revision to the current plan. A revision to the approved sewer area study may be allowed at the discretion of the Director of Public Works. The approved sewer area study shall remain valid for two years after initial approval of the tentative map. After this period of time, an update of the area study shall be submitted by the applicant if determined to be warranted by Public Works.

6. Provide a digital copy (PDF Format) of the approved area study and/or approved sewer improvement plans.

7. The subdivider shall send a print of the land division map to the County Sanitation District with a request for annexation. The request for annexation must be approved prior to final map approval.
8. Easements are required, subject to review by Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

9. Private easements are required and shall be dedicated by separate instruments in favor of existing lots fronting Live Oak Avenue. The separate instruments are subject to review by Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

Prepared by Allen Ma

Phone (626) 458-4921  Date Rev. 02-18-2008

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 01-07-2009
EXHIBIT "A" MAP DATED 01-07-2009
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. A water system maintained by the water purveyor, with appurtenant facilities to serve all buildings in the land division, must be provided. The system shall include fire hydrants of the type and location (both on-site and off-site) as determined by the Fire Department. The water mains shall be sized to accommodate the total domestic and fire flows.

2. There shall be filed with Public Works a statement from the water purveyor indicating that the water system will be operated by the purveyor, and that under normal conditions, the system will meet the requirements for the land division, and that water service will be provided to each building.

3. If required, provide off-site water improvements to bring water to this land division to the satisfaction of Public Works.

4. Easement shall be granted to the County, appropriate agency or entity for the purpose of ingress, egress, construction and maintenance of all infrastructures constructed for this land division to the satisfaction of Public Works.

5. Submit landscape and irrigation plans for each multi-family/open space lot in the land division, with landscape area greater than 2,500 square feet, in accordance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

Prepared by Massoud Esfahani  Phone (626) 458-4921  Date 02-09-2009
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT
5823 Rickerbacker Road
Compton, California 90240

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision: TR 68400
Map Date January 07, 2009 - Ex. A
C.U.P. Vicinity Map 0166C

☐ FIRE DEPARTMENT HOLD on the tentative map shall remain until verification from the Los Angeles County Fire Dept. Planning Section is received, stating adequacy of service. Contact (323) 881-2404.

☒ Access shall comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 902 of the Fire Code, which requires all weather access. All weather access may require paving.

☒ Fire Department access shall be extended to within 150 feet distance of any exterior portion of all structures.

☐ Where driveways extend further than 150 feet and are of single access design, turnarounds suitable for fire protection equipment use shall be provided and shown on the final map. Turnarounds shall be designed, constructed and maintained to insure their integrity for Fire Department use. Where topography dictates, turnarounds shall be provided for driveways that extend over 150 feet in length.

☒ The private driveways shall be indicated on the final map as “Private Driveway and Fireline” with the widths clearly depicted. Driveways shall be maintained in accordance with the Fire Code.

☒ Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants. All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted prior to construction.

☐ This property is located within the area described by the Fire Department as “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” (formerly Fire Zone 4). A “Fuel Modification Plan” shall be submitted and approved prior to final map clearance. (Contact: Fuel Modification Unit, Fire Station #32, 605 North Angeleno Avenue, Azusa, CA 91702-2904, Phone (626) 969-5205 for details).

☒ Provide Fire Department or City approved street signs and building access numbers prior to occupancy.

☐ Additional fire protection systems shall be installed in lieu of suitable access and/or fire protection water.

☐ The final concept map, which has been submitted to this department for review, has fulfilled the conditions of approval recommended by this department for access only.

☐ These conditions must be secured by a C.U.P. and/or Covenant and Agreement approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department prior to final map clearance.

☐ The Fire Department has no additional requirements for this division of land.

Comments: Access as shown on the Exhibit Map is adequate.

By Inspector: ____________ Date February 4, 2009

Land Development Unit – Fire Prevention Division – (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT
5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

WATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision No.  TR 68400  Tentative Map Date  January 07, 2009 - Ex. A

Revised Report  

☐ The County Forester and Fire Warden is prohibited from setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted. However, water requirements may be necessary at the time of building permit issuance.

☒ The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at this location is 3500 gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of 3 hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. 2 Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.

☐ The required fire flow for private on-site hydrants is ____ gallons per minute at 20 psi. Each private on-site hydrant must be capable of flowing ____ gallons per minute at 20 psi with two hydrants flowing simultaneously, one of which must be the furthest from the public water source.

☒ Fire hydrant requirements are as follows:

Install 7 public fire hydrant(s). Verify / Upgrade existing ____ public fire hydrant(s).

Install ____ private on-site fire hydrant(s).

☒ All hydrants shall measure 6"x 4"x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWA standard C503 or approved equal. All on-site hydrants shall be installed a minimum of 25' feet from a structure or protected by a two (2) hour rated firewall.

☐ Location: As per map on file with the office.

☐ Other location: ____

☒ All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted or bonded for prior to Final Map approval. Vehicular access shall be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction.

☐ The County of Los Angeles Fire Department is not setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted.

☒ Additional water system requirements maybe required during the building permit process.

☐ Hydrants and fire flows are adequate to meet current Fire Department requirements.

☐ Upgrade not necessary, if existing hydrant(s) meet(s) fire flow requirements. Submit original water availability form to our office.

Comments: The current water system is adequate per Fire Flow test perform by Golden State Water Company.
The required fire hydrants shall be installed and tested or bonded for prior to Final Map clearance.

All hydrants shall be installed in conformance with Title 20, County of Los Angeles Government Code and County of Los Angeles Fire Code, or appropriate city regulations. This shall include minimum six-inch diameter mains. Arrangements to meet these requirements must be made with the water purveyor serving the area.

By Inspector  [Signature]  Date  February 4, 2009

Land Development Unit – Fire Prevention Division – (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783
Sections 21.24.340, 21.24.350, 21.28.120, 21.28.130, and 21.28.140, the County of Los Angeles Code, Title 21, Subdivision Ordinance provide that the County will determine whether the development's park obligation is to be met by:

1) the dedication of land for public or private park purpose or,
2) the payment of in-lieu fees or,
3) the provision of amenities or any combination of the above.

The specific determination of how the park obligation will be satisfied will be based on the conditions of approval by the advisory agency as recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

---

Park land obligation in acres or in-lieu fees:

| ACRES:    | 2.23 |
| IN-LIEU FEES: | $692,386 |

---

Conditions of the map approval:

The park obligation for this development will be met by:
The payment of $692,386 in-lieu fees.

---

Trails:
No trails.

---

Comments:

***The In-Lieu Fee has been updated to $692,386 from $686,642 to reflect the fee schedule at the time Map 68400 was advertised for public hearing in September 2010.***

---

***Advisory:***

The Representative Land Values (RLVs) in Los Angeles County Code (LACC) Section 21.28.140 are used to calculate park fees and are adjusted annually, based on changes in the Consumer Price index. The new RLVs become effective July 1st of each year and may apply to this subdivision map if first advertised for hearing before either a hearing officer or the Regional Planning Commission or after July 1st pursuant to LACC Section 21.28.140, subsection 3. Accordingly, the park fee in this report is subject to change depending upon when the subdivision is first advertised for public hearing.

---

Please contact Clement Lau at (213) 351-5120 or Sheela Mathai at (213) 351-5121, Department of Parks and Recreation, 510 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90020 for further information or to schedule an appointment to make an in-lieu fee payment.

For information on Hiking and Equestrian Trail requirements, please contact the Trails Coordinator at (213) 351-5134.

---

By: [Signature]
James Barber, Land Acquisition & Development Section

Supw D 5th
October 05, 2010 08:49:08
QMB02F.FRX
The formula for calculating the acreage obligation and or In-lieu fee is as follows:

\[
(P)\text{people} \times (0.003) \text{ Ratio} \times (U)\text{units} = (X)\text{ acres obligation}
\]

\[(X)\text{ acres obligation} \times RLV/\text{Acre} = \text{In-Lieu Base Fee}
\]

Where:

- \(P\) = Estimate of number of People per dwelling unit according to the type of dwelling unit as determined by the 2000 U.S. Census. Assume \(*\) people for detached single-family residences; Assume \(*\) people for attached single-family (townhouse) residences, two-family residences, and apartment houses containing fewer than five dwelling units; Assume \(*\) people for apartment houses containing five or more dwelling units; Assume \(*\) people for mobile homes.

- \(Ratio\) = The subdivision ordinance provides a ratio of 3.0 acres of park land for each 1,000 people generated by the development. This ratio is calculated as "0.0030" in the formula.

- \(U\) = Total approved number of Dwelling Units.

- \(X\) = Local park space obligation expressed in terms of acres.

- \(RLV/\text{Acre}\) = Representative Land Value per Acre by Park Planning Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>318</th>
<th>= Proposed Units</th>
<th>318 + Exempt Units</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People*</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached S.F. Units</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.F. &lt; 5 Units</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.F. &gt;= 5 Units</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acre Obligation = 2.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Acre Obligation</th>
<th>RLV / Acre</th>
<th>In-Lieu Base Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@0.0030</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>$310,487</td>
<td>$692,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Provided Space</th>
<th>Provided Acres</th>
<th>Credit (%)</th>
<th>Acre Credit</th>
<th>Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Provided Acre Credit: 0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acre Obligation</th>
<th>Public Land Crdt.</th>
<th>Priv. Land Crdt.</th>
<th>Net Obligation</th>
<th>RLV / Acre</th>
<th>In-Lieu Fee Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>$310,487</td>
<td>$692,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 4, 2009

Tract Map No. 068400

Vicinity: Los Angeles

Tentative Tract Map Date: January 7, 2009 (3rd Revision)

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health has no objection to this subdivision and Vesting Tentative Tract Map 068400 is cleared for public hearing. The following conditions still apply and are in force:

1. Potable water will be supplied by Golden State Water Company, a public water company.

2. Sewage disposal will be provided through the public sewer and wastewater treatment facilities of the Los Angeles County Sanitation District #15 as proposed.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (626) 430-5380.

Becky Valentini, E.H.S. IV
Land Use Program
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: TR 068400 (RENT200700062, RPAT200700002, RZCT200700004, RCUPT200700073).

1. DESCRIPTION:

Application for a tract map to subdivide four parcels into six lots to construct 318 residential units—with a minimum 20 percent reserved for seniors—in the following configuration: 148 units in two four-story buildings and 170 units in 23 three-story buildings. Additionally, applicant proposes a 2,850 square foot (s.f.) club house, a 2,900 s.f. community center, a swimming pool, and a "village green." A zone change from R-1, R-3-P, and C-3 to R-3-DP and a General Plan Amendment to Limited Multi-Residence are also being requested. The current use of the site is a 232-unit mobile home park with 37 spaces occupied. The proposed project will require grading in the amounts of 40,000 cubic yards of cut and 17,000 cubic yards of fill.

2. LOCATION:

4241 East Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia, CA 91006

3. PROPOSER:

Prime Enterprises, LLC.
900 South San Gabriel Boulevard, #200
San Gabriel, CA 91776

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:

BASED ON THE ATTACHED INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT WITH MODIFICATION AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROJECT CHANGES/CONDITIONS FORM INCLUDED AS PART OF THE INITIAL STUDY.

5. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS MITAGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Anthony Curzi

DATE: August 3, 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Impact Mitigation</th>
<th>Responsible Agency or Party</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency or Party</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implement Geotechnical Engineering Investigation – dated 3/14/07, Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations, and addendums thereof.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Implement report recommendations</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limit all construction activities near occupied on- and off-site residences to between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM and excluded on all Sundays and County-observed holidays.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All construction equipment, stationary and mobile, operating on the project site shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained noise buffering muffler system or other noise reducing feature, reducing equipment noise levels to conform to applicable County standards.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement noise mitigation measures discussed in the Mestre Greve Noise Assessment dated 2/23/07, and summarized as follows: a. Construct a 16-ft. high temporary noise -sound blanket-barrier along the north and west perimeter property lines, and 9-ft. high temporary sound blanket-barrier along the south and east perimeter property lines, or a structure equal to or of greater mitigation. b. On-site loading and staging areas shall be located at least 50 ft. from existing residential dwellings.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Implement report recommendations</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reduce construction equipment emissions by implementing use of a series of measures inclusive of low emission construction equipment, low sulfur fuel, pre-coated/colored materials, and existing power.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer’s specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during applicable smog alerts.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Impact Mitigation</th>
<th>Responsible Agency or Party</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency or Party</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Use electricity from power poles when present, practicable, and cost-effective rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan check review</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Implement air quality measures – inclusive of ROG measures, as discussed in the Mestre Greve Associates report dated 12/18/08, as follows:</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Implement report recommendations</td>
<td>DRP</td>
<td>Plan checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Use pre-coated, pre-colored and naturally colored building materials, and use of high volume-low pressure sprayers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Utilize low emission, tank-less water heaters to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Utilize built-in, energy-efficient appliances and automated controls for HVAC to reduce energy consumption and emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Provide shade trees in subject development to reduce building heating/cooling needs as depicted in the landscape plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Install sunlight filtering window coatings, double-paned windows or window treatments to meet or exceed Title 24 Energy requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Use roof materials that maximize reflection of sunlight and minimize heat gains in buildings, thus reducing dependence on HVAC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewer, Traffic, Biota, Drainage and Grading, Relocation.**

| 12  | Provide and implement studies and analysis – Sewer Study, Traffic Study, Biological Assessment, Drainage/Grading and Closure Impact Report, as made a condition of approval.                                                                                                             | Project Applicant           | Implement report recommendations | DRP and DPW | Permits |

**Water Conservation**

| 13  | Utilize high-efficiency dual-flush toilets to reduce water consumption.                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Project Applicant           | Install dual flush toilets | DPW       | Permits |

Key: DPW = Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. DRP, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES
DUE TO ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Project No.: VTTM No. 068400(RPAT200700002/RZCT200700004/RCUP200700073)

The Department of Regional Planning ("DRP") staff has determined that the following mitigation measures for the project are necessary in order to assure that the proposed project will not cause significant impacts on the environment.

The Permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with the DRP within 30 days of Permit approval in order to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying information contained in reports required by the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

1. Implement Geotechnical Engineering Investigation – dated 3/14/07, Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations, and addendums thereof.
2. Limit all construction activities near occupied on- and off-site residences to between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM and excluded on all Sundays and County-observed holidays.
3. All construction equipment, stationary and mobile, operating on the project site shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained noise buffering muffler system or other noise reducing feature, reducing equipment noise levels to conform to applicable County standards.
4. Implement noise mitigation measures discussed in the Mestre Greve Noise Assessment dated 2/23/07, and summarized as follows:
   a. Construct a 16-ft. high temporary noise-reducing blanket-barrier along the north and west perimeter property lines, and 9-ft. high temporary sound blanket-barrier along the south and east perimeter property lines, or a structure equal to or of greater mitigation.
   b. On-site loading and staging areas shall be located at least 50 ft. from existing residential dwellings.
5. Reduce construction equipment emissions by implementing use of a series of measures inclusive of low emission construction equipment, low sulfur fuel, pre-coated/colored materials, and existing power.
6. Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer’s specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust.
7. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during applicable smog alerts.
8. Use electricity from power poles when present, practicable, and cost-effective rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.
9. Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.
10. Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.
11. Implement air quality measures – inclusive of ROG measures, as discussed in the Mestre Greve Associates report dated 12/18/08, as follows:
   a. Use pre-coated, pre-colored and naturally colored building materials, and use of high volume-low pressure sprayers.
   b. Utilize low emission, tank-less water heaters to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions.
   c. Utilize built-in, energy-efficient appliances and automated controls for HVAC to reduce energy consumption and emissions,
   d. Provide shade trees in subject development to reduce building heating/cooling needs as depicted in the landscape plan.
   e. Install sunlight filtering window coatings, double-paned windows or window treatments to meet or exceed Title 24 Energy requirements.
   f. Use roof materials that maximize reflection of sunlight and minimize heat gains in buildings, thus reducing dependence on HVAC.
12. Provide and implement studies and analysis – Sewer Study, Traffic Study, Biological Assessment, Drainage/Grading and Closure Impact Report, as made a condition of approval.
13. Utilize high-efficiency dual-flush toilets to reduce water consumption.

As the Applicant, I agree to incorporate these mitigation measures into the project, and understand that the public hearing and consideration by the Planning Commission will be on the project as mitigation measures.

[Temporary

Signatures

Staff

Date

[ ] No response within 10 days. Environmental Determination requires that these changes/conditions be included in the project.
** ** INITIAL STUDY ** **

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

L.A. Map Date: March 8, 2007
Thomas Guide: 597-F2
Location: 4241 Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia, CA

Staff Member: Anthony Curzi
USGS Quad: El Monte

Description of Project: The proposed project is an application for a tract map to subdivide four parcels into six lots to build 318 residential units with a 2,850 square foot (s.f.) club house and a 2,900 s.f. community center. The club house and the community center will require a Conditional Use Permit. The proposed residential units will be built in five phases and consist of 170 townhouse condominium units in 23 three-story buildings and 148 condominium units in two four-story buildings. The current use of the project site is a 232-unit mobile home park with 37 spaces occupied. The proposed project will require grading in the amounts of 40,000 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 17,000 c.y. of fill. The applicant is requesting a zone change to R-3-DP and a plan amendment to Limited Multi-Residence. Twenty percent of the units will be affordable for seniors.

Gross Acres: 12.45

Environmental Setting: The proposed project site is located in the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of South Monrovia Islands and is bordered to the south by Live Oak Avenue and to the east by Mayflower Avenue. Land uses within 500 feet consist of single-family residences. There are commercial establishments and one multi-family residence to the south. The project site contains flat and sloping topography to the south and east.

Zoning: R-A (Residential Agriculture), R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence), C-3 (Unlimited Commercial)
General Plan: Category 1 (Low Density Residential)
Community/Area wide Plan: NA
Major projects in area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION &amp; STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR 061438/CP 04-168</td>
<td>40 condominium units (pending).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 060123/CP 03-207</td>
<td>45 condominium units (approved 10/06/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 03-165</td>
<td>Maintain existing golf course (approved 03/17/04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 01-069</td>
<td>Repair and storage of construction equipment (approved 06/26/02).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

**REVIEWING AGENCIES**

**Responsible Agencies**
- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Los Angeles Region
- Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers

**Special Reviewing Agencies**
- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- City of Arcadia
- City of El Monte
- City of Monrovia
- City of Irwindale
- Monrovia USD
- Golden State Water Company

**Regional Significance**
- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- AQMD

**Trustee Agencies**
- None
- State Fish and Game
- State Parks
- Caltrans District 7
- Native American Heritage Commission

**County Reviewing Agencies**
- Subdivision Committee
- DPW: T&L, Geotechnical and Materials, Waterworks and Sewer Maintenance, EP.
- Sheriff’s, Fire, Library
- Parks and Recreation
- DPH: Environmental Hygiene
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>Pg</th>
<th>ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS</td>
<td>1. Geotechnical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td>Liquefaction area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Flood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
<td>1. Water Quality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td>NPDES requirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Air Quality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☒ ☒ ✔</td>
<td>Construction/grading, parking structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Biota</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cultural Resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mineral Resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Agriculture Resources</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Visual Qualities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td>1. Traffic/Access</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sewage Disposal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Fire/Sheriff</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Utilities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1. General</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>Plan Amendment and Zone Change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Environmental Safety</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Land Use</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☒ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as “significant”.

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The Addendum EIR is required to analyze only the factors changed or not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Anthony Curzi Date: 7/22/09
Approved by: Paul McCarthy Date: 7/22/09

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.
### HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70
- ☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
  - ☐ Lot Size
  - ☐ Project Design
- ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
  - Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

*Implement Geotechnical Engineering Investigation-dated 3/14/07, Chapter 7-Conclusions and Recommendations. Applicant shall comply with all requirements of Subdivision Committee.*

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

- ☒ Potential significant
- ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation
- ☐ Less than significant/No Impact
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HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?

| ☑  | ☐     |

Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?

| ☑  | ☐     |

Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?

| ☐  | ☑     |

Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?

| ☐  | ☑     |

Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?

| ☐  | ☑     |

Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A   ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES   ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size   ☐ Project Design

*Conceptual drainage concept was approved by DPW on July 14, 2008. Applicant shall comply with all requirements of said approval.*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by flood (hydrological) factors?

☒ More likely significant  ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation   ☑ Less than significant/No impact
HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?

Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?

Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?

Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?

Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8
☐ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Project Design   ☐ Compatible Use

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Subdivision Committee.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by fire hazard factors?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact
SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. | ☐   | ☐  | ☐     | Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *Project site is located on heavily-traveled Live Oak Avenue. Parking lots and other industrial uses including an auto repair shop are adjacent to the project site to the south.*
| b. | ☐   | ☐  | ☐     | Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *There is a library 500 feet to the southwest of the project site.*
| c. | ☐   | ☐  | ☒     | Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? *The project will utilize parking lots and a parking structure.*
| d. | ☐   | ☐  | ☐     | Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project? *Noise from project grading and construction.*
| e. | ☐   | ☒  | ☐     | Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Control (Title 12 - Chapter 8) ☐ Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - Chapter 35)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

*Comply with noise mitigation measures.*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by noise?

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact
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RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?

b. | ☒  | ☐     |

Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?

If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?

c. | ☒  | ☐     |

Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?

d. | ☒  | ☐     |

Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?

e. | ☒  | ☐     |

Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit  ☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269  ☐ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design  ☐ Compatible Use

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Subdivision Committee.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, water quality problems?

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☐ Less than significant/No impact
RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting/Impacts</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grading may create dust.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting/Impacts</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The proposed project has the potential to contribute to a cumulative net increase in air quality impacts.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting/Impacts</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Code Requirement</th>
<th>☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>☐ Project Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AQMD had no comments on project. Implement mitigation measures in MMP.*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, air quality?

| Impact | ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation | ☐ Less than significant/No impact |
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RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?**
  - *Project site is approximately one mile from Santa Fe Dam SEA.*

- **Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?**
  - *Project site is fully developed and does not contain natural habitat areas.*

- **Is a drainage course located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream, or lake?**

- **Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?**

- **Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?**

- **Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?**

- **Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?**

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☐ Oak Tree Permit

CONCLUSION
Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, biotic resources?

☐ Potential Significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact
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**RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact
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**RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on mineral resources?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact
### RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### □ MITIGATION MEASURES

- □ Lot Size
- □ Project Design

### □ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on agriculture resources?

- □ Less than significant with project mitigation
- □ Less than significant/No impact

14 7/21/09
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Proposed project is not near a riding or hiking trail.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Two four story buildings with a maximum height of 66 feet proposed.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
☐ Lot Size
☒ Project Design
☐ Visual Report
☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on scenic qualities?

☒ Less than significant
☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
☒ Less than significant/No impact
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SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

a. [□] [X] No [□] Maybe
Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?

318 residential units are proposed.

b. [□] [X] [□] No [□] Maybe
Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?

c. [□] [X] [□] No [□] Maybe
Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?

716 parking spaces and a two-level subterranean parking structure are proposed.

d. [□] [X] [□] No [□] Maybe
Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?

Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?

e. [□] [X] [□] No [□] Maybe

f. [□] [X] [□] No [□] Maybe
Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?

g. [□] [X] [□] No [□] Maybe
Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES

[□] Project Design [X] Traffic Report [X] Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

Traffic and Lighting concluded proposed project does not require additional studies per City of Arcadia’s guidelines.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on traffic/access factors?

[□] Less than significant with project mitigation [X] Less than significant/No impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

*Applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Subdivision Committee.*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to sewage disposal facilities?

[ ] Potentially Significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ✗ Less than significant/No impact
SERVICES - Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?

318 residential units could create capacity problems.

Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?

318 residential units could create capacity problems.

Could the project create student transportation problems?

Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?

Possible increase in library use.

Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES

- Site Dedication
- Government Code Section 65995
- Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to educational facilities/services?

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact
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SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES    ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

Nearest County Fire station 2.3 miles away at 5946 N. Kaufman Avenue, Temple City, CA.

Nearest Sheriff's station is 3.9 miles away at 8838 Las Tunas Drive, Temple City, CA.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to fire/sheriff services?

☐ Totally significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact
SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?

Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?

Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?

Solid waste generated by demolition/construction and operation of proposed project.

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES  ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design

Applicant shall comply with county requirements regarding waste disposal.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to utilities services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact
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OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
- Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
- Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
- Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact
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**OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Potential landfill within 1000 feet.*

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES  ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to public safety?

[ ] Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact
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OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. |     | X  |  
Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

   Plan Amendment to Limited Multi-Residence.

b. |     | X  |  
Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

   Zone Change to R-3-DP.

c. | X  |  |  
Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:

   - Hillside Management Criteria?
   - SEA Conformance Criteria?
   - Other?

d. | X  |  |  
Would the project physically divide an established community?

e. | X  |  |  
Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Approved plan amendment and zone change will allow proposed project to be consistent with plan designation and zoning.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to land use factors?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact
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### OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES  ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

---

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to population, housing, employment, or recreational factors?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact

---
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**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>MAYBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? &quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, water quality, visual, utilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical, noise, air quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Less than significant with project mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Less than significant/No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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March 28, 2011

Mr. Richard Smith and
Ms. Karlyne Smith
2952 Ashmont Avenue
Arcadia, CA 91006

Dear Mr. and Ms. Smith:

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT FOR TRACT NO. 068400-(5)
SANTA ANITA VILLAGE—4241 EAST LIVE OAK AVENUE, ARCADIA

Mayor Michael D. Antonovich asked that we look into your concerns regarding traffic management for Project No. TR068400-(5) and respond directly back to you. Public Works staff also received your e-mail dated February 16, 2011, in which you noted in more detail your concerns.

Since our last correspondence of December 13, 2010, to you, the applicant's consultant has augmented their traffic study by conducting a supplemental analysis of the site access from Live Oak Avenue. The analysis evaluated the unrestricted use of the driveway from Live Oak Avenue and came up with revised forecasted trips. With the unrestricted use of the driveway from Live Oak Avenue, 45 percent of the inbound trips and 27 percent of the outbound trips will be diverted away from the Mayflower Avenue entrance. The supplemental study has been reviewed by Public Works' Traffic and Lighting Division and they concurred with the consultant's conclusion. We expect that the project will be redesigned to make full use of the driveway from Live Oak Avenue.

Regarding your concerns over local and cut through traffic, note that the consultant's Traffic Impact Analysis Study did take into account existing local traffic counts and patterns. With regard to the construction traffic, we have discussed this issue with the developer, and we will be requiring the majority of construction traffic, including heavy vehicles, to utilize the Live Oak Avenue entrance.
We have been in contact with Mr. Steven Zuckerman, the developer of the proposed subdivision, to help coordinate a meeting between you, Public Works, and the developer so we can further discuss your concerns. We understand that Mr. Zuckerman has already made contact with you and that a meeting will be scheduled very soon.

If you have any further concerns or questions, please contact Mr. Andy Narag of our Land Development Division at (626) 458-4921 or anarag@dpw.lacounty.gov.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Works

DENNIS HUNTER, PLS PE
Deputy Director

AN:ca
P:\dpub\ADMIN\AMEMOS\2011\A3580-Traffic Management for Project TR068400-(5).doc

cc: Mayor Michael D. Antonovich (Edel Vizcarra)
Department of Regional Planning (Jodie Sackett, Susie Tae)
From: Richard & Karlyne [mailto:richkar@charter.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 2:03 PM
To: anarag@dpw.lacounty.gov
Cc: jsackett@planning.lacounty.gov; pnovac@lacbos.org
Subject: Project: TR068400-(5)

Mr. Narag

Attached is my letter in reply of your letter dated 12/13/2010.

Document written in Microsoft Word 2000
Scanned by Norton 360 Anti-Virus

February 16, 2011

County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
900 So. Fremont Ave.
Alhambra, Ca. 91803-1331

Project: TR068400-(5)
Location: 4241 East Live Oak Ave. Arcadia, Ca.

Dear Mr. Andy Narag

Thank you for your response to our concerns regarding the above project. We are aware that your department is using the consultants "developed neighborhood traffic management measure" or formula, to evaluate traffic patterns in and out of this project. With the reduction of only 16 units, they certainly have over reduced the number of vehicles coming and going during peaks hours.
From 158 outbound to just 78
From 214 inbound to just 41
There are assuming that the vast majority of the trips will thereby use the Live Oak entrance and exit. By there own calculations, with most of the traffic using Live Oak, it only makes sense this is where the main entrance should be, not on Mayflower Ave.

Keep in mind that these figures only deal with vehicles that reside within the project. What has not been dealt with, is all the traffic within our neighborhood and also all the cut though traffic north of Longden Ave and those that cut through from Myrtle Ave. that converge onto Mayflower Ave. going towards Live Oak Ave.
There is also the matter of heavy construction vehicles and equipment entering and leaving the project. Which entrance are they going to use? It has always been assumed the Mayflower entrance would be used. The street is posted 25 MPH and has a 3 ton weight limit, as does Longden Ave. If this entrance is used, who will repair the road bed? We don't feel that our tax money should be used for this. This is a private project, not a public one. Has this been addressed? We saw nothing addressing this in the project documents.

We might also add that your letter was dated 12/13/2010 and today is February 16, 2011, we have yet to hear from the applicant's consultant.

Thank you,

Richard & Karlyne Smith
2952 Ashmont Ave
Arcadia, Ca 91006
626-446-1380
richkar@charter.net

CC

Mayor Michael D. Antonovich Office (Mr. Paul Novac  pnovac@lacas.org)
Dept. of Regional Planning  (Mr. Jodie Sackett  jsackett@planning.lacounty.gov)
MEMORANDUM

To: Andy Narag  
Land Development Division  
L.A. County Department of Public Works

From: David S. Shender, P.E.  
Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers

Date: January 3, 2011  
LLG Ref: 1-063656-1

Subject: Traffic Study Addendum  
Santa Anita Village Project (VTNM 068400)

This traffic study addendum has been prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) for the Santa Anita Village project (also known as Vesting Tentative Tract Map 068400) located northwest of the Mayflower Avenue/Live Oak Avenue intersection in unincorporated Los Angeles County near the City of Arcadia.

LLG prepared a traffic study for the project dated February 13, 2007 (the “traffic study”), which was approved by the County’s Traffic and Lighting Division (approval letter dated September 13, 2007). The traffic study evaluated the project assuming the primary site ingress and egress via the main driveway on Mayflower Avenue. The site’s driveway on Live Oak Avenue was assumed to secondarily accommodate egress movements only, with right-turns only exiting the driveway (i.e., no left-turns onto Live Oak Avenue were assumed).

Subsequent to the preparation of the traffic study and approval thereof by L.A. County Traffic and Lighting, we understand there is an interest to reduce the number of project-related trips utilizing the Mayflower Avenue driveway by directing additional traffic to the Live Oak Avenue driveway. This would be accomplished by permitting additional traffic movements at the Live Oak Avenue driveway beyond the right-turn only egress movements assumed in the traffic study. Specifically, this traffic study addendum evaluates the potential traffic effects associated with the following:

A. Access Alternative A. Allowing project-related inbound trips to enter the site via a right-turn from westbound Live Oak Avenue (in addition to the previously considered right-turn egress movements); or

B. Access Alternative B. Allowing both left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress traffic movements at the project’s Live Oak Avenue driveway (i.e., all traffic movements permitted).

---

1 It is noted that the traffic study evaluated the potential impacts associated with the development of 334 multi-family units. We understand the project currently proposes to develop 318 multi-family residential units. Thus, the traffic effects of the project will be less than what was forecast in the traffic study.
Accordingly, this traffic study addendum evaluates the potential effects associated with the two alternative site access scenarios. The addendum also review the potential changes to the site plan required to accommodate either access scenario.

**Project Trip Distribution**

Table 6-1 of the traffic study notes that project (i.e., 334 units evaluated in the traffic study) was forecast to generate 2,672 vehicle trips (i.e., 1,336 trips inbound, 1,336 trips outbound) over a 24-hour period on a typical weekday. Figure 7-1 from the traffic study provides the previously considered assignment of project-related trips. As noted in the figure, 100% of ingress trips and 83% of egress trips were forecast to utilize the site’s Mayflower Avenue driveway. The Live Oak Avenue driveway was forecast to accommodate 17% of egress trips (right-turns only onto westbound Live Oak Avenue. Thus, when applied to the daily trip generation forecast, 1,336 trips daily would enter via the site’s Mayflower Avenue driveway. Similarly, 1,109 project-related trips would exit directly onto Mayflower Avenue and 227 project-related trips would exit directly onto Live Oak Avenue.

Figures 7-1A and 7-1B have been prepared to illustrate the potential project-related trip assignment patterns assuming implementation Access Alternative A and Access Alternative B, respectively. Specifically, Figure 7-1A assumes the Live Oak Avenue driveway would accommodate right-turn ingress and right-turn egress. Similarly, Figure 7-1B assumes the Live Oak Avenue driveway would accommodate all traffic movements (i.e., left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress movements). It is noted that in each access scenario, it is assumed that the Mayflower Avenue driveway would be used by both residents and visitors to the project (i.e., based on the location of the call box at the Mayflower access location) and the Live Oak Avenue driveway would primarily be used by residents only.

For comparison purposes, the table below provides the forecast 24-hour traffic volumes at the two site driveways under the three access scenarios (i.e., the project as originally proposed, as well as the two access alternatives). The volumes were derived by applying the project’s trip generation calculation provided in Table 6-1 of the traffic study to the project driveway trip distribution forecast provided in Figure 7-1 (contained in the traffic study), as well as Figures 7-1A and 7-1B developed for Access Alternative A and Access Alternative B, respectively.
**Forecast Driveway Traffic Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Oak Avenue Access Scenario</th>
<th>Mayflower Ave Driveway Volumes (24-Hour)</th>
<th>Live Oak Ave Driveway Volumes (24-Hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Study Right-Turn Egress Only (Figure 7-1)</td>
<td>Entry: 1,336 trips Exit: 1,109 trips</td>
<td>Entry: 0 trips Exit: 227 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Alternative A Right-Turn Ingress and Egress (Figure 7-1A)</td>
<td>Entry: 1,002 trips Exit: 1,109 trips</td>
<td>Entry: 334 trips Exit: 227 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Alternative B All Traffic Movements (Figure 7-1B)</td>
<td>Entry: 735 trips Exit: 975 trips</td>
<td>Entry: 601 trips Exit: 361 trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, the access scenario evaluated in the traffic study (i.e., right-turn egress only from the Live Oak Avenue driveway) results in 2,445 daily trips (1,336 inbound, 1,109 outbound) using the Mayflower Avenue driveway. Under Access Alternative A (right-turn ingress and right-turn egress at the Live Oak Avenue driveway), the forecast 24-hour traffic volumes at the Mayflower Avenue driveway are reduced to 2,111 daily trips (1,002 inbound, 1,109 outbound). For Access Alternative B (left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress movements at the Live Oak Avenue driveway), the forecast 24-hour traffic volumes at the Mayflower Avenue driveway are further reduced to 1,710 daily trips (735 inbound, 975 outbound). Thus, while both alternative access schemes would reduce project-related trips at the Mayflower Avenue driveway, Access Alternative B would be most effective in terms of shifting project-related traffic to Live Oak Avenue.

**Traffic Analysis**

The traffic analysis provided in the approved traffic study was updated to evaluate the potential traffic impacts associated with the two access alternatives. The purpose of the analysis is to confirm that implementation of either of the access alternatives would not change the findings from the approved traffic study previously prepared for the project. It is noted that the approved traffic study concluded that the project would cause incremental, but not significant traffic impacts at the off-site intersections evaluated in the report.
In review of Figures 7-1A and 7-1B attached, as compared to Figure 7-1 in the approved traffic study, implementation of either Access Alternative A or Access Alternative B would cause some shifting in the forecast assignment of project-related trips as compared to what was evaluated in the approved traffic study. Specifically, the assignment of project-related traffic would change at the following four study intersections with implementation of either access alternative:

3. Mayflower Avenue/Longden Avenue (County of Los Angeles)
4. Mayflower Avenue/Live Oak Avenue (County of Los Angeles)
9. Myrtle Avenue-Peck Road/Live Oak Avenue (County of Los Angeles)
8. Myrtle Avenue/Longden Avenue (City of Irwindale)

The Level of Service calculations were updated for each of the four study intersections assuming implementation of either Access Alternative A or Access Alternative B. It is noted that study intersection Nos. 3, 4 and 9 were evaluated using the County of Los Angeles traffic analysis methodology and thresholds of significance while study intersection No. 8 was evaluated based on the City of Irwindale traffic analysis methodology and thresholds of significance.

Corresponding to Table 10-1 in the approved traffic study, Tables 10-1A and 10-1B attached provide the summary of the traffic analysis prepared for the three affected County of Los Angeles intersections assuming implementation of Access Alternative A and Access Alternative B, respectively. Similarly, corresponding to Table 12-1 in the approved traffic study, Tables 12-1A and 12-1B attached provide the summary of the traffic analysis prepared for the one affected City of Irwindale study intersection assuming implementation of Access Alternative A and Access Alternative B, respectively. In review of Tables 10-1A and 10-1B, as well as Tables 12-1A and 12-1B, it is concluded that with implementation of either Access Alternative A or Access Alternative B, the relative traffic impacts due to the project at the four analyzed intersections would be less than significant. Thus, no traffic mitigation measures are required or recommended at the off-site intersections. It is noted that this conclusion regarding the relative effects of the project at the off-site intersections, even with implementation of the access alternatives, is consistent with the finding provided in the approved traffic study.

---

2 The intersection numbering corresponds to the labeling provided in the approved traffic study. The primary jurisdiction of each study intersection is noted in parentheses.
Live Oak Avenue Drive Site Access Design Considerations

The project’s Live Oak Avenue driveway is located on the north side of Live Oak Avenue between the signalized intersections of Mayflower Avenue to the east and 10th Avenue to the west. There are no driveways on the south side of Live Oak Avenue across from the proposed driveway. The proposed driveway is in close proximity to the existing driveway serving the prior residential use on the project site, which accommodated both left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress movements.

See attached Figure A for the depiction of the proposed project driveway location within the current configuration of Live Oak Avenue. As shown on Figure A, in the area of the proposed driveway, Live Oak Avenue currently provides two through travel lanes in each direction, separated by a center two-way left-turn lane. The two-way left-turn lane would safely accommodate left-turn movements into the project driveway from eastbound Live Oak Avenue. The two-way left-turn can also function as a temporary reservoir area for vehicles making left-turn exiting movements onto eastbound Live Oak Avenue from the project driveway.

The westbound “curb” lane on Live Oak Avenue is approximately 19 feet in width. Thus, vehicles approaching the project driveway along westbound Live Oak Avenue will be able to pull close to the curb and out of the through traffic flow to slow down and turn right into the driveway. Curbside parking along the north side of Live Oak Avenue east of the driveway can be prohibited (e.g., for approximately 50 feet in length) to ensure that this curb space remains open for vehicles turning right into the driveway. The proposed curbside parking prohibition would also enhance motorist sight distance for vehicles entering and exiting the driveway.

As shown on Figure A, the project’s Live Oak Avenue driveway is proposed to be 30 feet in width. This is sufficient to accommodate both entry and exit traffic, and thus no changes to this design are proposed.

As previously noted, the proposed residential project is gated, with the Live Oak Avenue driveway proposed to accommodate resident traffic only (i.e., the visitor call box would be located at the project’s Mayflower Avenue driveway). It is recommended that the gate at the Live Oak Avenue driveway be set back a minimum of 40 feet from the property line. This storage length would accommodate two queued vehicles on-site and would be sufficient so as to ensure that inbound vehicles waiting for the gate to open would not block the sidewalk on Live Oak Avenue, or otherwise queue into the street. The 40-foot queue length would be sufficient whether the Live Oak Avenue driveway accommodated right-turn entry movements, or left-turn and right-turn entry movements.
In summary, the project’s Live Oak Avenue driveway can adequately accommodate either right-turn in/right-turn out movements, or full left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress movements based on the following:

- The proposed project driveway is in close proximity to the existing driveway (to be removed) on Live Oak Avenue which accommodated left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress movements, and therefore would not represent a substantial change in terms of traffic activity at this location.

- The configuration of Live Oak Avenue, with a center two-way left-turn and a wide curb lane, allows for vehicles to safely turn left and right to and from the project site.

- The proximity of the existing signalized intersections east and west of the project driveway creates regular gaps in the eastbound and westbound Live Oak Avenue through traffic flow, thereby facilitating turning movements to and from the project driveway.

- Driveway design features as recommended herein for the proposed project driveway would preclude project-related vehicles from queuing onto Live Oak Avenue.

It is noted that use of the Live Oak Avenue driveway by project residents would be optional, and that motorists more comfortable with accessing Live Oak Avenue via the signalized Mayflower Avenue intersection would be able to do so via the project’s Mayflower Avenue driveway.

Summary

This traffic study addendum has been prepared for the Santa Anita Village project (also known as Vesting Tentative Tract Map 068400) located northwest of the Mayflower Avenue/Live Oak Avenue intersection in unincorporated Los Angeles County near the City of Arcadia. The approved traffic study for the project assumed the primary site ingress and egress via the main driveway on Mayflower Avenue, with the project driveway on Live Oak Avenue assumed to secondarily accommodate egress movements only, with right-turns only exiting the driveway (i.e., no left-turns onto Live Oak Avenue were assumed).

Subsequent to the preparation of the traffic study and approval thereof by L.A. County Traffic and Lighting, we understand there is an interest to reduce the number of project-related trips utilizing the Mayflower Avenue driveway by directing
additional traffic to the Live Oak Avenue driveway. This would be accomplished by permitting additional traffic movements at the Live Oak Avenue driveway beyond the right-turn only egress movements assumed in the traffic study. Specifically, this traffic study addendum evaluates the potential traffic effects associated with the following:

A. **Access Alternative A.** Allowing project-related inbound trips to enter the site via a right-turn from westbound Live Oak Avenue (in addition to the previously considered right-turn egress movements); or

B. **Access Alternative B.** Allowing both left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress traffic movements at the project's Live Oak Avenue driveway (i.e., all traffic movements permitted).

The following provides a summary of the key findings of this traffic study addendum:

- Implementation of either access alternative (Access Alternative A or Access Alternative B) for the project would be feasible and would not cause new or unanticipated significant traffic impacts related to site access or operations at the nearby study intersections.

- In the approved traffic study, the Live Oak Avenue driveway was assumed to accommodate approximately 17% of the project-related exit traffic (no entry traffic). Implementation of Access Alternative A would shift approximately 25% of the project-related inbound trips to the Live Oak Avenue driveway. Similarly, implementation of Access Alternative B would result a forecast of 45% and 27% of the project’s entry and exit traffic respectively utilizing the Live Oak Avenue driveway.

- Implementation of either access alternative would not change the findings provided in the approved traffic study with respect to potential traffic impacts at the nearby study intersections. The project-related traffic impacts due to the project would continue to be less than significant.

- As summarized herein, the existing configuration of Live Oak Avenue, in combination with driveway design features recommended herein would safely accommodate left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress movements related to a project driveway at this location. It is noted that all project residents would continue to have the option to utilize the project’s Mayflower Avenue driveway based on personal preference related to accessing Live Oak Avenue.
Please let us know if there are any questions or comments regarding the traffic study addendum prepared for the Santa Anita Village project.

cc: Steve Zuckerman
    File
FIGURE 7-1A
PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION
LIVE OAK DRIVEWAY: RIGHT-TURNS IN/RIGHT-TURNS OUT
SANTA ANITA VILLAGE PROJECT
FIGURE 7-1B
PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION
LIVE OAK DRIVEWAY: ALL LEFT-TURN AND RIGHT-TURN MOVEMENTS
SANTA ANITA VILLAGE PROJECT

XX = INBOUND PERCENTAGES
(XX) = OUTBOUND PERCENTAGES

LINSCHOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers
Table 10-1A
SUMMARY OF VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIOS and LEVELS OF SERVICE
AM AND PM PEAK HOURS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES STUDY INTERSECTIONS
LIVE OAK DRIVEWAY: RIGHT-TURNS IN/RIGHT-TURNS OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mayflower Avenue/ Longden Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.591 A</td>
<td>0.603 B</td>
<td>0.648 B</td>
<td>0.045 NO</td>
<td>0.651 B</td>
<td>0.048 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.495 A</td>
<td>0.505 A</td>
<td>0.562 A</td>
<td>0.057 NO</td>
<td>0.566 A</td>
<td>0.061 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mayflower Avenue/ Live Oak Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.571 A</td>
<td>0.584 A</td>
<td>0.597 A</td>
<td>0.013 NO</td>
<td>0.608 B</td>
<td>0.020 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.550 A</td>
<td>0.563 A</td>
<td>0.575 A</td>
<td>0.012 NO</td>
<td>0.580 A</td>
<td>0.017 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Myrtle Avenue-Peck Road/ Live Oak Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.701 C</td>
<td>0.718 C</td>
<td>0.719 C</td>
<td>0.001 NO</td>
<td>0.730 C</td>
<td>0.012 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.800 C</td>
<td>0.819 D</td>
<td>0.828 D</td>
<td>0.009 NO</td>
<td>0.832 D</td>
<td>0.013 NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"an impact is considered significant if the project related increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c) equals or exceeds the thresholds shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Pre-Project ICU</th>
<th>Project-Related Increase in V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 0.700 - 0.800</td>
<td>equal to or greater than 0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 0.800 - 0.900</td>
<td>equal to or greater than 0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/F</td>
<td>&gt; 0.900</td>
<td>equal to or greater than 0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mayflower Avenue/Longden Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mayflower Avenue/Live Oak Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Myrtle Avenue-Peck Road/Live Oak Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] According to the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works' "Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines," January 1, 1997, Page 6: an impact is considered significant if the project related increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c) equals or exceeds the thresholds shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Pre-Project ICU</th>
<th>Project-Related Increase in V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 0.700 - 0.800</td>
<td>equal to or greater than 0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 0.800 - 0.900</td>
<td>equal to or greater than 0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/F</td>
<td>&gt; 0.900</td>
<td>equal to or greater than 0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12-1A
SUMMARY OF VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIOS, DELAY AND LEVELS OF SERVICE
AM AND PM PEAK HOURS
CITY OF IRWINDALE STUDY INTERSECTIONS
LIVE OAK DRIVEWAY: RIGHT-TURNS IN/RIGHT-TURNS OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Myrtle Avenue/</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.80 17.8  B</td>
<td>0.80 17.8  B</td>
<td>0.0 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89 19.9  B</td>
<td>0.89 20.0  B</td>
<td>0.1 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longden Avenue</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.99 21.9  C</td>
<td>1.02 23.5  C</td>
<td>1.6 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08 27.3  C</td>
<td>1.10 29.3  C</td>
<td>2.0 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
V/C = Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
Delay = Average motorist delay measured in seconds per vehicle
LOS = Level of Service
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Myrtle Avenue/Longden Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
V/C = Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
Delay = Average motorist delay measured in seconds per vehicle
LOS = Level of Service
December 13, 2010

Mr. Richard Smith and
Ms. Karlyne Smith
2952 Ashmont Avenue
Arcadia, CA 91006

Dear Mr. and Ms. Smith:

APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED 318-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY SUBDIVISION
LOCATED AT 4241 EAST LIVE OAK AVENUE, ARCADIA
TRACT NO. 068400-(5) (SANTA ANITA VILLAGE)

Mayor Michael D. Antonovich asked that we look into your concerns regarding the proposed project and respond directly back to you. Public Works' staff has reviewed your September 16, 2010, e-mail and the October 19, 2010, response provided by the Department of Regional Planning and generally concurs with Regional Planning’s conclusions.

You expressed concern over possible congestion along Mayflower Avenue due to the location of the proposed main entrance for Tract No. 068400 at Mayflower Avenue and Ashmont Avenue. To address your concerns, the applicant's traffic consultants prepared a follow-up traffic analysis (December 2008) after meeting with various Ashmont Avenue residents to study cut-through traffic on Ashmont Avenue as well as concerns that the driveway location may induce more traffic. As a result, the consultant developed a neighborhood traffic management measure that requires the construction of a channelized island to restrict eastbound left turns and through movements at the Mayflower access.

The study analyzed the impact of restricting all traffic exiting the project driveway (located along Mayflower Avenue) to right turn only movements. The study estimated 78 vehicles will exit the Mayflower driveway during the a.m. peak hour and 41 vehicles will exit during the p.m. peak hour. The remaining outbound trips are forecasted to exit from the Live Oak Avenue driveway. The study concluded the redesigned project access will not have a significant impact at study intersections, previously evaluated in the applicant’s February 2007 traffic study.
Mr. Richard Smith and
Ms. Karlyne Smith
December 13, 2010
Page 2

Please note that the December 2008 study estimated new trip generation figures during the peak hours (due to the change in the project's scope) from 334 residential units to 318 units. Consequently, the project is estimated to generate 150 net new vehicle trips (15 inbound trips and 135 outbound trips) during the a.m. peak hour and 202 net new vehicle trips (130 inbound trips and 72 outbound trips) during the p.m. peak hour.

Although the study did not specifically analyze the intersection of Mayflower Avenue at Ashmont Avenue, we do not expect the project's redesigned access to have a significant impact at this intersection. However, to further address your concerns, we have contacted the applicant and reopened the discussion involving access. We do not expect that this will lead to a redesign of the main entrance at Mayflower Avenue, but may result in allowing ingress at the Live Oak Avenue driveway for better distribution of traffic. The applicant's consultant will contact you shortly to discuss the proposed revisions.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Andy Narag at (626) 458-4921 or anarag@dpw.lacounty.gov.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Works

Dennis Hunter
DENNIS HUNTER, PLS PE
Deputy Director

cc: Mayor Michael D. Antonovich (Paul Novak)
    Department of Regional Planning (Jodie Sackett)
Re: Project No. TR068400-(5)

County Supervisor Antonovich:

I am a homeowner at 2845 Ashmont Ave, Arcadia Area, 91006-5517.
I write regarding the townhome/condo development project for the address, 4241 East Live Oak Avenue (TR068400, “Santa Anita Village”). This proposed development is about 700 feet from my front door.

My neighbors have expressed a range of concerns about this development, from its tripling of traffic on our streets, to its building heights.

I worry about the development’s entrance and exit alignment. Currently – and despite its Live Oak address – the development’s main gate is to be on Mayflower Avenue, directly aligned with Ashmont.

In order to assuage Ashmont residents’ worries about “cut-through” traffic (i.e., residents of 4241 E. Live Oak driving across Mayflower and up Ashmont to reach arterial streets), the development’s designers plan for its exit onto Mayflower to be right-turn only.

The developers, however, have made no observable effort to eliminate the possibility of cut-through traffic *entering* 4241 E. Live Oak by way of driving down Ashmont and across Mayflower.

Ashmont has *no sidewalks.* Pedestrians, joggers, and children walking to the nearby Mayflower Elementary must walk on the side of the road, or on the edge of neighbors’ lawns.

If traffic is allowed to cut-through Ashmont, straight into 4241 E. Live Oak, these pedestrians and school children will be endangered.

I propose 4241 E. Live Oak’s primary exit and entrance be moved from Mayflower to Live Oak.

Should this prove unfeasible, I propose the developers add a median in Mayflower that completely blocks 4241 E. Live Oak residents from entering the development from -- or exiting the development onto -- Ashmont Avenue.

Thank you for your time,

Alex Muniz
2845 Ashmont Ave
Arcadia, CA 91006-5517
October 19, 2010

Richard and Karlyne Smith
2952 Ashmont Avenue
Arcadia, California 91006

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Smith:

SUBJECT: APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED 318-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT 4241 E. LIVE OAK AVENUE, ARCADIA PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5) (“SANTA ANITA VILLAGE”)

Thank you for your correspondence dated September 16, 2010. At the request of Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich, staff is providing this letter in response to your e-mail dated September 16, 2010, regarding the proposed multi-family subdivision (“TR068400”) located at 4241 E. Live Oak Avenue in Arcadia. The project currently proposes six multi-family condominium lots with 318 residential condominium units (170 units in 23 townhouse buildings and 148 units in two multi-unit buildings) on 12.1 gross acres. The project is still pending in the tentative map stage, and no development approvals and/or permits have been issued.

Your e-mail indicated a concern regarding the proposed project driveway in relation to your property on the corner of Ashmont Avenue and Mayflower Avenue. The project driveway on Mayflower, currently proposed slightly to the northwest of your property where Ashmont meets Mayflower, is the project’s main gate and acts as both entrance and exit (please see the attached map). In your correspondence, you stated that “you do not want the driveway in our front yard” and that “the driveway belongs on Live Oak Avenue not at Mayflower and Ashmont”. Regarding this concern, there is currently a driveway for “exit only” proposed along Live Oak Avenue. In reviewing the initial project plans, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (“Public Works”) determined that a “main gate” along Live Oak is less desirable from a traffic circulation and safety standpoint, and that the currently proposed location at Mayflower is more desirable for traffic and safety. This determination was supported by a traffic analysis conducted by the applicant and reviewed by Public Works.

TR068400 is scheduled for a public hearing before the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission (“Commission”) on Wednesday, October 20, 2010. Any interested persons will be given an opportunity to testify and voice their concerns to the Commission. The Commission will consider this testimony when it makes its decision regarding the proposed development. Your concerns have already been forwarded to the Commission for their consideration.
Should you have any additional questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ms. Susan Tae or Jodie Sackett, the case planner, of the Land Divisions Section at (213) 974-6433. Our office hours are Monday through Thursday, 7:30am to 5:30pm. We are closed on Fridays.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Richard Bruckner
Director

RJB:SA:SMT:jds

Attachment: Site map

c: Paul Novak, Planning Deputy
Hello!

I beg you to forgive my delay in delivering this for the Department's consideration today.

It's in your standard PDF formatted document, entitled

Behind Your Back, and Without Your Permission.pdf

I pray that you will at the very least table the motion to accept the impact report, rather than to ratify the damage that's already been done, behind your back, and without your permission so far.

Larry Jessee
4241 F25 Live Oak
Arcadia CA 91006

(Because Santa Anita Village removed my mailbox from the mail room (the Postal Service will not deliver anything you might mail to me here.)
My dear commissioners:

I urge you to reject the "impact report" prepared by and for Santa Anita Village. I beg you not to reward and to ratify the catastrophic damage very nearly completed . . 

**Behind Your Back**

and

**Without Your Permission**

Santa Anita Village quietly began converting the use of the property a dozen years ago or so, until Regional Planning called a halt to that action when a disgruntled employee blew the whistle several years ago.

While holding itself out to the State and the County as a provider of low-income housing, Santa Anita Village replaced nearly all of our 228 low-income homeowners with short-term, transient motor homes and recreational vehicles.
Per L.A. County's Department of Regional Planning, Santa Anita Village is no longer allowed to accept RVs, which includes motorhomes, 5th wheels, travel trailers, and truck campers.

We apologize for the inconvenience and wish you safe traveling.

Management
(626) 447-3878

But by that time, the damage was already done to all those gone by now.
We urge you to reject their "impact report," for it contains false information, and it fails to disclose the catastrophic damage that this family will suffer with the loss of our home, our livelihood, and our life's possessions.

We beg you not to reward or to ratify the damage they've already done to nearly all of us low-income, long-term home owners while the park had been holding itself out to the State and the County as a provider of low-income housing, but wasting this park all that time in advance of its "conversion."

The property managers hired to do the deed had turned our comfortable, cozy, commodious setting into a wasteland from which they'd withdrawn and shut down nearly all of the services and amenities that we had enjoyed for most of our forty years here.

The sometimes not-so-subtle campaign to replace the long-term, low-income tenants with disposable short-term residents involved a large-scale withdrawal of the amenities we'd been paying for over forty years.

Some of the actions instigated by the off-site property conversion manager have done since 1996 have been to

1) Removed our mailbox from the mailroom, so that the Postal Service refuses to delivery mail addressed to us.

2) Shut down two out of three laundry facilities, and removed nearly all of our clothes lines.

3) Shut down and locked up the community showers and toilet facilities we had freely enjoyed at any hour for the first 40 years at home here.

4) Let my 85-year-old asthmatic neighbor suffer a quadrupled gas bill for several months, while the off-site property manager stubbornly ignored repeated requests to simply correct the erroneous reading and promptly refund the extravagant overcharge my poor neighbor felt obligated to pay.

5) Broke into our home on a fishing expedition for anything they might use, as they've done in the past with at least one of our former neighbors, as a flimsy pretext for a Health Code eviction that failed.

6) In letters of apology, expressed concern and compassion for what they knew to be extended periods away for medical reasons, then promptly posted a succession
of notices to quit under the pretense of not having received a rental payment.

7) Employed as a groundskeeper a resident criminal who boasted at family parties (according to a seemingly honest cousin) of his lock-picking skills, and who, according to the third of the pair of office-minders the off-site property conversion specialists had hired, had broken into the home of a cancer-stricken old woman away for medical treatment and had stolen whatever valuables he could find.

The Sheriff's SWAT team shot and killed that former employee when he'd barricaded himself in a home near the office, with the stainless steel shotgun that he'd occasionally brandished not far from my door.

8) Up until only the last few years, butchered our fruit-bearing shade trees routinely, while carting off the bulk of our crop with the excuse that they had left "enough" of our avocados to satisfy what they regarded as our meager needs.

I moved my home to this spot in March of 1969, constructed a large second bedroom with permission and permits, and after 41 years my cozy, comfortable, but immovable home has no market value whatever, and I do not want to move.

I'm not looking for money, or for "reasonable moving expenses" for a home that cannot be moved. Closing this park will force me to suffer a catastrophic loss of my home and my life's possessions. I'd rather see Santa Anita Village restore its 228 low-income sites.

My income is about half that regarded as the poverty level threshold.

The damage I'll suffer if your ratify the impact statement will be the value to me of my comfortable, cozy home in place, with its two small bedrooms in 340 ft² living space for the price of around $470/month, with contiguous sheltered parking for two cars, contiguous outside storage, my own private grove of mango and avocado trees and my garden, a large swimming pool, and — until the campaign to turn our little piece of paradise into a deserted wasteland made miserable by intermittent retaliatory actions of pointed harassment — the formerly unrestricted access at any hour to community showers and toilets, a large commercial kitchen inside a library and a recreation hall ("Please Don't Play the Piano between 10 pm and 9 am" is the 60-year-old sign still posted above our keyboard) that are open only at the convenience of the office minders.

I beg you to reject that impact report, for it fails to fully reflect the damage to be done.

Larry Jessee
Larry_Jessee@RescueTeam.com
(The Postal Service will not deliver any mail addressed to me at Santa Anita Village.)
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS
LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 200700002
ZONE CHANGE NO. 200700004
MOBILEHOME PERMIT NO. 201000003
PARKING PERMIT NO. 200800002
HOUSING PERMIT NO. 201000001
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 200700073
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 068400

The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") held a public hearing on October 20, 2010 for General Plan Amendment No. 200700002, Zone Change No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. The Commission took its final action on October 20, 2010, approving the Mobilehome Permit, Housing Permit, Parking Permit, CUP, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map, and recommending to the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors ("Board") adoption of the Zone Change and approval of the Plan Amendment. The project proposes to create a multi-family development of 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. Included within the proposed 318 dwelling units are 75 market rate units of senior housing. A Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") was prepared for the project, indicating that there will be less than/no significant impacts on the environment with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. The project is located at 4241 E. Live Oak Avenue, in the South Arcadia Zoned District and unincorporated community of South Monrovia Islands, Fifth Supervisorial District.

Notice of public hearing was published in the "San Gabriel Valley Tribune" and "La Opinion" newspapers. Additionally, notices were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as those individuals and organizations on the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") courtesy mailing lists. Three public hearing signs were posted on the subject property, one along each public street frontage. Project materials, including the staff report, tentative map, Exhibit "A" and environmental documentation, were mailed to the Live Oak Library located at 4153 E. Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia, CA 91006-5895. Original project materials are available at Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1382, Los Angeles. Project materials are also posted on the Regional Planning website, http://planning.lacounty.gov/case.htm.

October 20, 2010 Proceedings

The subject project includes a request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre); a Zone Change to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program); a Mobilehome Permit to consider a closure impact report for an existing 228-unit mobilehome park (37 units currently occupied); a Housing Permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside; a parking permit for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots; a CUP for the Development Program ("DP") zone, modifications to the R-3 zone (building and wall/fence heights, and setbacks), and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill; and a Vesting Tentative Tract Map to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff, testimony from the applicant, and testimony from several community members. The applicant testimony in support of the project included the following points:

- Project replaces an "obsolete" mobilehome park
- Project provides a "campus-like" environment with many amenities
- Senior housing set-aside will allow seniors to remain in neighborhood
- Project design/access will direct traffic away from neighborhood streets
- Project was reviewed by the Monrovia School District
- Paying an overall $2.6 million in developer fees and an estimated $900,000 per year in property taxes to the County and other agencies
- Current design reflects input gathered from several neighborhood meetings; reduced building heights and removed windows to improve privacy
- Project was reviewed by County environmental staff and the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), no significant impacts found
- Project falls within the proposed CEQA CO₂ (carbon emissions) standard for new development projects

The community testimony opposed to the project made the following points:

- Overall environmental impacts of project (traffic, air, noise, aesthetic)
- Project has lack of community compatibility (overall size, building height)
- Project approval will induce other mobilehome parks to be closed and redeveloped
- Project will reduce/eliminate privacy; should be redesigned with "one-story units"
- Project MND is insufficient; does not address "greenhouse gases"; MND is inappropriate for size and scale of project
- Project’s plan amendment and zone change are inappropriate; not in the public health safety and general welfare

During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development and made the following comments:

- The Commission asked County Counsel to clarify if the project should have completed an Environmental Impact Report or MND, to which County Counsel responded that the development reflected an MND.
The Commission indicated that it is disappointed to see a mobilehome park closed, and that mobilehome parks need to be "kept in the community". However, the Commission also stated that the developer "listened to the community" in designing the project and that it can be a "leadership project" for the community.

On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing; approved the MND and adopted the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP); approved Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003, Parking Permit No. 200800002, Housing Permit No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400; and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change No. 200700004.
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7/28/11
REQUEST
Mobilehome Permit: To consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report.
General Plan Amendment: To amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).
Zone Change: To change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U- DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Units Per Net Acre – Development Program).
Conditional Use Permit ("CUP"): For the Development Program zone; modifications to setbacks, height, walls and fences; and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill.
Parking Permit: For shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.
Housing Permit (discretionary): To allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing within the proposed development.
Tract Map: To create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

LOCATION/ADDRESS
4241 E. Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia

ACCESS
Live Oak Ave., Mayflower Ave.

ZONED DISTRICT
South Arcadia

COMMUNITY
South Monrovia Islands

EXISTING ZONING
C-3, R-3-P, R-A

SHAPE
Irregular

TOPOGRAPHY
Gently sloping

SURROUNDING LAND USES & ZONING (WITHIN 500 FEET)

North: Single-family residences / R-A

South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair / R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)

East: Single-family residences, mobile home park / R-A, C-3 (Unlimited Commercial)

West: Single-family residences / R-A

GENERAL PLAN
Countywide General Plan

DESIGNATION
Category 1 (Low Density Residential)

MAXIMUM DENSITY
72 DU

CONSISTENCY
Yes (with Plan Amendment)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS
A Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project, as staff determined that the project will have less than significant or no impacts on the environment with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN
PLEASE REFER TO PAGE 2.

KEY ISSUES
PLEASE REFER TO PAGE 2.

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY ON CASES TO BE HEARD BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFF CONTACT PERSON
Jodie Sackett, 213-974-6433

RPC HEARING DATE (S)
October 20, 2010

RPC ACTION DATE
October 20, 2010

RPC RECOMMENDATION
Approval

MEMBERS VOTING AYE
Valadez, Bellamy, Helsey, Rew, Modugno

MEMBERS VOTING NO
None

MEMBERS ABSTAINING
None

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (PRIOR TO HEARING)
Approval

SPEAKERS* (O) 4

PETITIONS (O) 1

LETTERS (O) 6

* (O) = Opponents (F) = In Favor
SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

☐ APPROVAL ☐ DENIAL

☐ No improvements ☐ 20 Acre Lots ☐ 10 Acre Lots ☐ 2½ Acre Lots ☐ Sect 191.2

☒ Street improvements ☒ Paving ☒ Curbs and Gutters ☒ Street Lights

☒ Street Trees ☐ Inverted Shoulder ☒ Sidewalks ☐ Off Site Paving ☐ ft.

☒ Water mains and hydrants

☒ Drainage facilities

☐ Sewer ☐ Septic tanks ☐ Other ________________________________

☒ Park dedication “in-lieu fee”

INDIVIDUAL AGENCY COMMENTS

NONE

DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN

The exhibit “A” (site plan) dated January 7, 2009 depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 apartment units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter. The center of the development contains a cluster of four additional townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests of the development. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicap parking. The southerly portion of the development contains a “podium” structure design with two four-story condominium towers (each having 74 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo buildings will be set-aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project. Primary ingress and egress access for the development is proposed via a gated entrance at Mayflower Avenue.

KEY ISSUES

• Mobile Home Park Closure: A 228-unit mobile home park currently exists on the project site. There are 37 mobile home units still occupied. Proposed with the project is consideration of a Closure Impact Report, which outlines measures proposed to relocate and compensate the current park tenants. No mobile home units are proposed to remain on the site.

• Project Design: The proposed project requests an increase in land use density and zoning to accommodate the 318 new multi-family units, which includes 75 units set aside for seniors. The project site is primarily surrounded by single-family residences whose rear yards adjoin the site. The project is designed to minimize the visual impacts to these adjacent residences via building setbacks, landscape screening and reduced-height units along the site perimeter. Two larger four-story buildings are located away from the single-family residences near existing commercial and multi-family development along Live Oak Avenue. The project design includes other features for minimizing traffic and visual impacts and has more than the required amount of onsite parking. This helps to ensure that the increase in site use intensity and the overall re-development of the site will be compatible with the neighborhood.

PREPARED BY

Jodie Sackett
Regional Planning Commission
Transmittal Checklist

Project Number: TR068400-(5)
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. 200700002
ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 200700004
MOBILEHOME PERMIT CASE NO. 201000003
PARKING PERMIT CASE NO. 200800002
HOUSING PERMIT CASE NO. 201000001
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 200700073
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 068400
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CASE NO. 200700062

Case(s):

Planner: Mr. Jodie Sackett, Land Divisions Section

☐ Factual
☐ GIS Aerial Map (11x17)
☐ Thomas Bros. Guide Page
☐ Color 8.5x11 Site Plan
☐ Staff Report
☐ Draft Resolutions
☐ Draft Findings and Conditions
☐ Drought-Tolerant Landscaping Recommendations
☐ Environmental Documentation
☐ Burden of Proof Statement(s)
☐ Mobilehome Park Closure Impact Report with Review Letter
☐ Correspondence
☐ Color Photos
☐ Color Rendering
Map and Plan Set
(Includes Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Exhibit "A", Phasing Exhibit, Parking Exhibit, Color Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Landscape Plan)

Reviewed By: [Signature]
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone (213) 974-6433

PROJECT NO. TRO68400-5
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. 200700002
ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 200700004
MOBILEHOME PERMIT CASE NO. 201000003
PARKING PERMIT CASE NO. 200800002
HOUSING PERMIT CASE NO. 201000001
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 200700073
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 068400

APPLICANT
Prime Enterprises, LLC

OWNER
Prime Enterprises, LLC

REPRESENTATIVE
Prime Enterprises, LLC

REQUEST
Mobilehome Permit: To consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report.
General Plan Amendment: To amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential - One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential - 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).
Zone Change: To change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence - Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural - 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-ZSU-3P (Limited Multiple Residence - 22 Units Per Net Acre - Development Program) Conditional Use Permit ("CUP"). For the Development Program zone; modifications to setbacks, height, walls and fences; and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill.
Parking Permit: For shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.
Housing Permit (discretionary): To allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing within the proposed development. Tract Map: To create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

LOCATION/ADDRESS
4241 E. Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia

ACCESS
Live Oak Ave., Mayflower Ave.

ZONED DISTRICT
South Arcadia

COMMUNITY
South Monrovia Islands

EXISTING ZONING
C-3, R-3-P, R-A

SHAPE
Irregular

TOPOGRAPHY
Gently sloping

SURROUNDING LAND USES & ZONING (WITHIN 500 FEET)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residences / R-A</td>
<td>Single-family residences, mobile home park / R-A, C-3 (Unlimited Commercial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair / R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural - 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)</td>
<td>Single-family residences / R-A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL PLAN</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
<th>CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide General Plan</td>
<td>Category 1 (Low Density Residential)</td>
<td>72 DU</td>
<td>Yes (with Plan Amendment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS
A Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project, as staff determined that the project will have less than significant or no impacts on the environment with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN
PLEASE REFER TO PAGE 2.

KEY ISSUES
PLEASE REFER TO PAGE 2.

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY ON CASES TO BE HEARD BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF CONTACT PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPC HEARING DATE (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERS VOTING AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF RECOMMENDATION (PRIOR TO HEARING)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKERS* (O) (F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(O) = Opponents (F) = In Favor
SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- [x] APPROVAL
- [ ] DENIAL

- [ ] No improvements
- [ ] 20 Acre Lots
- [ ] 10 Acre Lots
- [ ] 2½ Acre Lots
- [ ] Sect 191.2

- [x] Street Improvements
- [ ] Paving
- [x] Curb and Gutters
- [x] Street Lights
- [x] Street Trees
- [ ] Inverted Shoulder
- [x] Sidewalks
- [ ] Off Site Paving
- [ ] ft.

- [x] Water mains and hydrants
- [ ] Drainage facilities
- [ ] Sewer
- [ ] Septic tanks
- [ ] Other

- [x] Park dedication “in-lieu fee”

INDIVIDUAL AGENCY COMMENTS

NONE

DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN

The exhibit “A” (site plan) dated January 7, 2009 depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 apartment units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter. The center of the development contains a cluster of four additional townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests of the development. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicap parking. The southerly portion of the development contains a “podium” structure design with two four-story condominium towers (each having 74 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo buildings will be set-aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the driveways and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project. Primary ingress and egress access for the development is proposed via a gated entrance at Mayflower Avenue.

KEY ISSUES

- **Mobile Home Park Closure:** A 228-unit mobile home park currently exists on the project site. There are 37 mobile home units still occupied. Proposed with the project is consideration of a Closure Impact Report, which outlines measures proposed to relocate and compensate the current park tenants. No mobile home units are proposed to remain on the site.

- **Project Design:** The proposed project requests an increase in land use density and zoning to accommodate the 318 new multi-family units, which includes 75 units set aside for seniors. The project site is primarily surrounded by single-family residences whose rear yards adjoin the site. The project is designed to minimize the visual impacts to these adjacent residences via building setbacks, landscape screening and reduced-height units along the site perimeter. Two larger four-story buildings are located away from the single-family residences near existing commercial and multi-family development along Live Oak Avenue. The project design includes other features for minimizing traffic and visual impacts and has more than the required amount of onsite parking. This helps to ensure that the increase in site use intensity and the overall re-development of the site will be compatible with the neighborhood.

PREPARED BY

Mr. Jodie Sackett
1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The applicant, Prime Enterprises LLC, proposes a residential subdivision to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units in five phases (170 townhouse units in 23 three-story buildings and 148 multi-family units in two four-story towers), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. Major issues include the following:

- **Mobilehome Park Closure**: A 228-unit mobilehome park currently exists on the project site. There are 37 mobilehome units still occupied. Proposed with the project is consideration of a Closure Impact Report, which outlines measures proposed to relocate and compensate the current park tenants. No mobilehome units are proposed to remain onsite.

- **Project Design**: The proposed project requests an increase in land use density and zoning to accommodate the 318 new multi-family units, which includes 75 units set aside for seniors. The project site is primarily surrounded by single-family residences whose rear yards adjoin the site. The project is designed to minimize the visual impacts to these adjacent residences via building setbacks, landscape screening and reduced-height units along the site perimeter. Two larger four-story buildings are located away from the single-family residences near existing commercial and multi-family development along Live Oak Avenue. The project design includes other features for minimizing traffic and visual impacts and has more than the required amount of onsite parking. Overall, these features help to ensure that the increase in site use intensity and the re-development of the site will be compatible with the neighborhood.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY

**Location**: The project site is located at 4241 E. Live Oak Avenue, in the unincorporated community of the South Monrovia Islands, Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

**Existing Features**: The subject property is approximately 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size, rectangular in shape, with flat terrain. There is an existing 228-unit mobilehome park with 37 units still occupied. The mobilehome park has a leasing office, pool, and recreation
center, with internal private driveways providing access to the individual mobilehome units. There are trees, bushes and other types of landscaping distributed throughout the park site.

**Access:** Primary access to the subject property is via Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide major highway with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median. Live Oak Avenue borders the subject property to the south. Secondary access is via Mayflower Avenue, an 80-foot wide public street with 56 feet of paved width. Mayflower borders the subject property to the east. Access to the subject property can also be gained from the west via Lovejoy Street (northwest), a 60 foot wide public street (tap street) with a variable paved with of 35 to 40 feet, and a 20-foot wide public alley (southwest). Access into the subject property is gated at Lovejoy but un-gated at the public alley.

**Utilities:** The site currently has public water and sewer connections. Public water service will be provided by Golden State Water Company. Public sewer service will be provided by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15.

### 3. ENTITLEMENTS REQUESTED

- **General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002:** To amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

- **Zone Change Case No. 200700004:** To change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Units Per Net Acre – Development Program).

- **Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003:** To consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

- **Housing Permit Case No. 201000001:** A discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

- **Parking Permit Case No. 200800002:** For shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

- **CUP Case No. 200700073:** For the Development Program ("DP") zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill, 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

  **(Building Setbacks)**

  a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.

c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.

d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.

e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.

f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)

a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.

b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.

c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.

d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)

a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.

b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.

c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.

d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

- Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400: To create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

4. EXISTING ZONING

Subject property: The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

Surrounding area: Zoning within a 500-foot radius of the subject property:

- North: R-A
- East: R-A, C-3
- South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
- West: R-A

5. EXISTING LAND USES

Subject property: The subject property consists of one developed lot (mobilehome park).

Surrounding area: Land uses within a 500-foot radius of the subject property:
6. PREVIOUS CASES/ZONING HISTORY

Previous Cases: The subject property was originally created as portions of Lot Nos. 144 and 145 of the Arcadia Acreage Tract, recorded in 1906, and portions of Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Tract No. 14718 recorded in 1950. Subsequent cases on the subject property include:

- **Plot Plan No. 47330**: A proposed billboard sign denied in 2002 (did not meet zoning requirements).
- **Existing mobilehome park**: No information currently on record.

Zoning History: The South Arcadia Zoned District was established by Ordinance No. 4851 effective on March 13, 1947. Subsequent Ordinance No. 9440 created the existing R-A zoning on December 8, 1967; Ordinance No. 10826 created the C-3 zoning on February 8, 1974; and Ordinance No. 12211 created the R-3-P zoning on October 2, 1980.

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Site Design: The Exhibit "A" (site plan) dated January 7, 2009 depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two towers), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. Below are two examples of the proposed "stepped-down" townhomes along a portion of the project perimeter:

**Perimeter Townhome Elevations**

(Drawings courtesy Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP, 2009)

*Above: Westerly view from the project site looking down the property line, adjacent to residences along Birchcroft Street. The setback distance is 15 feet from the wall.*
The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicap accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units.

Offsite to the south, there is an existing apartment building and non-residential uses along the perimeter bordering the proposed condominium towers. One of the proposed condominium towers (Building No. 24) has frontage along Live Oak Avenue and will be clearly visible from the street. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

**Access:** As part of this development, primary access to the project site is proposed via Mayflower Avenue, an 80-foot wide secondary highway with 56 feet of paved width. Mayflower is the only proposed method of ingress, with egress available for "right turn only" on Mayflower. Access is also proposed along Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide major highway with a 10-foot wide concrete median and 120 feet of total paved width. Live Oak will be for egress and emergency vehicles only. The project is proposed to be walled at Lovejoy Street to the northwest and the public alley to the southwest, with no through-access from Lovejoy or the alley.

**Subdivision:** The project site is proposed to be subdivided into six multi-family lots, each containing a portion of the proposed development. Proposed Lot No. 5 lacks frontage along
a public street, and a request to waive the frontage requirements is required. Further details regarding development proposed within each lot can be found in the table below.

**Grading**: A total of 166,470 cubic yards of cut and 132,670 cubic yards of fill are proposed for the project, with 16,140 cubic yards of earthwork to be imported from offsite.

**Utilities**: Public water service will be provided by Golden State Water Company. Public sewer service will be provided by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15.

**Phasing**: Please see the below table describing the proposed phases of development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Lot No(s.)</th>
<th>Net Ac.</th>
<th>Bldg. (Unit) Count</th>
<th>Open Space Ac./% Tot.</th>
<th>Resident Parking</th>
<th>Guest Pkg.</th>
<th>Acc. Pkg.</th>
<th>Total Pkg.</th>
<th>Phase Features/Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5 (38)</td>
<td>1.03/26%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Establish main project access from Mayflower and Live Oak; gated entry and street improvements at Mayflower; clubhouse, pool/spa, village green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6 (45)</td>
<td>0.59/15%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5 (38)</td>
<td>0.24/6%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7 (49)</td>
<td>0.61/16%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2 (148)</td>
<td>0.82/22%</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Community center, subterranean parking, 75 senior units, fire access lane; street improvements at Live Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3 (318)</td>
<td>3.3**/100%</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Phase 1 will be constructed first in sequence; all other phases may/may not be constructed in numerical order.
** A total of 29 percent of the overall net project area will be used for open space. Open space includes all areas used for landscaping, courtyards, outdoor patios, and walkways, and excludes all structures, driveways and fire lanes.

8. GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

GENERAL GOALS AND POLICIES CHAPTER

Urban Revitalization
To "revitalize declining urban areas" is the third General Goal of the General Plan (General Goals, p. G-10). The project proposes to redevelop a relatively large 12-acre site in an older urbanized area experiencing little new growth and/or investment. The existing mobilehome park on the project site has been mostly vacant for several years, and some adjacent retail shops are minimally maintained and/or vacant. The new condominium development will provide a significant investment in the community and may potentially act as a development stimulus for surrounding properties and businesses. The project will provide additional housing units and an added diversity of housing than currently existing in the neighborhood. This is consistent with General Plan policy to "improve the residential... sections of the older urban areas of the County... increasing the quantity and protecting the quality of housing... and improving the design of developments." (p. G-10).

CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

Conservation/Open Space Policies
The General Plan states that "landscaping is needed to provide scenic beauty, make the
urban environment more attractive and pleasant, and separate and screen urban uses" (Promote Landscaping, p. OS-24). The development proposes a total of 3.3 acres (or 29 percent) of the net project area as open space, which includes landscaping, courtyards, a play area and walkways. The project open space is evenly distributed throughout the site, with landscaping and trees screening adjacent views, and providing shade for buildings and pedestrians. Larger common areas of open space (such as a pool, spa and "village green") are centrally located on the site, maximizing accessibility. These factors indicate a high-quality open space design consistent with plan policy.

LAND USE ELEMENT

Land Use Policy Map
The subject property is contained within the Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) land use category of the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan ("General Plan"). The proposed multi-family lots and multi-family residences are not consistent with the allowed land uses of Category 1 (see General Plan, Land Use Element, p. LU-13). In addition, Category 1 only allows a maximum density of 72 dwelling units on the subject property. As 318 multi-family dwelling units are proposed, the applicant has requested a General Plan Amendment to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Gross Acre). If approved, the plan amendment to Category 3 will allow the proposed development land use and density to be consistent with the General Plan.

Land Use Element Objectives
Objectives of the Land Use Element of the General Plan include "maintain[ing] and enhancing the quality of existing residential neighborhoods" and "encourag[ing] high quality design in all development projects, compatible with the... manmade environment" (Objectives, p. LU-8). The proposed development enhances the quality of surrounding neighborhood through its design features, such as appropriate building location, heights and setbacks, attractive façades, ample open space and recreational area, and convenient guest parking throughout the development. This is consistent with both listed objectives of the General Plan.

Land Use Element Policies
Overall, the proposed development will provide higher density housing in an urbanized area in close proximity to existing services and facilities, such as retail businesses, transit stops, and public sewer and water lines of sufficient capacity to accommodate new development. This is consistent with plan policies to "provide convenient access to jobs and services", "promote compatible land use arrangements that reduce reliance on the private automobile... and maximize energy conservation" (Needs and Policies, pp. LU-9, LU-11).

Also proposed is the elimination of 0.9 net acres of C-3 commercial zoning within the subject property along Live Oak Avenue. Although the underlying land use category is Category 1, the existing adjacent land uses along Live Oak are commercial in nature, and it may have been more consistent for the project to propose a commercial use on the 0.9 net acre portion. This would have allowed the project to be "mixed use", and thus more supportive of plan policy to "promote neighborhood commercial facilities which provide... goods and services" (p. LU-10). However, the scale of proposed revitalization and sensitive project design, when compared with the relatively small amount of viable commercial project area available along Live Oak, somewhat compensates for the lack of mixed uses within the project.
HOUSING ELEMENT

Senior Housing
A goal of the General Plan’s adopted 2008 Housing Element is to incorporate “a wide range of housing types in sufficient supply to meet the needs of current and future residents, particularly persons with special needs, including but not limited to... seniors” (Goal No. 1, p. 2). The project proposes 75 market-rate units reserved for seniors, and, as such, supports General Plan policy to meet the needs of seniors within the County.

Affordable Housing
Overall, the proposed closure of the existing mobilehome park and elimination of mobilehome units decreases the supply of less expensive housing in the area. Although senior housing is being proposed within the development, allowing local residents to “age in place” within their own community, the set-aside units are not affordable and thus are less effective in meeting the needs of seniors (and non-seniors) living on fixed incomes and reliant on locally accessible services. This contrasts with plan policy to “support the development of affordable housing near employment opportunities and/or within a reasonable distance of public transportation” (Goal 2, p. 2). Staff believes that an affordable component could have been added to the proposed development. However, the applicant did not include affordable units due to financial considerations and some negative feedback received from local residents (see Section 17).

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

Availability of Commercial Land
As previously mentioned, nearly an acre of C-3 zoned commercial space existing along Live Oak Avenue will be eliminated with the proposed zone change allowing the new multi-family residential development. The replacement of commercial land with other uses is not supported by the General Plan, which states “the existing supply of... commercial land must be used more efficiently and its absorption by other uses must be discouraged” (Land and Infrastructure, p. ED-10). However, also as previously mentioned, the new influx of a major development in the area will support the economic well-being of other nearby businesses.

9. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

The project proposal includes a General Plan Amendment from Category 1 to Category 3 to allow a medium-density residential use at a location currently designated for low-density residential development. In order to justify the amendment, the applicant must demonstrate the following:

(1) That a need for the proposed Plan Amendment exists;

(2) That the particular amendment proposed is appropriate and proper;

(3) That modified conditions warrant a revision to the Countywide General Plan as it pertains to the area or district under consideration;

(4) That approval of the proposed Plan Amendment will be in the interest of the public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good planning practices.
The plan amendment to Category 3 will allow new major development and investment in an older urbanized area in need of revitalization. Although adjacent portions along Live Oak Avenue are designated Category 1, most of the land uses along the north side of this corridor are commercial and not residential. Thus, the higher density is proposed adjacent to more intensive uses compatible with the proposed development. The project supports General Plan policy for increased multi-family housing in closer proximity to existing services and facilities, such as auto repair, offices, a furniture store, public library, restaurant and other retail businesses. Furthermore, the project supports general policy direction to direct new development “in a more concentrated urban pattern” away from undeveloped areas where growth is less appropriate (see General Goals, p. G-12, and Open Space Element, p. OS-1). Lastly, no significant environmental impacts are anticipated, and potential impacts will be reduced to less than significant with appropriate project mitigation measures.

Staff has reviewed the applicant’s responses and determined that they satisfy the above criteria. The applicant’s responses are attached.

10. ZONE CHANGE

The project includes a Zone Change request for 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A zoning on the subject property to all R-3-22U-DP, which will allow attached townhomes and multi-family residences. In order to justify the change, the applicant must demonstrate the following:

(1) That a need for the proposed Zone Change exists;

(2) That the particular change proposed is appropriate and proper;

(3) That modified conditions warrant a revision to the Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to the area or district under consideration;

(4) That approval of the proposed Zone Change will be in the interest of the public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good planning practices.

The zone change to R-3-22U-DP will facilitate needed urban revitalization by allowing attached multi-family residences to be constructed. The proposed zoning is consistent with neighboring C-3 zoning to the south (a comparable intensity of use). The 2.3 acres of existing R-3-P zoning on the property is of the same intensity as the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning, and this area will contain a significant portion of the larger multi-family buildings being proposed. This demonstrates a thoughtful project design aimed at minimizing neighborhood impacts while at the same time achieving a significant investment in the community. Lastly, the DP-CUP required with the zone change will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area.

Staff has reviewed the applicant’s responses and determined that they satisfy the above criteria. The applicant’s responses are attached.
11. MOBILEHOME PERMIT

County Regulations
A mobilehome permit has been requested to consider the approval of a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR"). Section 8.57.300 of the County Code ("Mobilehome Park Impact Reports") states:

"The purpose of this section is to require persons to convert, close or cease the use of a mobilehome park to address the impact on the residents to be displaced, and, where required, to take steps to mitigate the adverse impacts on the residents."

The County Code states that prior to the closure of a mobilehome park, the applicant shall file a "report on the impact of the closure" upon the residents of the mobilehome park who will be displaced. The mobilehome park cannot be closed until the CIR has been approved and the mitigation measures specified have been completed. The CIR shall address the availability of adequate replacement housing in other mobilehome parks and relocation costs for each resident of the mobilehome park. It shall specify the steps to be taken by the applicant to mitigate any adverse impact of the proposed closure on the residents who will be displaced. The CIR shall be approved if found that it contains the information required pursuant to the County Code. In approving the CIR, the advisory agency may impose such conditions as it finds necessary to mitigate the adverse impacts on the residents; however, "any steps required to be taken by the applicant shall not exceed the reasonable costs of relocation."

State Regulations
Since the CIR has been filed concurrently with a subdivision, provisions of the Subdivision Map Act ("Map Act") related to the mobilehome park closure apply to the proposed project, and these provisions supersede the provisions of the County Code where applicable. Section 66427.4 of the Map Act states:

"In determining the impact of the conversion on displaced mobilehome park residents, the report shall address the availability of adequate replacement space in mobilehome parks... this section establishes a minimum standard... and shall not prevent a local agency from enacting more stringent measures."

The Map Act also states:

"The advisory agency... may require the subdivider to take steps to mitigate any adverse impact of the conversion on [the displaced residents]..."

CIR Review and Comment
Staff initially received and reviewed the Closure Impact Report ("CIR") in 2009. Subsequently, staff sent CIR revision comments to the applicant, and the report was updated and resubmitted in February 2010. In September 2010, under the advisement of the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission, staff required the applicant to have the CIR peer-reviewed by a third party consultant to determine if the CIR meets the requirements of the Map Act and County Code. Soon thereafter, the consultant submitted their comments on the CIR to staff and the applicant, determining that the CIR meets the applicable regulations of the Map Act and County Code. Related to the park closure mitigation, staff is recommending that the relocation rates of compensation to remaining park tenants be adjusted for inflation and cost of living increase, since the County regulations
were originally set in 1991 and have not been updated. Staff believes that such increase reasonably falls within the "more stringent measures" local agencies may enact under the Map Act provisions. The revised CIR already incorporates these adjusted rates, and they have been deemed acceptable by the consulting reviewer.

Staff has reviewed the consultant’s comments on the CIR and agrees that the CIR is complete and accurate as presented. A copy of the revised CIR and consultant comments are attached.

12. HOUSING PERMIT

A discretionary housing permit has been filed for a density bonus with the proposed 75 units of senior market-rate housing pursuant to Section 22.52.1870 of the County Code. The density bonus calculations are as follows:

- Total number of proposed dwelling units: 318
- Number of "pre-bonus" dwelling units (based on the maximum 22 dwelling unit per acre allowed by the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning): 250
- Number of bonus units needed: 68 (or 21 percent of 318)
- Number of senior units set-aside: 75 (or 30 percent of 250)

According to the County Code, the project meets the initial criteria for a senior housing permit, which requires at least 35 senior units be proposed as part of the overall development. As the proposed density bonus is greater than 20 percent, the applicant must apply for a discretionary housing permit. In order to justify the request, the applicant must demonstrate the following (Section 22.56.2820):

A. That the requested use at the location will not:
   1. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or
   2. Be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or
   3. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

B. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.

C. That the proposed site is adequately served:
   1. By highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and
   2. By other public or private service facilities as are required.

D. That the proposed project at the location proposed has been designed to be complementary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design.

E. That the proposed project will assist in satisfying housing needs, and is viable in terms of continuing availability to meet such housing needs.
The proposed senior units are integrated into a multi-family residential development that is compatible with the surrounding area, and has a high-quality of design with many onsite amenities such as a community center, pool, spa, courtyards, guest parking, handicap parking and a village green, all conveniently accessible by seniors. The project site is a short walking distance away from facilities such as a public library and bus transit stops located on Live Oak Avenue. The 75 units reserved for seniors constitute more than 30 percent of the overall units within the development and will greatly assist the County in meeting its senior housing needs.

Staff has reviewed the applicant's responses and determined that they satisfy the above criteria. The applicant's responses are attached.

13. PARKING PERMIT

A parking permit has been filed for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots pursuant to Section 22.52.1000 of the County Code. In order to justify the request, the applicant must demonstrate the following (Section 22.56.1020):

A. That there will be no need for the number of parking spaces required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52;

B. That there will be no conflicts arising from special parking arrangements allowing shared facilities, tandem spaces or compact spaces;

C. That off-site facilities, leases of less than 20 years, rear lot transitional parking lots and uncovered residential parking lots will provide the required parking for uses;

D. That the requested parking permit at the location proposed will not result in traffic congestion, excessive off-site parking or unauthorized use of parking facilities developed to serve surrounding property; and

E. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this ordinance.

Although three individual lots will not contain the minimum number of parking spaces required within the lot, the overall development will contain more than the required amount of parking. No offsite or shared parking is proposed or required. All required parking will be contained onsite, and designed in such a manner to be conveniently accessible to guests and conducive to a more sensitive project design, that, for example, does not propose large open parking lots or above-ground parking structures within the project site. These factors demonstrate the need of a parking permit to accommodate a well-designed project that minimizes impacts both in the surrounding area and within the development.

Staff has reviewed the applicant's responses and determined that they satisfy the above criteria. The applicant's responses are attached.

14. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Pursuant to Sections 22.40.040 and 22.56.210 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") (Zoning Ordinance), the project proposal includes a CUP for the DP zone and onsite
project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill material. The DP CUP will require that development occurring after the project has been approved and the property has been rezoned will be in substantial compliance with the approved project and conform to plans and exhibits submitted by the applicant. In addition, the DP CUP will allow modifications to yard setbacks, fence/wall and building heights to accommodate the proposed multi-family residences on the site. In order to justify the request, the applicant must demonstrate the following:

A. That the requested use at the location will not:

1. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or

2. Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or

3. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare; and

B. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area; and

C. That the proposed site is adequately served:

1. By highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and

2. By other public or private service facilities as are required.

As previously mentioned, the DP CUP will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. The requested modifications to required yard setbacks are necessary because the orientation of the proposed lots are suited to the project and do not follow a typical street pattern. Wall/fence heights greater than typically allowed are necessary in order to maintain security and privacy around the project site. Building heights greater than typically allowed are necessary in order to accommodate density and design features in a manner that will be compatible with surrounding development.

Regarding the grading CUP, much of the required grading is for excavation of an underground parking facility to provide the necessary amount of onsite resident and guest parking. The CUP will ensure that proposed grading is done in an orderly manner and in substantial conformance with the original project proposal.

Staff has reviewed the applicant's responses and determined that they satisfy the above criteria. The applicant's responses are attached.

15. COUNTY GREEN BUILDING PROGRAM
Low Impact Development ("LID"): The project was determined to be exempt from the County LID Ordinance, as the project completed the following prior to January 1, 2009:

- One Subdivision Committee Review
- Approved Drainage/SUSMP Plan
- Approved Soils/Geology Report

Drought-Tolerant ("D-T") Landscaping: The project conceptual landscaping plan currently incorporates drought-tolerant landscaping materials and complies with the County’s D-T Ordinance. In addition, staff has additional recommendations make the project landscaping plan more drought-tolerant.

Additional recommendations attached.

Green Building: The project will be required to comply with the County’s Green Building Ordinance prior to the issuance of building permits.

16. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On January 12, 2010 staff completed an Initial Study and determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") is required, according to the State and County environmental reporting guidelines. The MND concludes that the project will have less than significant/no impacts on the environment with project mitigation in the following areas:

- **Geotechnical**: Implement a Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prior to the issuance of grading permits.

- **Noise**: Limit the hours of construction activities near adjacent residences; implement measures to reduce noise and emissions from construction equipment.

- **Air Quality**: During grading and construction, use available electricity from power poles instead of diesel generators to reduce air emissions; use methanol or natural gas powered equipment instead of diesel; use propane or butane-powered equipment instead of gasoline; during construction, implement additional measures to improve air quality such as using shade trees, pre-coated building materials and low-emission water heaters.

- **Sewer, Traffic, Biota, Drainage and Grading**: Provide and implement additional studies and analysis related to sewer, traffic and biota prior to the issuance of grading and building permits.

- **Tenant Relocation**: Comply with and implement the provisions and conditions of the mobilehome permit and CIR.

- **Water Conservation**: Utilize high-efficiency dual-flush toilets in the project design to reduce water consumption.

The environmental determination and MMP are attached.
17. AGENCY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Subdivision Committee
The Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee ("Subdivision Committee") consists of the Departments of Regional Planning, Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, and Public Health. The Subdivision Committee has reviewed the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit "A" dated January 7, 2009, and recommends approval with the attached conditions.

Regional Planning
In compliance with Title 21 of the County Code (Subdivision Ordinance), new subdivisions are required to plant one tree within the front yard of each new residential lot. Strictly speaking, this would only mean planting six new trees (one for each proposed lot) on the 12-acre subject property. As the subject project is a multi-family development with multiple units and several lots, staff recommends that, in order to comply with the intent of this provision of the County Code, the project be required to plant one new tree for every 5,000 square feet of net lot area, for a total of 99 new trees, to be incorporated into the final project landscaping plan. The 99 required trees may be counted among some of the trees already proposed on the conceptual landscape plan, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

Other Agencies
A letter from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District ("Sanitation District") was received, indicating that the subject property must be annexed into the Sanitation District in order to receive sewer service. The letter also stated that the Sanitation District has enough capacity to meet the anticipated demand of the proposed development.

Agency comments and recommendations are attached.

18. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Community Outreach
Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along Mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, staff has not received any correspondence from these cities.
In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobilehome park closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, staff has not received any direct correspondence from MAD.

Responses to Public Noticing
At the time of writing, staff has received responses from two community members, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobilehome park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the past year. The second community member indicated concerns about increased traffic, blockage of “winds from the south”, excessively tall buildings, and also suggested that the new project should include “community gardens” and “office park” features.

All correspondence is attached.

19. LEGAL NOTIFICATION AND POSTING

Notification was provided as listed below:

- **Project Site Posting**: On September 13, 2010, three hearing notice signs were posted at the property frontages along Live Oak Avenue, Mayflower Avenue and Lovejoy Street (one sign at each location).

- **Hearing Notices**: On September 14, 2010, hearing notices were mailed to all property owners as identified on the current Assessor’s record within 1,000 feet of the subject property, as well as those on the courtesy mailing list for the South Arcadia Zoned District, for an approximate total of 664 notices.

- **Newspaper Advertisement**: On September 17, 2010, the public hearing notice was published in The San Gabriel Valley Tribune and La Opinion newspapers.

- **Library Package**: On September 17, 2010, project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit “A”, land use map, draft staff report, mobilehome park closure impact report, and the environmental determination were received at the Live Oak Library.

- **Website Posting**: On September 20, 2010, a copy of the library package containing the public hearing notice, factual, draft staff report and environmental determination was posted on the Regional Planning website.

20. STAFF CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, staff has determined that the project complies with all applicable provisions of the Map Act and County Code, and is overall consistent with the General Plan. Staff has also determined that all agency and community concerns have been sufficiently addressed, that the CIR is sufficient, and that the proposed MMP and mitigation
measures reflect satisfactory environmental mitigation to avoid potentially significant impacts to the environment. Therefore, in conclusion, staff recommends that the project be approved.

21. FEES/DEPOSITS

If approved, the following shall apply:

California Department of Fish and Game:
A processing fee (currently $2,085.25) associated with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk, to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game.

Los Angeles County Librarian:
A fee (currently $259,170.00 or $815.00 per dwelling unit) must be paid for library facilities mitigation.

Department of Regional Planning:
- Deposit the sum of $3,000.00 in order to defray the cost of reviewing the subdivider's reports and verifying compliance with the information contained in the reports required by the MMP.
- A fee of $200.00 per inspection for bond release will be charged to ensure completion/installation of onsite improvements in compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance.

22. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Planning Commission close the public hearing; approve the mobilehome permit; approve the MND and adopt the MMP; approve the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit, and recommend to the Board approval of the General Plan amendment and adoption of the zone change.

**Suggested Motion:** "I move that the Regional Planning Commission close the public hearing and approve Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003."

**Suggested Motion:** "I move that the Regional Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program."

**Suggested Motion:** "I move that the Regional Planning Commission approve Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 and Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, and recommend to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004."
Attachments:
1. Factual
2. Color 8x11 site plan
3. GIS-Net map
4. Thomas Brothers Guide map page
5. Draft resolutions, findings and conditions
6. D-T landscaping recommendations
7. Environmental determination
8. Burdens of proof
9. Mobilehome park closure impact report with review letter
10. Correspondence
11. Site photos
12. Site rendering
13. Map and Plan Set
   (Includes Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Exhibit "A", Phasing Exhibit, Parking Exhibit, Color Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Landscape Plan)

SMT:jds
10/7/10
A RESOLUTION OF THE
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
RELATING TO GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. 200700002

WHEREAS, Article 6 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California (commencing with Section 65350) provides for adoption of amendments to county general plans; and

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") has conducted a public hearing regarding General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002, Zone Change Case No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") Case No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068406 on October 20, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 57 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 is a request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1, (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

5. Zone Change Case No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3:22I:DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

6. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").
7. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

8. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

9. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

   (Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

   (Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 14 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

   Walls and Fences:
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setbacks.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

10. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 316 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.
11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.

12. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit “A”, depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 15 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 15 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   • North: R-A
   • East: R-A, C-3
   • South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
   - South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
   - West: Single-family residences

17. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

18. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia, and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

19. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

20. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobilehome park closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing-project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

21. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobilehome park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and
"office park" features.

22. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and testimony from the applicant. No other testimony was heard.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development and the following issues:

[RESERVED]

24. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2007000073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004.

25. The plan amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. The plan amendment allows a project that promotes urban revitalization, increases the supply and diversity of housing, increases the supply of senior housing, and promotes the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development.

26. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.

27. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit "A".

28. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related zone change, parking permit, CUP, and subdivision.

29. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

30. The recommended plan amendment is needed in order to fulfill and implement General Plan policies to provide high-quality multi-family and senior housing in older urban neighborhoods.

31. The particular amendment is appropriate and proper because the proposed location of the development efficiently utilizes existing infrastructure and services, is compatible with surrounding uses, and will improve the quality of the neighborhood.
32. Modified conditions warrant a revision to the General Plan. The area in question is in need of urban revitalization and conversion of a mostly vacant mobilehome park to a more beneficial land use.

33. Approval of the proposed plan amendment is in the best interest of the public health, safety and general welfare, as the area contains and/or the project proposes sufficient infrastructure and facilities to accommodate the development, to include street improvements, water supply, sewer connection, fire flow and fire access. The development is in conformity with good planning practices as the development is necessary in order to fulfill General Plan goals related to urban revitalization and senior housing.

34. The plan amendment to Category 3 will allow new major development and investment in an older urbanized area in need of revitalization. Although adjacent portions along Live Oak Avenue are designated Category 1, most of the land uses along the north side of this corridor are commercial and not residential. Thus, the higher density is proposed adjacent to more intensive uses compatible with the proposed development. The project supports General Plan policy for increased multi-family housing in closer proximity to existing services and facilities, such as auto repair, offices, a furniture store, public library, restaurant and other retail businesses. Furthermore, the project supports general policy direction to direct new development "in a more concentrated urban pattern" away from undeveloped areas where growth is less appropriate (see General Goals, p. G-12, and Open Space Element, p. OS-1). Lastly, no significant environmental impacts are anticipated, and potential impacts will be reduced to less than significant with appropriate project mitigation measures.

35. The applicant has satisfied the "Burden of Proof" for the requested plan amendment.

36. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP").

37. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

38. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the
project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

39. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

1. Hold a public hearing to consider the above recommended general plan amendment; and

2. Certify that the MND has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and the State and County Guidelines related thereto and reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

3. Approve the MND and MMP prepared for the project and certify that it has reviewed and considered the information contained therein; and

4. Find that the recommended general plan amendment is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan; and

5. Adopt General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 amending the Land Use Policy Map of the General Plan as depicted on the Exhibit attached hereto and described hereinafore.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted unanimously by the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on October 20, 2010.

______________________________
Commission Secretary
County of Los Angeles
Regional Planning Commission
A RESOLUTION OF THE
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
RELATING TO ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 200700004

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") has conducted a public hearing regarding Zone Change Case No. 200700004, General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002, Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") Case No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 008400 on October 20, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 87 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. Zone Change Case No. 200700004 is a request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

5. General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

7. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.
8. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

9. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

   (Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

   (Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

   (Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4, and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

10. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an
ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.

12. The applicant's site plan, labeled Exhibit "A", depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land-Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
17. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
   - South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
   - West: Single-family residences

18. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

19. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia Quarto Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

20. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

21. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobilehome closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

22. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobilehome...
park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include “community gardens” and “office park” features.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and testimony from the applicant. No other testimony was heard.

24. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development and the following issues:

[RESERVED]

25. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 20080002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004.

26. The zone change is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. The zone change allows a project that promotes urban revitalization, increases the supply and diversity of housing, increases the supply of senior housing, and promotes the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development.

27. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.

28. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping, and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit “A”.

29. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related plan amendment, parking permit, CUP, and subdivision.

30. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

31. The recommended zone change is needed in order to fulfill and implement General Plan policies to provide high-quality multi-family and senior housing in older urban neighborhoods.
32. The particular zone change is appropriate and proper because the proposed location of the development efficiently utilizes existing infrastructure and services, is compatible with surrounding uses, and will improve the quality of the neighborhood.

33. Modified conditions warrant a zone change. The area in question is in need of urban revitalization and conversion of a mostly vacant mobilehome park to a more beneficial land use.

34. Approval of the proposed zone change is in the best interest of the public health, safety and general welfare, as the area contains and/or the project proposes sufficient infrastructure and facilities to accommodate the development, to include street improvements, water supply, sewer connection, fire flow and fire access. The development is in conformity with good planning practices, as the development is necessary in order to fulfill General Plan goals related to urban revitalization and senior housing.

35. The zone change to R-3-22U-DP will facilitate needed urban revitalization by allowing attached multi-family residences to be constructed. The proposed zoning is consistent with neighboring C-3 zoning to the south (a comparable intensity of use). The 2.3 acres of existing R-3-P zoning on the property is of the same intensity as the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning, and this area will contain a significant portion of the larger multi-family buildings being proposed. This demonstrates a thoughtful project design aimed at minimizing neighborhood impacts while at the same time achieving a significant investment in the community. Lastly, the DP-CUP required with the zone change will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area.

36. The applicant has satisfied the "Burden of Proof" for the requested zone change.

37. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP").

38. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.
39. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

40. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

1. Hold a public hearing to consider the above recommended zone change;

2. Certify that the MND has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and the State and County Guidelines related thereto and reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

3. Approve the MND and MMP prepared for the project and certify that it has reviewed and considered the information contained therein;

4. Find that the recommended zone change is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan;

5. Adopt Zone Change Case No. 200700004 amending the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance as depicted on the Exhibit attached hereto and described herein above.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted unanimously by the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on October 20, 2010.

__________________________
Commission Secretary
County of Los Angeles
Regional Planning Commission
1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 on October 20, 2010. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002, Zone Change Case No. 200700004, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, CUP Case No. 200700073 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 is a request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR") for the Santa Anita Village mobilehome park ("park"), pursuant to the Section 66427 of the Subdivision Map Act ("Map Act") and Title 8.57.300 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code").

3. The park is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

4. General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

5. Zone Change Case No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked Exhibit A. No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

6. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

7. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

8. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (168,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite).

9. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.
10. The owner intends to close the park in conjunction with the approval of the aforementioned land entitlements authorizing a 318-unit multi-family condominium development over the entire 12.1 gross acre park site. Closure of the park will allow the property to be developed according to the conditions of the approved entitlements.

11. Closure of the park requires that the applicant submit a CIR to Regional Planning. The CIR was prepared by Overland, Pacific, & Cutler, Inc. The relocation costs were calculated using the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission ("CDC") guidelines for Mobilehome Park Closure/Conversion, adopted in 1991 by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. The adopted CDC guidelines included information related to relocation benefits. The relocation benefits offered in the CIR were adjusted to reflect 2010 rates of inflation and cost of living increases by using the U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, California Consumer Price Index, which equated to a 59.7 percent increase from the 1991 rates listed in the CDC guidelines.

12. Under a third-party agreement with the County and the applicant, Epic Land Solutions, Inc. ("Epic") was retained to review the CIR and determine its compliance with State and County relocation regulations.

13. Upon review, Epic concluded that the CIR was found to be in compliance with all applicable regulations. In addition, Epic recommended the following:

   a. That photos of coaches that have to be relocated be included in the CIR to help document the conditions of the park prior to closure; and

   b. That additional information on temporary housing be included in the CIR for those households which may have a more difficult time finding a replacement.

These additional requirements and information have been attached in an addendum to the CIR.

14. Staff has reviewed the CIR and found it to be in compliance with State and County regulations. The CIR sufficiently addresses the availability of adequate replacement housing in other mobilehome parks and sufficiently addresses relocation costs for each resident of the mobilehome park. The CIR specifies steps to be taken by management to mitigate any adverse impact of the proposed closure on the residents who will be displaced.

15. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 8.57.300(D)3 of the County Code, the management and residents of the mobilehome park were appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail.

16. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission’s decision is based in this matter is at the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section of Regional Planning.
BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That the CIR contains all information required by Section 66427 of the Map Act and Title 8.57.300 of the County Code.

B. That upon review of the relocation benefits detailed in the CIR, finds that the benefits proposed are consistent with the County guidelines adopted in 1991.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Approves Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 and the CIR subject to the attached conditions.
DRAFT CONDITIONS:

The Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park ("park") Closure Impact Report ("CIR") is approved, subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition No. 13. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 2, and Condition Nos. 3 and 4 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.

4. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten (10) days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

   a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

   b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 2.170.010.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
6. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recodification of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recodification of a final map, this grant shall terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

8. The permittee or successor in interest shall implement all mitigation measures as specified in the CIR and CIR Addendum, prepared by Overland, Pacific & Cutler, Inc., including but not limited to monetary and advisory assistance. Such mitigation measures are incorporated herein by reference.

9. The permittee or successor in interest shall convert, close, or cease the use of the park within 36 months after the date of final map recodification. If the permittee has failed to convert, close, or cease the use of the park within 36 months, the approval of the impact report shall become null and void. Thereafter, the permittee shall not convert, close or cease the use of the park until such time as a new impact report is approved. However, upon application of the management, filed with the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") on or before the date of expiration, the impact report may be extended by the Commission up to an additional 36 months. An application for an extension shall be subject to the notice and hearing procedures described in subdivision 3 of subsection (D) of Section 8.57.300.

10. Any time prior to the closure of the park, the Commission may, in its discretion, and upon good cause shown, initiate proceedings for the revocation or amendment of a CIR. Good cause may include, but is not limited to, change of circumstances that render the conditions or requirements of the CIR no longer necessary or appropriate, negligent or fraudulent misrepresentation of fact relating to the CIR, or noncompliance with the conditions of the CIR. Prior to revoking or amending a CIR, the Commission shall conduct a hearing in accordance with the procedures set forth in subdivision 3 of subsection (D) of Section 8.57.300. Upon revocation, the permittee or successor in interest shall not convert, close or cease the use of the park until such time as a new CIR is approved. Such revocation or amendment is subject to the same request for hearing as is provided in subdivision 5 of subsection (D) of Section 8.57.300.

11. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

12. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts
necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200 per inspection).

13. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public’s health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

14. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
FINDINGS OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FOR PARKING PERMIT CASE NO. 200800002

1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 on October 20, 2010. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002, Zone Change Case No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") Case No. 200700073, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

3. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228 unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

4. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

5. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is a request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

6. General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

7. Zone Change Case No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program) The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

8. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

9. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.
10. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

(Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

11. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

12. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.
13. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit "A", depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

14. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

15. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

16. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

17. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
18. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

19. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

20. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

21. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

22. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and testimony from the applicant. No other testimony was heard.
24. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development and the following issues:

[RESERVED]

25. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobile Home Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004.

26. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.

27. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping, and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit "A".

28. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related zone change, CUP, and subdivision.

29. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

30. Although three individual lots will not contain the minimum number of parking spaces required within the lot, the overall development will contain more than the required amount of parking. No offsite or shared parking is proposed or required. All required parking will be contained onsite, and designed in such a manner to be conveniently accessible to guests and conducive to a more sensitive project design, that, for example, does not propose large open parking lots or above-ground parking structures within the project site. These factors demonstrate the need of a parking permit to accommodate a well-designed project that minimizes impacts both in the surrounding area and within the development.

31. The applicant has satisfied the "Burden of Proof" for the requested parking permit.

32. The proposed use is subject to the development standards and requirements applicable to the R-3-22U- DP zone, as set forth in Sections 22.20.260 through 22.20.330 of the County Code, as well as the requirements of the DP zone, pursuant to Sections 22.40.030 through 22.40.080 of the County Code.

33. The applicant has submitted an application, site plan, and other information which complies with the requirements of Section 22.56.1010 of the County Code.
34. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP").

35. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

36. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

37. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That there will be no need for the number of parking spaces required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52;

B. That there will be no conflicts arising from special parking arrangements allowing shared facilities, tandem spaces or compact spaces;

C. That off-site facilities, leases of less than 20 years, rear lot transitional parking lots and uncovered residential parking lots will provide the required parking for uses;

D. That the requested parking permit at the location proposed will not result in traffic congestion, excessive off-site parking or unauthorized use of parking facilities developed to serve surrounding property; and

E. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, loading facilities, landscaping and other development features
prescribed in this ordinance.

THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a parking permit as set forth in Sections 22.56.1020 and 22.56.1060, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is approved, subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission.
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
PARKING PERMIT CASE NO. 200800002

Draft Conditions:

This grant authorizes less than the required amount of guest and handicapped-accessible parking on Lot Nos. 2, 3 and 5 as shown on the Exhibit "A" dated January 7, 2009.

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition No. 9, 20 and 22. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 2, and Condition Nos. 3, 4 and 20 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.

4. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten (10) days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 2.170.010.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
6. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

8. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

9. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be, financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200 per inspection).

10. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

11. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.

12. The subject property shall be maintained in substantial conformance with the plans marked Exhibit A. In the event that subsequent revised plans are required, the permittee shall submit four (4) copies of the proposed plans to the Director of Regional Planning for review and approval. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.

13. The subject property shall be developed, maintained, and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance, or to exercise reasonable
oversight of tenants or other so that development or activities not in full compliance are allowed to continue unabated, shall be a violation of these conditions.

14. All structures, walls and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings or signage that was not approved by Regional Planning. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the development on the premises or that do not provide pertinent information about said premises.

15. In the event of graffiti or other extraneous markings occurring, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

16. The permittee or successor in interest shall continuously maintain the property in a neat, clean, and healthful condition, free of litter and debris, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

17. A minimum of 746 automobile parking spaces, as depicted on the approved Exhibit “A” (dated January 7, 2009) or on an approved revised Exhibit “A”, shall be provided and continuously maintained on the subject property, developed to the specifications listed in Section 22.52.1060 of the County Code. The required parking spaces shall be continuously available for vehicular parking only and shall not be used for storage, automobile repair, or any other unauthorized use. No inoperable vehicles shall be parked or stored in any required parking spaces.

18. Within five days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,085.25) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 211752 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

19. The mitigation measures set forth in the “Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation” section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program (“MMP”). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee’s compliance with the required mitigation measures.

20. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the
information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.
1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 on October 20, 2010. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002, Zone Change Case No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") Case No. 200700073, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. The subject site is located at 4241 Live Oak Avenue, within the South Arcadia Zoned District and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

3. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

4. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

5. General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 is a request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Zone Change Case No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

7. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

8. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

9. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.
10. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

(Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 26: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4, and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

11. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

12. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.
13. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit “A”, depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a “podium” structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing off-site access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

14. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

15. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

16. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

17. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
• South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
• West: Single-family residences

18. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

19. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along Mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would “reduce property values” and “increase emergency vehicle activity”, respectively.

20. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

21. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

22. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and testimony from the applicant. No other testimony was heard.
24. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development and the following issues:

[RESERVED]

25. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobile Home Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004.

26. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit "A".

27. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related General Plan amendment, zone change, parking permit, CUP, and subdivision.

28. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property or other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

29. The proposed senior units are integrated into a multi-family residential development that is compatible with the surrounding area and has a high-quality of design with many onsite amenities such as a community center, pool, spa, courtyards, guest parking, handicapped parking and a village green, all conveniently accessible by seniors. The project site is a short walking distance away from facilities such as a public library and bus transit stops located on Live Oak Avenue. The 75 set-aside units reserved for seniors constitute more than 30 percent of the overall units within the development and will greatly assist the County in meeting its senior housing needs.

30. The applicant has satisfied the "Burden of Proof" for the requested housing permit.

31. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP").
32. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

33. This project does not have “no effect” on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

34. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission’s decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (“Regional Planning”), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That the requested use at the location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

B. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.

C. That the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.

D. That the proposed project at the location proposed has been designed to be complementary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design.

E. That the proposed project will assist in satisfying housing needs, and is viable in terms of continuing availability to meet such housing needs.

THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a housing permit as set forth in Sections 22.56.1020 and 22.56.1060, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is approved, subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission.
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING  
PROJECT NO. TR088400-(5)    
HOUSING PERMIT CASE NO. 201000001  

Exhibit "A" Date: January 7, 2009

DRAFT CONDITIONS:

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 14 and 16. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 2, and Condition Nos. 3, 4 and 14 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.

4. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten (10) days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

   a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

   b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 2.170.010.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

6. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall
terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

8. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200 per inspection).

9. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

10. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.

11. The permittee or successor in interest shall enter into a covenant with the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission ("CDC") and Regional Planning to set aside 75 dwelling units for "seniors" as defined in California Civil Code Section 51.3. The 75 units set-aside shall be entirely contained within Building No. 24 as depicted on the Exhibit "A" (dated January 7, 2009), shall contain the same interior finishes and overall visual and architectural quality as non-set aside units, and shall be set aside for senior condos for a period of 30 years.

12. Within five days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,085.25) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

13. The mitigation measures set forth in the "Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation" section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached
Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee’s compliance with the required mitigation measures.

14. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.
FINDINGS OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 200700073

1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") Case No. 200700073 on October 20, 2010. CUP Case No. 200700073 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002, Zone Change Case No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073 is a request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

   (Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

   (Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

   (Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.

d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

5. General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Zone Change Case No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

7. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

8. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

9. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.

10. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a related request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.

12. The applicant's site plan, labeled Exhibit "A", depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each
designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a “podium” structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views, and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
   - South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
   - West: Single-family residences

17. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached
multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

18. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along Mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

19. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

20. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

21. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

22. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and testimony from the applicant. No other testimony was heard.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development and the following issues:

[RESERVED]
24. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobile Home Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004.

25. The technical and engineering aspects of the project have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Public Health and Regional Planning.

26. The subject property is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping and other accessory structures except as otherwise modified, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map and Exhibit “A”.

27. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related zone change, parking permit, and subdivision.

28. There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.

29. The CUP will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. The requested modifications to required yard setbacks are necessary because the orientation of the proposed lots are suited to the project and do not follow a typical street pattern. Wall/fence heights greater than typically allowed are necessary in order to maintain security and privacy around the project site. Building heights greater than typically allowed are necessary in order to accommodate density and design features in a manner that will be compatible with surrounding development.

30. Regarding the grading CUP, much of the required grading is for excavation of an underground parking facility to provide the necessary amount of onsite resident and guest parking. This avoids large open parking lots and/or above-ground parking structures within the project site that would have a greater visual impact on the surrounding community. The CUP will ensure that proposed grading is done in an orderly manner and in substantial conformance with the original project proposal.

31. The applicant has satisfied the “Burden of Proof” for the requested CUP.

32. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) (“CEQA”), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer,
traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP").

33. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

34. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

35. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That the requested use at the location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

B. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.

C. That the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.

THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a CUP as set forth in Sections 22.52.1870 and 22.56.2820, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, CUP Case No. 200700073 is approved, subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission.
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 200700073  

Exhibit “A” Date: Jan. 7, 2009

DRAFT CONDITIONS:

1. This grant authorizes a multi-family residential development in the R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence - 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre - Development Program) zone for six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres, as depicted on the approved Exhibit “A” (dated January 7, 2009) or an approved revised Exhibit “A”, subject to all of the following conditions of approval.

2. Approval of Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) Case No. 200700073 is contingent upon the approval of Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 and Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, and also contingent upon the approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004 by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (“Board”).

3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (“Regional Planning”) their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 10, 44 and 46. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 3, Condition Nos. 5, 6 and 44 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

4. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or entity making use of this grant.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

6. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if it finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the subject property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its terms and conditions to the transferee or lessee of the subject property.

8. Within three days of the approval date, remit processing fees (currently $2,085.25) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish
and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

9. The subject property shall be developed and maintained in full compliance with the conditions of this grant, and any law, statute, ordinance or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

10. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the property is being used in violation of any condition of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $150.00 per inspection).

11. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate in the defense.

12. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000.00 from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to depositions, testimony, and other assistance to the permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation; and

b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 2.170.010.

13. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall
terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

14. The subject property shall be graded, developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the approved vesting tentative tract map and the approved Exhibit "A", dated January 7, 2009, or an approved revised Exhibit "A".

15. The development of the subject property shall conform to the conditions approved for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400.

16. All development shall comply with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property, except as specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions, including the approved Exhibit "A," or a revised Exhibit "A" approved by the Director of Regional Planning ("Director of Planning").

17. Permission is granted for the following:

a) Building setbacks according to the following:
   1. Lot No. 1: A rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   2. Lot No. 2: A side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   3. Lot No. 3: A rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   4. Lot No. 4: A rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   5. Lot No. 5: A rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   6. Lot No. 6: A side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

b) Building heights according to the following:
   1. Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: A maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   2. Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: A maximum height of 37 feet.
   4. Building No. 25: A maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

c) Walls and fences according to the following:
   1. Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   2. Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   3. Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   4. Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: to allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

18. No grading permit shall be issued prior to the recordation of a final map except as authorized by the Director of Planning.
19. A minimum of 746 automobile parking spaces, as depicted on the approved Exhibit "A" (dated January 7, 2009) or on an approved revised Exhibit "A", shall be provided and continuously maintained on the subject property, developed to the specifications listed in Section 22.52.1060 of the County Code. The required parking spaces shall be continuously available for vehicular parking only and shall not be used for storage, automobile repair, or any other unauthorized use. The permittee shall provide for continual enforcement in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions ("CC&Rs") to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

20. A minimum of 12 guest parking spaces must be handicapped-accessible, and at least two of the 12 accessible spaces must be "van-accessible." Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the permittee shall submit to the Director of Planning for review and approval three copies of a revised Exhibit "A" showing the required accessible parking spaces.

21. The permittee shall submit a copy of the project CC&Rs to Regional Planning for review prior to final map approval. A copy of these conditions shall be attached to the CC&Rs.

22. The permittee shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for the continuous maintenance of the common areas, including the driveways, landscaping and the lighting system along all walkways and outdoor seating areas, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

23. The permittee shall reserve in the CC&Rs the right for all residents within the condominium project to use the internal driveway system for access and the guest parking spaces throughout the subdivision.

24. The permittee shall state in the CC&Rs that parking of recreational vehicles and outside storage shall not be allowed within the development.

25. The permittee shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for graffiti removal. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage by 6:00 am the next day. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.

26. All structures, walls and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the use of the premises or that do not provide pertinent information about said premises. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

27. Information contained within the CC&Rs required by these conditions shall not be modified in any way without prior authorization from Regional Planning.

28. All utilities shall be placed underground.

29. All structures shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Building and Safety of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("Public Works").
30. Detonation of explosives or any other blasting devices or material shall be prohibited unless all required permits have been obtained and adjacent property owners have been notified.

31. All grading and construction on the subject property and appurtenant activities, including engine warm-up, shall be restricted to Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and Saturday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. No Sunday or holiday operations are permitted.

32. The permittee shall implement a dust control program during grading and construction to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and the Director of Public Works.

33. The permittee shall, upon commencement of any grading activity allowed by this permit, diligently pursue all grading to completion.

34. No construction equipment or vehicles shall be parked or stored on any existing public or private streets.

35. The permittee shall obtain all necessary permits from Public Works and shall maintain all such permits in full force and effect throughout the life of this permit.

36. All construction and development within the subject property shall comply with the applicable provisions of the Building Code and the various related mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire, grading and excavation codes as currently adopted by the County.

37. The permittee shall utilize water-saving devices and technology in the construction of this project consistent with Los Angeles County Building and Plumbing Codes.

38. The permittee shall comply with the green building and drought-tolerant landscaping provisions of the Los Angeles County Green Building Program (the project is LID exempt). Prior to the issuance of building permits, the permittee shall submit building and landscaping plans as a Revised Exhibit “A” demonstrating compliance with the County’s green building and drought-tolerant landscaping ordinances.

39. The property shall be developed and maintained in compliance with all applicable requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. Adequate water and sewage facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of said department.

40. Upon approval of this grant, the permittee shall contact the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden to determine what facilities may be necessary to protect the property from fire hazard. Any necessary facilities including, but not limited to water mains, fire hydrants, and fire flow facilities, shall be provided to the satisfaction of and within the time periods established by said Department.

41. Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit, a site plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Director of Planning indicating that the proposed construction and/or associated grading complies with the conditions of this grant and the provisions of the County Code. The site plan shall also include plans that depict architectural details of window treatments, façade and roofing materials, for all proposed structures.
42. Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit, the permittee shall submit to
the Director of Planning for review and approval three copies of a landscape plan. The
landscape plan shall show size, type, and location of all plants, trees, and watering
facilities. The landscape plan shall also contain a note indicating the timing of the
required planting and planting deadlines as described herein. All landscaping shall be
maintained in a neat, clean, and healthful condition, including proper pruning, weeding,
removal of litter, fertilizing and replacement of plants when necessary. To the maximum
extent feasible, drip irrigation systems shall be employed.

Timing of Planting. Prior to the issuance of building permits for any construction the
applicant shall submit a landscaping and phasing plan for the landscaping associated
with that construction to be approved by the Director of Planning. This phasing plan shall
establish the timing and sequencing of the required landscaping.

The planting shall begin at least 90 days prior to occupancy of the first unit within the
building. The required planting of new trees, shrubs and/or ground cover, and all
remaining project landscaping, shall be completed within six months following the date of
issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first unit.

43. Within five days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in
interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,085.25) payable to the County of Los
Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in
compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711
of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection
and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project
subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

44. Pursuant to Chapter 22.72 of the County Code, the subdivider or successor in interest
shall pay a fee (currently $259,170.00) to the Los Angeles County Librarian prior to
issuance of any building permit.

45. The mitigation measures set forth in the "Project Mitigation Measures Due to
Environmental Evaluation" section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project
are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The
permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached
Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). After completion of the appeal period, record a
covention and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional
Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation
measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of
ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual
mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall
describe the status of the permittee’s compliance with the required mitigation measures.

46. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to
defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the
information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the
services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the
approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.

47. The following development program conditions shall apply:

d) No building or structure of any kind except a temporary structure used only in the developing of the property according to the development program shall be built, erected, or moved onto any part of the property.

e) No existing building or structure which under the program is to be demolished shall be used.

f) No existing building or structure which, under the program, is to be altered shall be used until such building or structure has been so altered.

g) All improvements shall be completed prior to the occupancy of any structures within each phase of development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

h) Where one or more buildings in the projected development are designated as primary buildings, building permits for structures other than those so designated shall not be issued until the foundations have been constructed for such primary building or buildings.
1. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a public hearing on the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 on October 20, 2010. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 was heard concurrently with General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002, Zone Change Case No. 200700004, Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, and Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") Case No. 200700073.

2. The irregularly-shaped subject property is 12.1 gross acres (11.4 net acres) in size with gently-sloping topography. The subject property currently has a 228-unit mobilehome park ("Santa Anita Village"), still in operation, with 37 remaining units occupied.

3. Primary access to the subject property is from Live Oak Avenue, a 142-foot wide Major Highway as shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways, with 120 feet of paved width and a 10-foot wide concrete median.

4. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is a request to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings) on 12.1 gross acres.

5. General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 is a related request to amend the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map on the 12.1 gross acre subject property from Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units Per Acre) to Category 3 (Medium Density Residential – 12 to 22 Dwelling Units Per Acre).

6. Zone Change Case No. 200700004 is a related request to change 0.9 net acres of existing C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning, 2.3 net acres of existing R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence – Parking) zoning, and 8.1 net acres of existing R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Require Lot Area) zoning on the subject property to R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre – Development Program). The Development Program ("DP") designation will ensure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the CUP will restrict the development of the rezoned site to the proposed residential development as shown on the site plan marked "Exhibit A". No other development will be permitted on the property unless a new CUP is first obtained.

7. Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003 is a related request to consider a mobilehome park Closure Impact Report ("CIR").

8. Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 is a related request for shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots.

9. Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 is a related request for a discretionary housing permit to allow a density bonus of 68 units (or 21 percent) with 75 units of senior housing set aside within the proposed development.
10. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073 is a related request for the DP zone and onsite project grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill (166,470 cubic yards cut, 132,670 cubic yards fill and 16,140 net cubic yards imported from offsite). Also proposed with the DP zone are the following modifications to the R-3 zone:

(Building Setbacks)
   a) Lot No. 1: To allow a rear yard setback of 10 feet for Building No. 10.
   b) Lot No. 2: To allow a side yard setback of one foot for Building No. 17, and to allow a rear yard setback of three feet for Building No. 11 and two feet for Building No. 17.
   c) Lot No. 3: To allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Building No. 3 and two feet for Building No. 6.
   d) Lot No. 4: To allow a rear yard setback of two feet for Building No. 2.
   e) Lot No. 5: To allow a rear yard setback of four feet for Building No. 15.
   f) Lot No. 6: To allow a side yard setback of three feet and a rear yard setback of six feet for Building Nos. 24 and 25.

(Building Heights)
   a) Building Nos. 1 through 7, 10, 16, 18, and 19 through 23: To allow a maximum height of 36 feet and nine inches.
   b) Building Nos. 8, 9, 11 through 15, and 17: To allow a maximum height of 37 feet.
   c) Building No. 24: To allow a maximum height of 66 feet and four inches.
   d) Building No. 25: To allow a maximum height of 64 feet and eight inches.

(Walls and Fences)
   a) Lot No. 2: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required front yard setback.
   b) Lot Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required side yard setbacks.
   c) Lot Nos. 1 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to eight feet within the required rear yard setbacks.
   d) Lot Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 6: To allow a wall/fence height up to six feet within the required front yard setback.

11. Approval of the vesting tentative tract map, CUP, housing permit and parking permit will not become effective unless and until the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") has approved the proposed general plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone, and such ordinance has become effective.

12. The applicant’s site plan, labeled Exhibit "A", depicts six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units (170 townhouse units in 23 buildings and 148 multi-family units in two buildings), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. The site is designed with 19 townhouse buildings (each designed with either seven or eight dwelling units) along the site perimeter bordering
single-family residences to the east, north and west. The townhouse units are designed to reduce in height as they approach the site perimeter adjoining the rear yards of the adjacent single-family residences. The center of the development contains a cluster of four townhouse buildings, a clubhouse building, outdoor pool and spa, playground and village green, all for common use by residents and guests. Also contained in the center is front-loaded guest and handicapped-accessible parking area along a private driveway/fire lane allowing access to the adjacent amenities and surrounding residences. The southerly portion of the development contains a "podium" structure design with two four-story condominium towers (one tower containing 75 units and the other 73 units), subterranean parking, a community center and three outdoor courtyards for common use. One of the two condo towers will be set aside for senior housing units. Internal circulation and access is provided by a private driveway and fire lane system with paved widths varying between 26 and 33 feet. This system includes both parallel and front-loaded guest parking spaces dispersed throughout the site, as well as a network of sidewalks offering pedestrian connectivity throughout the site and allowing offsite access to Live Oak and Mayflower. Landscaping is provided along the project perimeter to screen the development from adjacent views and also within the development along the drives and sidewalks to provide shade and enhance the aesthetic appeal of the project.

13. The entire 12.1 gross acre subject property is depicted within the Category 1 land use category of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map. A plan amendment to Category 3 is proposed, allowing a maximum density of 22 dwelling units per gross acre (or 266 units). The project proposes 250 dwelling units, along with an additional 68 dwelling units as part of a density bonus authorized under the proposed discretionary housing permit, bringing the overall project total number of units to 318. The applicable density of the proposed project is 250 units (or 21 dwelling units per gross acre) which is consistent with the maximum under Category 3.

14. The subject property consists of C-3, R-3-P and R-A zoning.

15. Surrounding zoning within a 500-foot radius consists of the following:
   - North: R-A
   - East: R-A, C-3
   - South: R-3-P, C-3, A-1 (Light Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
   - West: R-A

16. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius consist of the following:
   - North: Single-family residences
   - East: Single-family residences, mobilehome park
   - South: Single-family residences, offices, retail, light industrial, parking, auto repair
   - West: Single-family residences

17. The project is consistent with the proposed R-3-22U-DP zoning classification. Attached multi-family residences are permitted in the R-3-22U-DP zone pursuant to Sections
22.20.260 and 22.40.040 of the County Code. The project also complies with the density provisions of the R-3-22U-DP zone, which allows a maximum of 250 (pre-density bonus) dwelling units on the subject property. With the associated CUP, the project will also comply with the DP zone.

18. Between October 2007 and October 2008, the applicant conducted outreach with nearby residents, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Town Council ("MAD"), and the adjacent jurisdictions of the City of Monrovia, City of Arcadia and the City of Irwindale. In summary, local residents were primarily concerned with privacy (i.e. building heights and setbacks) and traffic. With respect to privacy, the applicant, based on community feedback, has revised the project to incorporate a modest reduction in density (from 334 units to 318), reducing the building heights to one story along the property perimeter adjacent to single-family residences, removing windows facing the outer perimeter, and installing additional perimeter landscape screening. Regarding traffic, the project was redesigned to include a center island at the main entry gate along Mayflower Avenue, restricting left turns and reducing negative neighborhood effects from "cut-through" traffic. Local residents also expressed some opposition to any proposed affordable and senior units, which would "reduce property values" and "increase emergency vehicle activity", respectively.

19. In October 2007, the applicant sent letters to the municipalities of Monrovia, Irwindale and Arcadia, summarizing the proposed development and requesting feedback. As of date, no correspondence has been received from these cities.

20. In April and October 2008, the applicant attended meetings with MAD, answering questions related to the estimated selling price of the proposed condominium units, the timing of the mobile home closure, traffic impacts, local school funding, headlight glare from egressing project traffic, and a second project entry from Live Oak Avenue. As of date, no direct correspondence has been received from MAD.

21. At the time of writing, two responses from local residents have been received, one of whom is a person taking care of an ill tenant currently residing within the mobile home park. This person expressed a concern with the relocation assistance presented in the CIR, and whether the list of potential relocation areas has been updated within the last year. The second community member indicated a general concern about increased traffic, and also suggested that the new project should include "community gardens" and "office park" features.

22. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission heard a presentation from staff and testimony from the applicant. No other testimony was heard.

23. During the October 20, 2010 public hearing, the Commission discussed the proposed development and the following issues:

[RESERVED]
24. On October 20, 2010, after hearing all testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing, approved the MND and MMP, approved Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400, and recommended to the Board approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004.

25. Approval of this subdivision is conditioned on the subdivider's compliance with the attached conditions of approval as well as the conditions of approval for Mobilehome Permit Case No. 201000003, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001, and CUP Case No. 200700073.

26. The subdivider has demonstrated the suitability of the subject property for the proposed use. Establishment of the proposed use at such location is in conformity with good zoning practice. Compliance with the conditions of approval will ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and consistency with all applicable General Plan policies.

27. The proposed subdivision and the provisions for its design and improvement are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

28. The site is physically suitable for the density and type of development proposed, since it has access to a County-maintained street and will be served by public sewer and public water supplies to meet anticipated needs.

29. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvements will not cause serious public health problems, since sewage disposal, storm drainage, fire protection, and geological and soils factors are addressed in the conditions of approval.

30. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantial and avoidable injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject property is not located in a Significant Ecological Area and does not contain any stream courses or high value riparian habitat.

31. The design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities therein.

32. The division and development of the property in the manner set forth on this map will not unreasonably interfere with the free and complete exercise of public entity and/or public utility rights-of-way and/or easements within this map, since the design and development as set forth in the conditions of approval and shown on the tentative map provide adequate protection for any such easements.

33. Pursuant to Article 3.5 of the Subdivision Map Act, the proposed subdivision does not contain or front upon any public waterway, river, stream, coastline, shoreline, lake or reservoir.
34. The housing and employment needs of the region were considered and balanced against the public service needs of local residents and available fiscal and environmental resources when the project was determined to be consistent with the General Plan.

35. The subject tract map has been submitted as a "vesting" tentative map. As such, it is subject to the provisions of Sections 21.38.101 through 21.38.080 of the County Code (Subdivision Ordinance).

36. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified less than significant/no impacts with project mitigation for geotechnical, noise, air quality, sewer, traffic, drainage and grading, tenant relocation, and water conservation. Based on the Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and such measures have been included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

37. After consideration of the attached MND together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and approves the MND.

38. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.

39. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Division Section, Regional Planning.

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, the MND is approved and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 is approved, subject to the attached conditions of the Commission, including recommendations of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee.
DRAFT CONDITIONS:

1. Conform to the applicable requirements of Title 21 and Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"), including the requirements of the R-3-22U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence - 22 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre - Development Program) zone. Also, conform to the requirements of Conditional Use Permit Case No. 200700073, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002, Housing Permit Case No. 201000001 and the Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND").

2. Recordation of the final map is contingent upon approval of General Plan Amendment Case No. 200700002 and adoption of Zone Change Case No. 200700004 by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board").

3. Permission is granted to adjust lot lines on the final map to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

4. Permission is granted to record multiple final maps. The boundaries of the final unit maps shall be to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee ("Subdivision Committee"). Each final unit map to record shall comply on its own, or in combination with previously recorded final unit maps, with the parking and lot area requirements of the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, Parking Permit Case No. 200800002 and CUP Case No. 200700073. Prior to approval of each final unit map, the subdivider or successor in interest shall submit the following:
   a. A phasing map indicating the boundaries of the current final map, the boundaries and status of all previously filed final unit maps and the expected boundaries and phasing of all future final unit maps; and
   b. A summary sheet indicating the number and type of all lots shown, including parking breakdown by phase, on the current and previous final maps.

5. The subdivider or successor in interest shall label the interior driveways as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane." on the final map.

6. The subdivider or successor in interest shall construct or bond with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("Public Works") for driveway paving in widths as shown on the approved Exhibit "A", dated January 7, 2009, to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("Fire").

7. The subdivider or successor in interest shall submit a copy of the project Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions ("CC&Rs") to Regional Planning for review and approval prior to final map approval. Those provisions required by the County to be contained in the CC&Rs shall be identified as such, and shall not be modified in any way without prior authorization from Regional Planning.

8. The subdivider or successor in interest shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for the
continuous maintenance of all common areas, including the driveways, landscaping and the lighting system along all walkways and outdoor seating areas, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

9. The subdivider or successor in interest shall reserve in the CC&Rs the right for all residents within the condominium project to use the internal driveway system for access and the guest parking spaces throughout the subdivision.

10. The subdivider or successor in interest shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for graffiti removal. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage by 6:00 am the next day. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.

11. The subject property shall be developed and maintained in substantial compliance with the approved Exhibit Map dated January 7, 2009.

12. The subdivider or successor in interest shall place a note or notes on the final map, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, that this subdivision is approved as a condominium project for a total of 318 residential units whereby the owners of the units of air space will hold an undivided interest in the common areas, which will in turn provide the necessary access, and utility easements for the units.

13. The subdivider or successor in interest shall remove all existing structures (including mobilehome park units, and any accessory structures) on the subject property. The subdivider or successor in interest shall submit a copy of a demolition permit or other proof of removal prior to final map approval, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

14. The subdivider or successor in interest shall plant at least 99 trees (one tree for every 5,000 square feet of the net project area) of a non-invasive species throughout the landscaped and common areas of the subject project. The location and the species of said trees shall be incorporated into a site plan or landscape plan. Prior to final map approval, the site landscaping plan shall be approved by Regional Planning, and a bond shall be posted with Public Works or other verification shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Regional Planning to ensure the planting of the required trees.

15. Within three days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2, 085.25) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

16. The mitigation measures set forth in the "Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation" section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement
attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee’s compliance with the required mitigation measures.

17. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.

18. Pursuant to Chapter 22.72 of the County Code, the subdivider or successor in interest shall pay a fee (currently $259,170.00) to the Los Angeles County Librarian prior to issuance of any building permit.

19. No grading permit may be issued prior to final map recordation unless otherwise authorized by the Director of Regional Planning.

20. The subdivider or successor in interest shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this tract map approval, or related discretionary approvals, whether legislative or quasi-judicial, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 66499.37 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall promptly notify the subdivider or successor in interest of any claim, action or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense. If the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the subdivider shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

21. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the subdivider or successor in interest shall within 10 days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000.00, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department’s cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to the subdivider or the subdivider’s counsel. The subdivider shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

   a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the subdivider shall deposit additional funds to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation;

   b. At the sole discretion of the subdivider, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the subdivider according to the County Code Section 2.170.010.
Except as expressly modified herein above, this approval is subject to all those conditions set forth in the CUP, housing permit, parking permit, MMP and the attached reports recommended by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, consisting of the Departments of Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, and Public Health.
Landscape Plan Review
Project: TR 068400
APN: 8511-028-017
Santa Anita Village

Prior to landscape plan approval, the following comments must be addressed:

1. Please depict or list on the landscape plan any drought-tolerant and non-drought tolerant landscaping that will be incorporated into the project. In addition, the site plan shall outline the areas of the project to be landscaped with drought-tolerant plants and/or turf, and calculations shall be provided on the site plan showing the percent of landscaped area devoted to each. *(Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2240)*


   Please provide the calculations on the landscape plan that indicate the area devoted to drought-tolerant plants and turf.

2. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of the total landscaped area shall contain plants from the drought-tolerant plant list. *(Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230)*

   a. The diversity of the plant pallet is impressive. Since the 75% rule applies to area and not number of species or number of individuals as depicted on the plans, the intent of this Landscape Plan with revision date of July 3, 2010, is to comply ‘Code-plus’ with the Ordinance. Please make sure that the total landscaped area is a minimum of 75% and identified according to Comment 1 above.

   b. This project occurs within the Los Angeles Basin & San Fernando Valley Planting Zone 3 of the County ordinance. The following species are not approved for use within this zone: *(Olea europaea 'Swan Hill') Swan Hill Olive Tree, (Pinus edulis) Afgan Pine, (Cycas revoluta) Sago Palm (Juniperus chinensis 'Kaizuka') Hollywood Juniper, (Photinia X Fraseri) Red-Top Photinia, (Salvia greggii) Autumn Sage, (Hemerocallis hybrids) Evergreen Daylilies, (Rosmarinus officinalis 'Prostratus') Prostrate Rosemary, and (Macfadyena unguis-cati) Cat Claw Vine. Since these plants are approved for use in other Ordinance zones and their water requirements are less than or equal to the plants approved for use in Zone 3, they may be used only in this plan.

   c. *(Limonium perezii)* Sea lavender is not on the County approved list, but it is ranked by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Met) as a very low water use plant. Therefore, it is approved for use in this plan.

   d. Of the *Grevillea* species, only the following are approved for use in the Ordinance: *(Grevillea alpina)* Mountain grevillea, *(Grevillea asplenifolia)* Fern-leaf grevillea, *(Grevillea australis)* Alpine grevillea, *(Grevillea banksii)* Banks' grevillea, *(Grevillea curviloba)* Narrow Curved-
leaved grevillea, (Grevillea lanigera) Woolly Grevillea, (Grevillea lavadulacea) Lavender Grevillea, (Grevillea robusta) Silky-oak. Limit your selection to these species.

3. A maximum of twenty-five (25) percent of the total landscaped area may consist of turf (lawn). Please depict amount of landscaping dedicated to turf as a percentage of total landscaped area. Be advised that turf shall not be planted in strips less than five (5) feet wide, and in no event shall the total landscaped area contain more than five thousand (5,000) square feet of turf. *(Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230)*

Please provide the calculations on the landscape plan that indicate the area devoted to turf.

4. Be advised that all turf in the total landscaped area shall be water efficient. Please indicate on the plan the type of turf proposed for this project. Please refer to the list shown below for appropriate turf types. *(Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230)*


   a) The Water Efficient Turf List is under revision, since the California Invasive Plant Council lists the following five species as invasive: (Cynodon dactylon) Bermuda grass, (Festuca arundinacea) Tall fescue, (Lolium multiflorum) Annual ryegrass, (Pennisetum clandestinum) Kikuyu grass, and (Poa pratensis) Kentucky Bluegrass. Please make another grass selection from the approved list or choose a turf alternative, such as a (Carex) species.

   b) If a sedge (Carex) species is planned for use, it must have a hydrozone rating between 1 to 3 within the California Friendly system of Met. ([http://www.bewaterwise.com/Gardensoft/index.aspx](http://www.bewaterwise.com/Gardensoft/index.aspx)).

* Note that sedges are not grasses, and the area calculations for turf and drought-tolerant plants must be in accord with comment 1. Therefore, it’s possible to plan a 100% drought-tolerant plant area under the Ordinance using a turf alternative, such as sedge, that can handle foot traffic.

5. All plants in the total landscaped area shall be grouped in hydrozones in accordance with their respective water, cultural (soil, climate, sun, and light), and maintenance requirements. Please show these hydrozones on the proposed plan. *(Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230)*

While the majority of the plants are identified as drought-tolerant according to the Ordinance, the symbol used to call one out on the plan is not clear, especially when grouped under a common symbol. Develop a planting plan that is in accord with either the Met hydrozones or WUCOLS water use requirements in the accompanying table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Grouping</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>MET Hydrozone</th>
<th>WUCOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Raised Planters</td>
<td>AGONIS FLEXUOSA</td>
<td>PEPPERMINT WILLOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Raised Planters</td>
<td>CITRUS</td>
<td>CITRUS TREE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Raised Planters</td>
<td>CUPRESSUS SEMPERVIRENS</td>
<td>ITALIAN CYPRESS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Raised Planters</td>
<td>ERYTHRINA CORALOIDES</td>
<td>NAKED CORAL TREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Raised Planters</td>
<td>OLEA EUROPAEA 'SWAN HILL'</td>
<td>SWAN HOLL OLIVE TREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Raised Planters</td>
<td>TABEBUIA IPE</td>
<td>PINK TRUMPET TREE</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Screen Trees</td>
<td>BRACHYCHITON POPULNEUS</td>
<td>BOTTLE TREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Screen Trees</td>
<td>PINUS ELDARICA</td>
<td>AFGHAN PINE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Screen Trees</td>
<td>PODOCARPUS GRAECIORM</td>
<td>FERN PINE - LOW BRANCH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>CUPRESSUS SEMPERVIRENS</td>
<td>ITALIAN CYPRESS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA</td>
<td>JACARANDA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA HYBRID</td>
<td>CRAP MYRTLE 'MUSKOGE'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>MAGNOLIA GRANDIFLORA 'ST MARY'</td>
<td>MAGNOLIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>OLEA EUROPAEA 'SWAN HILL'</td>
<td>SWAN HOLL OLIVE TREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA</td>
<td>DATE PALM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>PINUS ELDARICA</td>
<td>AFGHAN PINE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>PRUNUS CERASIFERA 'VERSUVIRUS'</td>
<td>PURPLE LEAF PLUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>PYRUS CALLERYANA</td>
<td>BRADFORD PEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>PYRUS KAWAKAMI</td>
<td>EVERGREEN PEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Common Area</td>
<td>RHUS LANCEA</td>
<td>AFRICAN SUMAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>CARISSA MACROCARPA</td>
<td>NATAL PLUM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>CYCAS REVOLUTA</td>
<td>SAGO PALM</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>FEJUEA SELLOWIANA</td>
<td>PINEAPPLE GUAVA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>JUNIPERUS CHINENSIS 'Kaiaka'</td>
<td>HOLLYWOOD JUNIPER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>LEPTOSPERMUM LAEVIGATUM</td>
<td>AUSTRALIAN TEA TREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>LIGUSTRUM JAPONICUM 'TEXANUM'</td>
<td>TEXAS PRIVET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>WESTRINGIA FRUTICOSA</td>
<td>COAST ROSEMARY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Large Shubs</td>
<td>XYLOSMAC CONGESTUM</td>
<td>SHINY XYLOSMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>Boxus microphylla japonica 'Green Beauty'</td>
<td>BOXWOOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>COPROSMA REPENS</td>
<td>MIRROR PLANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>DIETES VEGETA</td>
<td>FORTNIGHT LILY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>GREVILLEA SPECIES</td>
<td>GREVILLEA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>PHOTINIA X FRASERI</td>
<td>RED-TOP PHOTINIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>PITTOSPORUM TOBIRA</td>
<td>MOCK ORANGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>RHAPHIOLEPS INDICA</td>
<td>INDIA HAWTHORN</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Medium Shubs</td>
<td>SALVIA GREGGII</td>
<td>AUTUMN SAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>Agapanthis africanus 'Peter Pan'</td>
<td>DWARF LILY OF THE NILE</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>AGAVE ATTENUATA</td>
<td>FOXTAIL AGAVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>ESCALLONIA COMPACTA 'Newport Dwarf'</td>
<td>DWARF ESCALONIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>HELOERACUS HYBRIDS</td>
<td>EVERGREEN DAYLILIES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>LANTANA MONTEVIDENSIS</td>
<td>LANTANA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>LIMONIUM PEREZII</td>
<td>SEA LAVENDER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>Rosmarinus officinalis 'Prostratus'</td>
<td>PROSTATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Small Shubs</td>
<td>Trachelospermum Jasminoides</td>
<td>STAR JASMIN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Be advised that a covenant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk indicating that the owner of the subject property is aware of the drought-tolerant landscaping requirements and is also aware of how said requirements apply to the owner’s project.

See the Green Building Program for a copy of the “Drought-tolerant Landscaping Covenant” at http://planning.lacounty.gov/green.

7. The plan shows plants that are considered invasive or flammable by the County of Los Angeles.

Please consider using different plants in place of: (Ligustrum japonicum ‘Texanum’) Texas privet, (Phoenix dactylifera) Date palm, and (Pittosporum tobira) Mock orange.

8. The landscape plan is also subject to the Department of Public Works’ Low Impact Development Standards. See the Green Building Program for a copy of all related ordinances and other Green Building Program information at http://planning.lacounty.gov/green.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 - Vines</th>
<th>BOUGAINVILLEA SPECIES</th>
<th>BOUGAINVILLEA</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - Vines</td>
<td>MACADYENA UNGUIS-CATI</td>
<td>CAT CLAW VINE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Vines</td>
<td>PARTHENOCISSUS QUINQUEFOLIA</td>
<td>VIRGINIA CREEPER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following reports consisting of 17 pages are the recommendations of Public Works.

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Details and notes shown on the tentative map are not necessarily approved. Any details or notes which may be inconsistent with requirements of ordinances, general conditions of approval, or Department policies must be specifically approved in other conditions, or ordinance requirements are modified to those shown on the tentative map upon approval by the Advisory agency.

2. Easements are tentatively required, subject to review by the Director of Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

3. Easements shall not be granted or recorded within areas proposed to be granted, dedicated, or offered for dedication for public streets, highways, access rights, building restriction rights, or other easements until after the final map is filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office. If easements are granted after the date of tentative approval, a subordination must be executed by the easement holder prior to the filing of the final map.

4. In lieu of establishing the final specific locations of structures on each lot/parcel at this time, the owner, at the time of issuance of a grading or building permit, agrees to develop the property in conformance with the County Code and other appropriate ordinances such as the Building Code, Plumbing Code, Grading Ordinance, Highway Permit Ordinance, Mechanical Code, Zoning Ordinance, Undergrounding of Utilities Ordinance, Water Ordinance, Sanitary Sewer and Industrial Waste Ordinance, Electrical Code, and Fire Code. Improvements and other requirements may be imposed pursuant to such codes and ordinances.

5. All easements existing at the time of final map approval must be accounted for on the approved tentative map. This includes the location, owner, purpose, and recording reference for all existing easements. If an easement is blanket or indeterminate in nature, a statement to that effect must be shown on the tentative map in lieu of its location. If all easements have not been accounted for, submit a corrected tentative map to the Department of Regional Planning for approval.
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6. Adjust, relocate, and/or eliminate lot lines, lots, streets, easements, grading, geotechnical protective devices, and/or physical improvements to comply with ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the date the County determined the application to be complete all to the satisfaction of Public Works.

7. Quitclaim or relocate easements running through proposed structures.

8. Prior to final approval of the tract/parcel map submit a notarized affidavit to the Director of Public Works, signed by all owners of record at the time of filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office, stating that any proposed condominium building has not been constructed or that all buildings have not been occupied or rented and that said building will not be occupied or rented until after the filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

9. Place standard condominium notes on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

10. Label driveways and multiple access strips as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane" and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

11. Reserve reciprocal easements for drainage, ingress/egress, sewer, water, utilities, right to grade, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the common private driveways to the satisfaction of Public Works.

12. Remove existing buildings prior to final map approval. Demolition permits are required from the Building and Safety office.

13. If unit filing occurs, reserve reciprocal easements for drainage, ingress/egress, utilities, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the private driveways and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

14. The boundaries of the unit final maps shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Departments of Regional Planning and Public Works.

15. The first unit of this subdivision shall be filed as Tract No. 68400-01, the second unit, Tract No. 68400-02, and the last unit, Tract No. 68400.

16. A final tract map must be processed through the Director of Public Works prior to being filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.
17. Prior to submitting the tract map to the Director of Public Works for examination pursuant to Section 66442 of the Government Code, obtain clearances from all affected Departments and Divisions, including a clearance from the Subdivision Mapping Section of the Land Development Division of Public Works for the following mapping items; mathematical accuracy; survey analysis; and correctness of certificates, signatures, etc.

18. A final guarantee will be required at the time of filing of the final map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

19. Within 30 days of the approval date of this land use entitlement or at the time of first plan check submittal, the applicant shall deposit the sum of $2,000 (Minor Land Divisions) or $5,000 (Major Land Divisions) with Public Works to defray the cost of verifying conditions of approval for the purpose of issuing final map clearances. This deposit will cover the actual cost of reviewing conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permits, Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Vesting Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Oak Tree Permits, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, CEQA Mitigation Monitoring Programs and Regulatory Permits from State and Federal Agencies (Fish and Game, USF&W, Army Corps, RWQCB, etc.) as they relate to the various plan check activities and improvement plan designs. In addition, this deposit will be used to conduct site field reviews and attend meetings requested by the applicant and/or his agents for the purpose of resolving technical issues on condition compliance as they relate to improvement plan design, engineering studies, highway alignment studies and tract(parcel map boundary, title and easement issues. When 80% of the deposit is expended, the applicant will be required to provide additional funds to restore the initial deposit. Remaining balances in the deposit account will be refunded upon final map recordation.

Prepared by John Chin
Phone (626) 458-4918
Date 02-09-2009
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
WWW.DPW.LACOUNTY.GOV

TRACT MAP NO.: 068400
REVISED TENTATIVE MAP DATE: 1/07/2009
REVISED EXHIBIT MAP DATE: 01/07/2009

STORM DRAIN/HYDROLOGY SECTION CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, PHONE: (626) 458-4921

1. Comply with the requirements of the Drainage Concept, which was conceptually approved on 07/14/08 to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

Name  Christopher Sheppard  Date 1/22/2009  Phone (626) 458-4921
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP
SUBDIVIDER Diamond Development/Prim Enterprises
ENGINEER B&E Engineers
GEOLOGIST
SOILS ENGINEER Geocon

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 1/07/09 (revised) Exhibit A
LOCATION Arcadia
GRADING BY SUBDIVIDER [Y] (Y or N) 132,780 c.y.
REPORT DATE ____
REPORT DATE 6/12/07

TENTATIVE MAP FEASIBILITY IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL FROM A GEOLOGIC STANDPOINT

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS APPLICABLE TO THIS DIVISION OF LAND:

- The Final Map does not need to be reviewed by GMED.
- Soils engineering reports may be required prior to approval of building or grading plans.
- The Soils Engineering review dated 2-2-09 is attached.

Reviewed by          Date January 28, 2009

Please complete a Customer Service Survey at http://cpw.lacounty.gov/go/gmedsurvey
P:\Geo\pub\Geology\Review\Forms\Form02.doc
9/30/07
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
GEOTECHNICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION

SOILS ENGINEERING REVIEW SHEET

Address: 900 S. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803
Telephone: (626) 458-4925
Fax: (626) 458-4913

Tentative Tract Map 68400
Location South Arcadia
Developer/Owner Prime Enterprises, LLC
Engineer/Architect B&E Engineers
Soils Engineer Geocon (P.N. A8455-06-01A)
Geologist

Review of:
Revised Tentative Tract Map and Exhibit Dated by Regional Planning 1/7/09
Soils Engineering Report Dated 6/12/07
Previous review sheet dated 6/22/09

ACTION:
Tentative Map feasibility is recommended for approval, subject to conditions below:

REMARKS:
At the grading stage, submit two sets of grading plans to the Soils Section for verification of compliance with County codes and policies.

Prepared by Lukas Przybylo Reviewed by

Date 2/2/09

NOTICE: Public safety, relative to geotechnical subsurface exploration, shall be provided in accordance with current codes for excavations, inclusive of the Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 11:48, and the State of California, Title 8, Construction Safety Orders.
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

**REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO GRADING PLAN APPROVAL:**

1. Provide approval of:
   a. The latest drainage concept/hydrology/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP)/Low Impact Development (LID) plan by the Storm Drain and Hydrology Section of Land Development Division.
   
   b. The grading plan by the Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division (GMED).

**REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL MAP RECORDEDATION:**

2. Submit a grading plan for approval. The grading plan must show and call out the following items, including but not limited to: construction of all drainage devices and details, paved driveways, elevation and drainage of all pads, SUSMP and LID devices (if applicable), and any required landscaping and irrigation not within a common area or maintenance easement. Acknowledgement and/or approval from all easement holders may be required.

3. A maintenance agreement or CC&Rs may be required for all privately maintained drainage devices, slopes, and other facilities.

**Signature**

Name Jason Flood

Date 2/17/09

Phone (626) 458-4921
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Dedicate the right to restrict vehicular access on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue.

2. Dedicate vehicular access rights on Lovejoy Street and the alley. If the Department of Regional Planning requires the construction of a wall, complete access rights shall be dedicated.

3. Align the proposed “A” Driveway at Mayflower Avenue with Ashmont Avenue.

4. Label all interior streets as private driveway and fire lane.

5. Locate the entry gate (or the key pad if one is provided) a minimum of 50 feet beyond the right of way of Mayflower Avenue on “A” Driveway, and construct a minimum 32-foot radius turnaround preceding the gated entrance to the satisfaction of Public Works. The minimum gate setback shall be increased, if necessary, to accommodate adequate stacking distance as determined in each case by the traffic engineering consultant at final engineering to the satisfaction of Public Works.

6. All egress traffic from “A” Driveway shall be restricted to right turn only.

7. The proposed entry driveway details on “A” Driveway are not approved. Redesign the raised median and approach area (including curb returns) along “A” Driveway to allow the best channelization of egress traffic on to the south bound of Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

8. Terminate the raised median nose along “A” Driveway at the right of way line without encroaching to the public right of way on Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

9. The entry gate on “D” Driveway at the frontage of Live Oak Avenue is restricted for egress only and it shall be located a minimum of 20 feet beyond the right of way of Live Oak Avenue.

10. The entry gate on “U” Driveway at the frontage of Live Oak Avenue is restricted for emergency use only and it shall be located a minimum of 20 feet beyond the right of way of Live Oak Avenue.

11. Close any unused driveway with standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue.
12. Repair any displaced, broken, or damaged curb, gutter, driveway apron, and pavement along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

13. Construct 5 foot minimum (conventional section) sidewalk along the property frontage on Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Execute a maintenance covenant for the landscaping or include in the CC&R provision for the maintenance of landscaping along the street frontage to the satisfaction of Public Works.

14. Plant street trees along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Existing trees on Mayflower Avenue in the dedicated right of way shall be removed and replaced if not acceptable as street trees.

15. Underground all existing service lines and distribution lines that are less than 50 KV and new utility lines to the satisfaction of Public Works and Southern California Edison. Please contact Construction Division at (626) 458-3129 for new location of any above ground utility structure in the parkway.

16. Prior to final map approval, enter into an agreement with the County franchised cable TV operator (if an area is served) to permit the installation of cable in a common utility trench to the satisfaction of Public Works, or provide documentation that steps to provide cable TV to the proposed subdivision have been initiated to the satisfaction of Public Works.

17. Comply with any additional requirements, if any, as a means of mitigating any traffic impacts as identified in the traffic study approved by Public Works.

18. Provide a left-turn lane on Mayflower Avenue at "A" Driveway to the satisfaction of Public Works.

19. Comply with the following street lighting requirements:

   a. Provide street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring along the property frontage on Live Oak Avenue and Mayflower Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Submit street lighting plans as soon as possible for review and approval to the Street Lighting Section of the Traffic and Lighting Division. For additional information, please contact the Street Lighting Section at (626) 300-4726.
have been energized, and the developer has requested a transfer of billing at least by January 1 of the previous year, the Lighting District can assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the street lights by July 1 of any given year. The transfer of billing could be delayed one or more years if the above conditions are not met.

20. Submit a detailed 1" = 40' scaled signing and striping plan for Mayflower Avenue and Live Oak Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

21. Comply with the mitigation measures identified in the attached February 9, 2009 and September 13, 2007, letters from our Traffic and Lighting Division to the satisfaction of Public Works.

Prepared by Allan Chan

Phone (626) 458-4921  Date 02-09-2009
February 9, 2009

Mr. Bruce Chow  
Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers  
236 East Colorado Boulevard, Suite 200  
Pasadena, CA 91106

Dear Mr. Chow:

SANTA ANITA VILLAGE PROJECT  
NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURE  
RESIDUAL TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (DECEMBER 3, 2008)  
TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 68400  
ARCADIA AREA

As requested, we have reviewed the above-mentioned analysis for the proposed Santa Anita Village project located at 4241 East Live Oak Avenue in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles area of Arcadia.

The analysis addresses residents' concerns that the proposed driveway located on Mayflower Avenue may generate cut-through traffic on Ashmont Avenue. To minimize project-related traffic from exiting the project site directly onto Ashmont Avenue, the project proposes to construct a channelized island on the project driveway, which will restrict eastbound left-turn and through movements. The analysis concludes this proposed neighborhood traffic management measure will not result in any significant traffic impacts at the study intersections previously evaluated in the February 13, 2007, traffic study.

We generally agree with the analysis that the redistribution of project traffic, as well as, the cumulative traffic generated by the project and other related projects will not have a significant impact to County roadways or intersections in the area.
If you have any further questions regarding the review of this document, please contact Mr. Isaac Wong of our Traffic Studies Section at (626) 300-4796.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Works

WILLIAM J. WINTER
Assistant Deputy Director
Traffic and Lighting Division

cc: City of Inwindale (Jose Loera)
   City of Monrovia (Doug Benash)
   Department of Regional Planning (Rudy Silva)

bc: Land Development (Hunter, Wong)
September 13, 2007

Mr. David S. Shender
Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers
234 East Colorado Boulevard, Suite 400
Pasadena, CA 91101

Dear Mr. Shender:

SANTA ANITA VILLAGE PROJECT
TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS REVIEW (FEBRUARY 13, 2007)
TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 68400
ARCADIA AREA

As requested, we have reviewed the above-mentioned document for the Santa Anita Village development located on the west side of Mayflower Avenue generally between Larkfield at Live Oak Avenues in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles area of Arcadia.

The proposed project includes the construction of 334 attached townhouses. The project is estimated to generate approximately 2,422 net new vehicle trips daily, with 158 and 214 net new vehicle trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively.

We generally agree with the study that the traffic generated by the project alone, as well as the cumulative traffic generated by the project and other related projects, will not have a significant impact to County roadways or intersections in the area. We also generally agree that the project will not have a significant impact on the Congestion Management Program-monitored intersections, arterials, or freeways in the area.

The project shall submit a 40-foot-scale revised site plan of the project showing access locations in relationship to adjacent intersections and driveways shall be submitted Mr. Matthew Dubiel of our Land Development Review Section for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.
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We recommend the applicant consult with Caltrans as well as the Cities of Irwindale and Monrovia to obtain their concurrence with any potential California Environmental Quality Act impacts within their respective jurisdictions.

If you have any further questions regarding the review of this document, please contact Mr. Todd Liming of our Traffic Studies Section at (626) 300-4826.

Very truly yours,

DONALD L. WOLFE  
Director of Public Works

WILLIAM J. WINTER  
Assistant Deputy Director  
Traffic and Lighting Division

cc: Caltrans (Cheryl Powell)  
City of Irwindale (Jose Loera)  
City of Monrovia (Doug Benash)  
Department of Regional Planning (Rudy Silva)

bc: Land Development (Hunter, Wong)
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. The subdivider shall provide a replacement sewage disposal system for the existing sewer house laterals serving lots fronting Live Oak Avenue and shall provide continuous and uninterrupted sewer service, including but not limited to operation and maintenance of the private sewer house laterals until such time the outlet sewer system is accepted for public use. A bond shall be posted to the satisfaction of Public Works.

2. The subdivider shall install and dedicate main line sewers and serve each building with a separate house lateral or have approved and bonded sewer plans on file with Public Works.

3. If necessary, the subdivider shall comply with current sewer easement vacation procedures and shall post a sewer easement vacation bond to the satisfaction of Public Works.

4. If necessary, install off-site sewer house laterals to serve existing lots fronting Live Oak Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.

5. Comply with the mitigation measures as identified in the approved sewer area study (PC 12053AS, dated 12-09-2008) to the satisfaction of Public Works. The sewer area study shall be invalidated should the total number of dwelling units, increase, the density increases, dwelling units occur on previously identified building restricted lots, change in the proposed sewer alignment, increase in tributary sewershed, change of the sewer collection points, or the adoption of a land use plan or a revision to the current plan. A revision to the approved sewer area study may be allowed at the discretion of the Director of Public Works. The approved sewer area study shall remain valid for two years after initial approval of the tentative map. After this period of time, an update of the area study shall be submitted by the applicant if determined to be warranted by Public Works.

6. Provide a digital copy (PDF Format) of the approved area study and/or approved sewer improvement plans.

7. The subdivider shall send a print of the land division map to the County Sanitation District with a request for annexation. The request for annexation must be approved prior to final map approval.
8. Easements are required, subject to review by Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

9. Private easements are required and shall be dedicated by separate instruments in favor of existing lots fronting Live Oak Avenue. The separate instruments are subject to review by Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

Prepared by Allen Ma
Phone (626) 458-4921 Date Rev. 02-18-2008

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 01-07-2009
EXHIBIT “A” MAP DATED 01-07-2009
The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. A water system maintained by the water purveyor, with appurtenant facilities to serve all buildings in the land division, must be provided. The system shall include fire hydrants of the type and location (both on-site and off-site) as determined by the Fire Department. The water mains shall be sized to accommodate the total domestic and fire flows.

2. There shall be filed with Public Works a statement from the water purveyor indicating that the water system will be operated by the purveyor, and that under normal conditions, the system will meet the requirements for the land division, and that water service will be provided to each building.

3. If required, provide off-site water improvements to bring water to this land division to the satisfaction of Public Works.

4. Easement shall be granted to the County, appropriate agency or entity for the purpose of ingress, egress, construction and maintenance of all infrastructures constructed for this land division to the satisfaction of Public Works.

5. Submit landscape and irrigation plans for each multi-family/open space lot in the land division, with landscape area greater than 2,500 square feet, in accordance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

Prepared by Massoud Esfahani  Phone (626) 458-4921  Date 02-09-2009
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT
3823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision: TR 68400 Map Date January 07, 2009 - Ex. A
C.U.P. Vicinity Map 0166C

☐ FIRE DEPARTMENT HOLD on the tentative map shall remain until verification from the Los Angeles County Fire Dept. Planning Section is received, stating adequacy of service. Contact (323) 881-2404.

☐ Access shall comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 902 of the Fire Code, which requires all weather access. All weather access may require paving.

☐ Fire Department access shall be extended to within 150 feet distance of any exterior portion of all structures.

☐ Where driveways extend further than 150 feet and are of single access design, turnarounds suitable for fire protection equipment use shall be provided and shown on the final map. Turnarounds shall be designed, constructed and maintained to insure their integrity for Fire Department use. Where topography dictates, turnarounds shall be provided for driveways that extend over 150 feet in length.

☐ The private driveways shall be indicated on the final map as “Private Driveway and Firelane” with the widths clearly depicted. Driveways shall be maintained in accordance with the Fire Code.

☐ Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants. All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted prior to construction.

☐ This property is located within the area described by the Fire Department as “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” (formerly Fire Zone 4). A “Fuel Modification Plan” shall be submitted and approved prior to final map clearance. (Contact: Fuel Modification Unit, Fire Station #32, 605 North Angeleno Avenue, Azusa, CA 91702-2904, Phone (626) 969-5205 for details).

☐ Provide Fire Department or City approved street signs and building access numbers prior to occupancy.

☐ Additional fire protection systems shall be installed in lieu of suitable access and/or fire protection water.

☐ The final concept map, which has been submitted to this department for review, has fulfilled the conditions of approval recommended by this department for access only.

☐ These conditions must be secured by a C.U.P. and/or Covenant and Agreement approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department prior to final map clearance.

☐ The Fire Department has no additional requirements for this division of land.

Comments: Access as shown on the Exhibit Map is adequate.

By Inspector: [Signature] Date February 4, 2009

Land Development Unit – Fire Prevention Division – (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT
5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

WATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision No. TR 68400

Tentative Map Date January 07, 2009 - Ex. A

Revised Report

☐ The County Forester and Fire Warden is prohibited from setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted. However, water requirements may be necessary at the time of building permit issuance.

☒ The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at this location is 3500 gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of 3 hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. 2 Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.

☐ The required fire flow for private on-site hydrants is _____ gallons per minute at 20 psi. Each private on-site hydrant must be capable of flowing _____ gallons per minute at 20 psi with two hydrants flowing simultaneously, one of which must be the furthest from the public water source.

☒ Fire hydrant requirements are as follows:

Install 2 public fire hydrant(s).

Verify / Upgrade existing ____ public fire hydrant(s).

Install ____ private on-site fire hydrant(s).

☒ All hydrants shall measure 6"x 4"x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWA standard C503 or approved equal. All on-site hydrants shall be installed a minimum of 25' feet from a structure or protected by a two (2) hour rated firewall.

☐ Location: As per map on file with the office.

☐ Other location: ____

☒ All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted or bonded for prior to Final Map approval. Vehicular access shall be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction.

☐ The County of Los Angeles Fire Department is not setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted.

☒ Additional water system requirements maybe required during the building permit process.

☐ Hydrants and fire flows are adequate to meet current Fire Department requirements.

☐ Upgrade not necessary, if existing hydrant(s) meet(s) fire flow requirements. Submit original water availability form to our office.

Comments: The current water system is adequate per Fire Flow test perform by Golden State Water Company. The required fire hydrants shall be installed and tested or bonded for prior to Final Map clearance.

All hydrants shall be installed in conformance with Title 20, County of Los Angeles Government Code and County of Los Angeles Fire Code, or appropriate city regulations. This shall include minimum six-inch diameter mains. Arrangements to meet these requirements must be made with the water purveyor serving the area.

By Inspector ____________ Date February 4, 2009

Land Development Unit – Fire Prevention Division – (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783
Sections 21.24.340, 21.24.350, 21.28.120, 21.28.130, and 21.28.140, the County of Los Angeles Code, Title 21, Subdivision Ordinance provide that the County will determine whether the development's park obligation is to be met by:

1) the dedication of land for public or private park purpose or,
2) the payment of in-lieu fees or,
3) the provision of amenities or any combination of the above.

The specific determination of how the park obligation will be satisfied will be based on the conditions of approval by the advisory agency as recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

Conditions of the map approval:

The payment of $692,386 in-lieu fees.

Trails:

No trails.

Comments:

***The In-Lieu Fee has been updated to $692,386 from $686,642 to reflect the fee schedule at the time Map 68400 was advertised for public hearing in September 2010.

***Advisory:

The Representative Land Values (RLVs) in Los Angeles County Code (LACC) Section 21.28.140 are used to calculate park fees and are adjusted annually, based on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The new RLVs become effective July 1st of each year and may apply to this subdivision map if first advertised for hearing before either a hearing officer or the Regional Planning Commission or after July 1st pursuant to LACC Section 21.28.140, subsection 3. Accordingly, the park fee in this report is subject to change depending upon when the subdivision is first advertised for public hearing.

Please contact Clement Lau at (213) 351-5120 or Sheela Mathai at (213) 351-5121, Department of Parks and Recreation, 510 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90020 for further information or to schedule an appointment to make an in-lieu fee payment.

For information on Hiking and Equestrian Trail requirements, please contact the Trails Coordinator at (213) 351-5134.

By: [Signature]

James Barber, Land Acquisition & Development Section
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LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PARK OBLIGATION WORKSHEET

Tentative Map # 68400
Park Planning Area # 5
ARCADIA ISLANDS

DRP Map Date: 01/07/2009
SMC Date: 1/1
Report Date: 10/05/2010
Map Type: REV, (REV RECD)

The formula for calculating the acreage obligation and or In-lieu fee is as follows:

\[ (P \times (0.003) \times R) \times (U) = (X) \text{ acres obligation} \]

\[(X) \text{ acres obligation} \times \text{RLV/Acre} = \text{In-Lieu Base Fee} \]

Where:

\[ P = \text{Estimate of number of People per dwelling unit according to the type of dwelling unit as determined by the 2000 U.S. Census}. \]
\[ U = \text{Total approved number of Dwelling Units}. \]
\[ X = \text{Local park space obligation expressed in terms of acres}. \]
\[ \text{RLV/Acre} = \text{Representative Land Value per Acre by Park Planning Area}. \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detached S.F. Units</th>
<th>People*</th>
<th>3.0 Acres / 1000 People</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Acre Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.F. &lt; 5 Units</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.F. &gt;= 5 Units</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Units</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acre Obligation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Park Planning Area = 5 ARCADIA ISLANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio @ (0.0030)</th>
<th>Acre Obligation</th>
<th>RLV / Acre</th>
<th>In-Lieu Base Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>$310,487</td>
<td>$692,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Provided Space</th>
<th>Provided Acres</th>
<th>Credit (%)</th>
<th>Acre Credit</th>
<th>Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Provided Acre Credit:</th>
<th>0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acre Obligation</th>
<th>Public Land Credit</th>
<th>Priv. Land Credit</th>
<th>Net Obligation</th>
<th>RLV / Acre</th>
<th>In-Lieu Fee Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>$310,487</td>
<td>$692,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tract Map No. 068400

Vicinity: Los Angeles

Tentative Tract Map Date: January 7, 2009 (3rd Revision)

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health has no objection to this subdivision and Vesting Tentative Tract Map 068400 is cleared for public hearing. The following conditions still apply and are in force:

1. Potable water will be supplied by Golden State Water Company, a public water company.

2. Sewage disposal will be provided through the public sewer and wastewater treatment facilities of the Los Angeles County Sanitation District #15 as proposed.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (626) 430-5380.

Becky Valent, B.H.S. IV
Land Use Program
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: TR 068400 (RENV02007000062, RPAT0200700002, RZCT0200700004, RCRIPT0200700073).

1. DESCRIPTION:

Application for a tract map to subdivide four parcels into six lots to construct 318 residential units—with a minimum 20 percent reserved for seniors—in the following configuration: 148 units in two four-story buildings and 170 units in 23 three-story buildings. Additionally, applicant proposes a 2,850 square foot (s.f.) club house, a 2,900 s.f. community center, a swimming pool, and a "village green." A zone change from R-A, R-3-P, and C-3 to R-3-DF and a General Plan Amendment to Limited Multi-Residence are also being requested. The current use of the site is a 232-unit mobile home park with 37 spaces occupied. The proposed project will require grading in the amounts of 40,000 cubic yards of cut and 17,000 cubic yards of fill.

2. LOCATION:

4241 East Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia, CA 91006

3. PROPOSANT:

Prime Enterprises, LLC.
900 South San Gabriel Boulevard, #200
San Gabriel, CA 91776

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:

BASED ON THE ATTACHED INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT WITH MODIFICATION AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROJECT CHANGES/CONDITIONS FORM INCLUDED AS PART OF THE INITIAL STUDY.

5. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS MITAGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Anthony Curzi

DATE: August 3, 2009
*** INITIAL STUDY ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

L.A. Map Date: March 8, 2007  Staff Member: Anthony Curzi
Thomas Guide: 597-F2  USGS Quad: El Monte
Location: 4241 Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia, CA

Description of Project: The proposed project is an application for a tract map to subdivide four parcels into six lots to build 318 residential units with a 2,850 square foot (s.f.) club house and a 2,900 s.f. community center. The club house and the community center will require a Conditional Use Permit. The proposed residential units will be built in five phases and consist of 170 townhouse condominium units in 23 three-story buildings and 148 condominium units in two four-story buildings. The current use of the project site is a 232-unit mobile home park with 37 spaces occupied. The proposed project will require grading in the amounts of 40,000 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 17,000 c.y. of fill. The applicant is requesting a zone change to R-3-DP and a plan amendment to Limited Multi-Residence. Twenty percent of the units will be affordable for seniors.

Gross Acres: 12.45

Environmental Setting: The proposed project site is located in the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of South Monrovia Islands and is bordered to the south by Live Oak Avenue and to the east by Mayflower Avenue. Land uses within 500 feet consist of single-family residences. There are commercial establishments and one multi-family residence to the south. The project site contains flat and sloping topography to the south and east.

Zoning: R-A (Residential Agriculture), R-3-P (Limited Multiple Residence), C-3 (Unlimited Commercial)

General Plan: Category I (Low Density Residential)

Community/Area wide Plan: NA
Major projects in area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION &amp; STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR 061438/CP 04-168</td>
<td>40 condominium units (pending).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 060123/CP 03-207</td>
<td>45 condominium units (approved 10/06/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 03-165</td>
<td>Maintain existing golf course (approved 03/17/04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 01-069</td>
<td>Repair and storage of construction equipment (approved 06/26/02).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies
☐ None
☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
☐ Los Angeles Region
☐ Lahontan Region
☐ Coastal Commission
☐ Army Corps of Engineers

Special Reviewing Agencies
☐ None
☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
☐ National Parks
☐ National Forest
☐ Edwards Air Force Base
☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
☒ City of Arcadia
☒ City of El Monte
☒ City of Monrovia
☒ City of Irwindale
☐ Monrovia USD
☒ Golden State Water Company

Regional Significance
☐ None
☐ SCAG Criteria
☐ Air Quality
☐ Water Resources
☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
☒ AQMD

Trustee Agencies
☐ None

☒ State Fish and Game
☐ State Parks
☒ Caltrans District 7
☒ Native American Heritage Commission

County Reviewing Agencies
☒ Subdivision Committee
☒ DPW: T&L, Geotechnical and Materials, Waterworks and Sewer Maintenance, EP.
☒ Sheriff's, Fire, Library
☒ Parks and Recreation
☒ DPH: Environmental Hygiene

7/21/09
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>Pg</th>
<th>Analysis Summary (See individual pages for details)</th>
<th>Potential Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Significant Impact/No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Geotechnical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>□ □ □</td>
<td>Liquefaction area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Flood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Noise</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Air Quality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>NPDES requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cultural Resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mineral Resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Agriculture Resources</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Visual Qualities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Significant Impact/No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Traffic/Access</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sewage Disposal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Fire/Sheriff</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Utilities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. General</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Environmental Safety</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Land Use</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td>Plan Amendment and Zone Change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Finding:

**FINAL DETERMINATION:** On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☒ **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as “significant”.

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The Addendum EIR is required to analyze only the factors changed or not previously addressed.

Reviewed by:  
Anthony Curzi  
Date: 7/22/09

Approved by:  
Paul McCarthy  
Date: 7/22-09

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.*
HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

a. ☒ ☐ Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?

b. ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?

c. ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?

d. ☐ ☐ Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?

Liquefaction.

e. ☒ ☐ Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?

f. ☐ ☐ Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?

Grading in the amounts of 40,000 cubic yards of cut and 17,000 cubic yards of fill.

g. ☐ ☐ Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

h. ☒ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Implement Geotechnical Engineering Investigation-dated 3/14/07, Chapter 7-Conclusions and Recommendations. Applicant shall comply with all requirements of Subdivision Committee.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, geotechnical factors?

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No Impact
HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
- Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
- Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
- Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
- Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
- Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A  ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Conceptual drainage concept was approved by DPW on July 14, 2008. Applicant shall comply with all requirements of said approval.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by flood (hydrological) factors?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact
HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. |    |       | Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
| b. |    |       | Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
| c. |    |       | Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
| d. |    |       | Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
| e. |    |       | Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
| f. |    |       | Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
| g. |    |       | Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8
☐ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Subdivision Committee.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by fire hazard factors?

☒ Less than significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?

Project site is located on heavily-traveled Live Oak Avenue. Parking lots and other industrial uses including an auto repair shop are adjacent to the project site to the south.

Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?

There is a library 500 feet to the southwest of the project site.

Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?

The project will utilize parking lots and a parking structure.

Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?

Noise from project grading and construction.

Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Control (Title 12 – Chapter 8) ☐ Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - Chapter 35)

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Comply with noise mitigation measures.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by noise?

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact
RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Industrial Waste Permit
- Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
- Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
- NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

MITIGATION MEASURES

- Lot Size
- Project Design
- Compatible Use

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Subdivision Committee.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, water quality problems?

- Less than significant with project mitigation
- Less than significant/No impact
## RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Will the proposed project exceed the State’s criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?**

**Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?**

**Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance?**

**Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?**

*Grading may create dust.*

**Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

**Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

**Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

*The proposed project has the potential to contribute to a cumulative net increase in air quality impacts.*

**Other factors?**

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- [ ] Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

### MITIGATION MEASURES

- [X] Project Design
- [ ] Air Quality Report

**AQMD had no comments on project. Implement mitigation measures in MMP.**

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, air quality?

- [X] Less than significant with project mitigation
- [ ] Less than significant/No impact
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### RESOURCES - 3. Biota

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a.** Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
  - **Project site is approximately one mile from Santa Fe Dam SEA.**

- **b.** Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
  - **Project site is fully developed and does not contain natural habitat areas.**

- **c.** Is a drainage course located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream, or lake?

- **d.** Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?

- **e.** Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?

- **f.** Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

- **g.** Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

- ☐ Lot Size
- ☐ Project Design
- ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review
- ☐ Oak Tree Permit

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, biotic resources?

- ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation
- ☐ Less than significant/No impact

**Date:** 7/21/09
RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b. | ☒    | ☐     |
|    |      |       |
|    | Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? |

| c. | ☒    | ☐     |
|    |      |       |
|    | Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? |

| d. | ☒    | ☐     |
|    |      |       |
|    | Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? |

| e. | ☒    | ☐     |
|    |      |       |
|    | Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |

| f. | ☒    | ☐     |
|    |      |       |
|    | Other factors? |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design  ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact
RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on mineral resources?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact
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RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

No       Maybe

a.  ☒       ☐

Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?

b.  ☒       ☐

Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c.  ☒       ☐

Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

d.  ☒       ☐

Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on agriculture resources?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact
RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed project is not near a riding or hiking trail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two four story buildings with a maximum height of 66 feet proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
☐ Lot Size
☒ Project Design
☐ Visual Report
☐ Compatible Use

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on scenic qualities?

☒ Less than significant/No impact
☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. | No | ☒ | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
|    |    |    | **318 residential units are proposed.**
| b. | ☒ |  | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
| c. | ☒ |  | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
|    |    |    | **716 parking spaces and a two-level subterranean parking structure are proposed.**
| d. | ☒ |  | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
|    |    |    | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
| e. | ☒ |  | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
| f. | ☒ |  | Other factors?

☑ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Project Design  ☒ Traffic Report  ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

Traffic and Lighting concluded proposed project does not require additional studies per City of Arcadia's guidelines.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on traffic/access factors?

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☐ Less than significant/No impact
SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?

Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?

Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Subdivision Committee.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to sewage disposal facilities?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact
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**SERVICES - 3. Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

- ☐ Site Dedication  ☒ Government Code Section 65995  ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to educational facilities/services?

- ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact
SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

### SETTING/IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
☐ Fire Mitigation Fee
- Nearest County Fire station 2.3 miles away at 5946 N. Kaufman Avenue, Temple City, CA.
- Nearest Sheriff's station is 3.9 miles away at 8838 Las Tunas Drive, Temple City, CA.

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to fire/sheriff services?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
☐ Less than significant/No impact
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SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTLE/IMPACTS
No  Maybe

a.  X  ☐
Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

b.  X  ☐
Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?

c.  X  ☐
Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?

d.  ☐  X
Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?

Solid waste generated by demolition/construction and operation of proposed project.

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

e.  X  ☐

f.  X  ☐
Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269  ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

MITIGATION MEASURES
☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Applicant shall comply with county requirements regarding waste disposal.

CONCLUSION
Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to utilities services?

☐ Less than significant/No impact  ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
### OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

### MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size  ☐ Project Design  ☐ Compatible Use

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☒ Less than significant/No impact
OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

a. ☒ ☐ Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?

b. ☒ ☐ Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?

c. ☒ ☐ Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?

d. ☒ ☐ Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?

e. ☒ ☐ Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

f. ☒ ☐ Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

g. ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?

h. ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?

i. ☒ ☐ Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

j. ☐ ☒ Other factors?

Potential landfill within 1000 feet.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION
Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to public safety?

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact
### OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. |  |  | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?  
*Plan Amendment to Limited Multi-Residence.*
| b. |  |  | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?  
*Zone Change to R-3-DP.*
| c. |  |  | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:  
- Hillside Management Criteria?  
- SEA Conformance Criteria?  
- Other? |
| d. |  |  | Would the project physically divide an established community? |
| e. |  |  | Other factors? |

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

- Approved plan amendment and zone change will allow proposed project to be consistent with plan designation and zoning.

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to land use factors?

- Less than significant with project mitigation  
- Less than significant/No impact
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OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

No  Maybe

a. ☒  ☐ Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

b. ☒  ☐ Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

The project site and its surrounding area are urbanized and developed.

c. ☒  ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

d. ☒  ☐ Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?

e. ☒  ☐ Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?

f. ☒  ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

g. ☒  ☐ Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES  ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to population, housing, employment, or recreational factors?

☐ Significant  ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation  ☐ Less than significant/No impact
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

a. ☒ □  Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b. ☐ ☒  Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

Traffic, water quality, visual, utilities.

c. ☐ ☐  Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Geotechnical, noise, air quality.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation □ Less than significant/No impact
PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES
Due to ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Project No.: VTTM No. 068400(RPAT200700002/RZCT200700004/RCUP200700073)

The Department of Regional Planning ("DRP") staff has determined that the following mitigation measures for the project are necessary in order to assure that the proposed project will not cause significant impacts on the environment.

The Permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with the DRP within 30 days of Permit approval in order to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying information contained in reports required by the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

1. Implement Geotechnical Engineering Investigation — dated 3/14/07, Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations, and addendums thereof.

2. Limit all construction activities near occupied on- and off-site residences to between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM and exclude on all Sundays and County-observed holidays.

3. All construction equipment, stationary and mobile, operating on the project site shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained noise buffering muffler system or other noise reducing feature, reducing equipment noise levels to conform to applicable County standards.

4. Implement noise mitigation measures discussed in the Mestre Greve Noise Assessment dated 2/23/07, and summarized as follows:
   a. Construct a 16-ft. high temporary noise-sound blanket-barrier along the north and west perimeter property lines, and 9-ft. high temporary sound blanket-barrier along the south and east perimeter property lines, or a structure equal to or of greater mitigation.
   b. On-site loading and staging areas shall be located at least 50 ft. from existing residential dwellings.

5. Reduce construction equipment emissions by implementing use of a series of measures inclusive of low emission construction equipment, low sulfur fuel, pre-coated/colored materials, and existing power.

6. Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer's specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust.

7. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during applicable smog alerts.

8. Use electricity from power poles when present, practicable, and cost-effective rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.

9. Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.

10. Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.

11. Implement air quality measures — inclusive of ROG measures, as discussed in the Mestre Greve Associates report dated 12/18/08, as follows:
   a. Use pre-coated, pre-colored and naturally colored building materials, and use of high volume-low pressure sprayers.
   b. Utilize low emission, tank-less water heaters to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions.
   c. Utilize built-in, energy-efficient appliances and automated controls for HVAC to reduce energy consumption and emissions.
   d. Provide shade trees in subject development to reduce building heating/cooling needs as depicted in the landscape plan.
   e. Install sunlight filtering window coatings, double-paned windows or window treatments to meet or exceed Title 24 Energy requirements.
   f. Use roof materials that maximize reflection of sunlight and minimize heat gains in buildings, thus reducing dependence on HVAC.

12. Provide and implement studies and analysis — Sewer Study, Traffic Study, Biological Assessment, Drainage/Grading and Closure Impact Report, as made a condition of approval.

13. Utilize high-efficiency dual-flush toilets to reduce water consumption.

As the Applicant, I agree to incorporate these mitigation measures into the project, and understand that the public hearing and consideration by the Planning Commission will be on the project as mitigation measures.

Applicant: Prime Enterprises, LLC

[ ] No response within 10 days. Environmental Determination requires that these changes/conditions be included in the project

Staff

Date

7/32/09
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Impact Mitigation</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Implementation Agency of Party</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Geotechnical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implement Geotechnical Engineering Investigation – dated 3/14/07, Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations, and addendums thereof.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Implement report recommendations</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limit all construction activities near occupied on- and off-site residences to between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM and excluded on all Sundays and County-observed holidays.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All construction equipment, stationary and mobile, operating on the project site shall be equipped with proper operating and maintained noise buffering muffler system or other noise reducing feature, reducing equipment noise levels to conform to applicable County standards.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4   | Implement noise mitigation measures discussed in the Mestre Greve Noise Assessment dated 2/23/07, and summarized as follows:  
   a. Construct a 16-ft. high temporary noise–sound blanket-barrier along the north and west perimeter property lines, and 9-ft. high temporary sound blanket-barrier along the south and east perimeter property lines, or a structure equal to or of greater mitigation.  
   b. On-site loading and staging areas shall be located at least 50 ft. from existing residential dwellings. | Project Applicant       | Implement report recommendations | DPW                           | Plan check       |
<p>| 5   | Reduce construction equipment emissions by implementing use of a series of measures inclusive of low emission construction equipment, low sulfur fuel, pre-coated/colored materials, and existing power. | Project Applicant       | Inspection monitoring        | DPW Project Applicant | Construction     |
| 6   | Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer's specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust. | Project Applicant       | Inspection monitoring        | DPW Project Applicant | Construction     |
| 7   | Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during applicable smog alerts. | Project Applicant       | Inspection monitoring        | DPW Project Applicant | Construction     |
|     | <strong>Air Quality</strong>                                                                   |                         |                             |                               |                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Impact Mitigation</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency or Party</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Use electricity from power poles when present, practicable, and cost-effective rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan check review</td>
<td>DPW Project Applicant</td>
<td>Plan checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Implement air quality measures – inclusive of ROG measures, as discussed in the Mestre Greve Associates report dated 12/18/08, as follows: a. Use pre-coated, pre-colored and naturally colored building materials, and use of high volume-low pressure sprayers. b. Utilize low emission, tank-less water heaters to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions. c. Utilize built-in, energy-efficient appliances and automated controls for HVAC to reduce energy consumption and emissions. d. Provide shade trees in subject development to reduce building heating/cooling needs as depicted in the landscape plan. e. Install sunlight filtering window coatings, double-paned windows or window treatments to meet or exceed Title 24 Energy requirements. f. Use roof materials that maximize reflection of sunlight and minimize heat gains in buildings, thus reducing dependence on HVAC.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Implement report recommendations</td>
<td>DRP</td>
<td>Plan checking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewer, Traffic, Biota, Drainage and Grading, Relocation.**

| 12  | Provide and implement studies and analysis – Sewer Study, Traffic Study, Biological Assessment, Drainage/Grading and Closure Impact Report, as made a condition of approval. | Project Applicant | Implement report recommendations | DRP and DPW | Permits |

**Water Conservation.**

| 13  | Utilize high-efficiency dual-flush toilets to reduce water consumption. | Project Applicant | Install dual flush toilets | DPW | Permits |

Key: DPW = Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. DRP, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

BURDEN OF PROOF

Answers to the following must be made complete and full (use additional sheets as necessary):

(1) A need for the proposed Plan Amendment exists because:

The existing Major Commercial zone – C-3, promotes Community and Neighborhood serving commercial uses – permitting commercial development equal to a 13.0 FAR and 50 residential units per acre, fronting onto a major highway serving County residents, and commercial, residential and industrial uses within the Cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, and Irwindale. The County General Plan housing goals to accommodate higher density multi-family residential in urban areas, (ii) to provide a Category compatible with commercial and residential land uses, (iii) to provide alternatives to more expensive single lot home ownership, (iv) to provide access to two or four public street frontages, and direct traffic away from local streets, and (v) proposes General Plan consistency changes.

This Amendment will facilitate much needed local- and regional-serving housing that fronts onto two major arterials designated as Major Highway (Live Oak Ave.) and Secondary Highway (Mayflower Ave.). These arterials are part of the backbone to a countywide transportation and circulation system.

The particular amendment proposed is appropriate and proper because:

The Amendment will increase the supply and diversity of housing, and promote infill housing to replace an existing 232-unit mobile home park – only 39 units occupied, that is at the end of its development lifetime. This scarce under utilized land should be developed as an extension of the existing community, rather than continue as a barrier to additional development in the vicinity.

The Applicant should not bear the responsibility to create consistency between the County General Plan and existing zoning designations as required by the CA Government Code (Title 7 S. 65359 – Local Plan Consistency.)

Construction of air-right ownership housing: (i) enables local residents who no longer require a single family residence parcel to stay in the area, (ii) enables older residents who may have long terms of residence in the community to stay within the community, and (iii) provides quality family-sized housing as a less-expensive alternative to other market-rate ownership and rental projects, both in other areas in the County and in the adjacent cities. Construction of amenities consolidates outdoor activities towards the center of the 12.05 ac. parcel – away from neighboring properties. The proposed residential project is within close proximity to established commercial and residential neighborhoods.

Potentially significant impacts of higher-density development are mitigated to a level of insignificance through simultaneous review and approval of the Tract Map and CUP/DP associated with the zone change to R-3 - DP.

(2) Modified conditions warrant a revision to the County of Los Angeles Plan because:

Planning goals listed in the General Plan promote concentration of well-designed housing in and adjacent to regional centers to provide convenient access to jobs and services without sacrificing livability or environmental quality. (Source: County Land Use Element, Policy No. 1, pp. III – 11). The site is located within an urbanized, unincorporated area along Live Oak Ave., a Major Highway, serving local urban cities and unincorporated communities. The amendment will facilitate higher density home ownership near urban commercial corridors without impacting the quality of life for existing residents in the County and in the communities of Irwindale, Monrovia, Arcadia (Policy No. 24, p. III-14).

(3) Approval of the proposed Plan Amendment will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good planning practices because:

The proposed family-oriented residential project creates homeownership opportunities not available in the area without creating unmitigated environmental impacts.

Increase in the number of family-sized housing units is promoted by the General Plan; the project will be a catalyst for additional commercial and residential development that is contemplated in planning documents that promote housing growth in County and surrounding communities.

APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

I (We) being duly sworn, deposes and say that the foregoing answers and statements herein contained and the information submitted are in all respects true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief.

Executed this 70th day of April, 2026

Signed

[Signature]

Moss & Associates, Inc.

GPA/Bulen 3-25-68
In addition to the information required in the application, the applicant shall substantiate to the satisfaction of the Commission, the following facts. Answers must be made complete and full:

1. Modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning plan as it pertains to the area or district under consideration because:

   Residential use is permitted by right in the R-3, and C - A zones, and by CUP in the C-3 zone. The zone change to R-3 DP consolidates the 12.05 ac. into one category, and is needed for three principal reasons: (i) to implement County General Plan housing goals to accommodate higher density multi-family residential in urbanizing areas, (ii) to foster infill housing, and (iii) to provide flexibility to design and develop the 12.05 ac. parcel.

   The zone change is necessary to meet local and regional goals for additional housing and increase supply of quality, affordable "for-ownership" condominium and townhouse – condominium units.

   Construction of ownership housing will strengthen the community by enabling local residents who no longer require a single-family home to stay in the area, and by expanding opportunities for those who would like to move to the area.

   The R-3 DP zone accommodates the proposed density of 27.72 units/ac., and provides ample common and landscaped open space, and improvements including recreation buildings, pool, spa, and tot lot.

2. A need for the proposed zone classification exists within such area or district because:

   The Applicant should not bear the responsibility to create consistency between the County General Plan and existing zoning designations as required by CA Government Code (title 7, §65359 – Local Plan Consistency).

   The Countywide General Plan recognizes the limited supply of prime land available for multi-family housing and amending the zoning is needed to: (i) accommodate the increased demand for home ownership housing, (ii) to balance the area's economic needs for housing near job sources, (iii) promote land uses contributing to economic diversity, and (iv) provide design flexibility to collocate multi-family residential and on-site amenities in close proximity to single family residential communities.

   The R-3 DP zone can accommodate multi-family rental housing at a density of 27.72 units/ac., on-site amenities, and up to four story building heights of <68 ft.

   The particular property under consideration is a proper location for said zone classification within such area of district because:

   The site has access to all necessary services and facilities and is of sufficient size and shape to accommodate residential development and on-site amenities at the proposed height and density.

   The proposed R-3 DP zoning is consistent with the Countywide General Plan Category 1 and Category 4, and the proposed project can be conditioned to be compatible with surrounding land uses and General Plan policies using the DP portion of the zone change. The Applicant is exceeding minimum County parking standards and open space/amenities requirements.

   Compatibility with existing land uses—single-family residential to the west, to the north, and to the east across Mayflower Ave., and multiple family residential/commercial to the south, is ensured through the conditions of approval of the various discretionary entitlements.

   Placement of the proposed zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, and in conformity with good zoning practices because:

   This condominium and townhouse - condominium residential project with associated on-site amenities features ample walls, landscape buffers, larger setbacks, and better open space amenities than generally found with projects of this density. The layout and design of the units will encourage a variety of family types to gravitate towards staying in the community or moving to this area of the County.

   There are no growth-inducing impacts associated with the proposed land use and the effect of this infill development on the community will be positive.
In addition to the information required in the attached application, the applicant shall substantiate to the satisfaction of the Zoning Board and/or the Commission, the following facts:

A. That there will be no need for the number of parking spaces required by Part I of Chapter 22.52 because:

1. The age and/or physical condition of the residents is such that the use of automobiles is unlikely; or
2. The nature of the use is such that there is a reduced occupancy; or
3. The business or use has established a viable transportation program for its employees and/or customers to use transportation modes other than the single-occupant automobiles. Such a program shall include bicycle commuter facilities. Where appropriate, proximity to freeways with high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities shall be a factor in this consideration; or
4. Sufficient land area is reserved or an alternative arrangement is approved to ensure that the parking requirements may be complied with should the use, occupancy, or transportation program change. Such reservation or alternative may be waived for certain senior citizen and handicapped person’s housing developments where the director finds that it is unnecessary because of the anticipated permanent nature that it can be feasibly converted to parking if needed.

• The Permit is needed because the distribution of parking does not meet the “technical” interpretation of County code to place guest parking on the same lot as the unit. The guest parking layout conforms to the spirit and intent is laid out so that 92 of 104 guest parking spaces - 20 more than the required 84 spaces are on Lot Nos. 1 and 4 – are easily accessible to from all six lots.

• On-site vehicle circulation, parking, and emergency access design is acceptable to County DPW and Fire Department. There is convenient access to Live Oak mass transit.

• No waiver to reduce parking is requested; proposed parking promotes vehicular and pedestrian safety and efficient land use.

B. That there will be no conflicts arising from special parking arrangements allowing shared facilities, tandem spaces, or compact spaces because:

1. Uses sharing parking facilities operating at different times of the day or days of the week; or
2. Parking facilities using tandem spaces will employ valets or will utilize other means to insure a workable plan, or
3. Apartment houses using compact spaces for a portion of the require parking have a management program or homeowners association to assure an efficient distribution of all parking spaces.

• No aspect of the project is non-compliant with these findings.

C. That off-site facilities, leases of less than 20 years, rear lot transitional parking lots and uncovered residential parking spaces will provide the required parking for uses because:

1. Such off-site facilities are controlled through ownership, leasing or other arrangement by the owner of the use for which the site serves and are conveniently accessible to the main use, or
2. Such leases are written in such a way as to prevent multiple leasing of the same spaces or cancellation without providing alternate spaces; such leases shall contain other guarantees assuring continued availability of the spaces; or
3. Such transitional lots are designed to minimize adverse effects on surrounding properties; or
4. Uncovered parking for low and moderate income residential developments will be appropriately screened and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

• No aspect of the project is non-compliant with these findings. The Applicant will comply with final mitigation required by Traffic and Lighting based on the review of the traffic impact analysis prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers.

D. That the requested parking permit at the location proposed will not result in traffic congestion, excessive off-site parking, or unauthorized use of parking facilities developed to serve surrounding properties.

• The request for a Parking Permit will have no unmitigated impact on traffic congestion, circulation, off-site parking or parking for adjacent land uses.

E. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, loading facilties, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this ordinance.

• The site plan has been conceptually reviewed and approved by County DPW and Fire Department. The site complies with all applicable development standards.
In addition to the information required in the application, the applicant shall substantiate to the satisfaction of the Zoning Board and/or the Commission, the following facts:

A. That the requested use at the location proposed will not:

1. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or
2. Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property or other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or
3. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

- Compliance with applicable health and safety codes, the UBC and good development practices will result in a successful, safe and enjoyable living environment for new and existing community residents.
- The proposed for-sale condominium and townhouse development will improve the quality of life for on-site and adjacent residents in regards to landscape, infrastructure, and building design. New amenities and development standards include decorative landscaping, 4.1 ac. of common open space, recreation and community centers, a pool and spa, tot lot,
- There is ample parking and centralized vehicle ingress from Mayflower Ave.; circulation has been carefully designed for egress to Live Oak Ave., and Mayflower Ave, that limits vehicle access to major county arterials, and away from local serving residential collector streets. Well-designed condominium and townhouse units feature quality construction materials to create an aesthetic residential design enhancing the economic viability of area and acting as a catalyst for future quality projects.

B. That the 12.05 ac. site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate yards, walls, fences, parking, loading, landscaping, building stories and height, and other development features prescribed in this Title 22 application, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate the 12.05 ac. site with uses in the surrounding area.

- The project civil engineer, traffic engineer, geologist, noise and air quality consultants identified measures to mitigate impacts to a level of non-significance.
- Parking for 773 cars provides 20 spaces greater than required by County code.
- Building height is limited to a maximum of (i) four stories or 66 ft, (ii) two stories or 35 ft. The project will (i) comply with Fire and Public Works Department requirements consisting of private driveway widths of 28 ft. curb to curb (ii) locate all buildings within 150 ft. of an approved Fire Lane, (iii) provide massing and design to insure compatibility with the surrounding residential development, while protecting visual privacy of adjacent residential uses, and (iv) be developed at a density of 27.72 units/ac. - which is within R-3 DP standards and compatible with either Category 1 (existing) or Category 4 (proposed) of the General Plan.
- All development standards prescribed in this Title 22 application - Planning and Zoning requirements are either met, or exceptions to building height and setbacks are requested under the DP zoning to create a human-scale project with amenities that will be foster a quality living environment and have a positive effect of expanding the existing residential community.

C. That the proposed use is adequately served:

1. By highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and
2. By other public or private service facilities as are required.

- The Applicant will comply with final mitigation required by County Traffic and Lighting based on the review of the traffic impact analysis prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers. Live Oak Ave. and Mayflower Ave, right-of-ways are fully dedicated and will be improved with parkway landscaping, to adequately serve the project and surrounding community. Existing streets on the west sides of the project – Love Joy St. and Alley, serve adjacent residential uses and will not be accessed by Santa Ana Village guests or residents.
- Will serve utility letters – copies of which are enclosed in this application are provided for water, gas, sewer, and electric. Sewer, electric, cable and telephone have been requested but have not yet been received.
ATTACHMENT TO SECTION 5 OF HOUSING PERMIT SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION

4. Waiver or Modification of Development Standards – Section 22.52.1860

Please provide a short description of the requested waiver of modification of development standards.

75 dwelling units are provided in one condominium tower that is exclusively restricted to senior residents.

5. Discretionary Housing Permit Burden of Proof – Section 22.56.2820

A. That the requested use at the location will not:

1. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area.

   With the exception of the pending clearances of a Closure Impact Report and an addendum to the project’s Air Quality Assessment, the project and its anticipated conditions incorporate mitigation measures that were recommended in the project’s environmental studies.

   Both the street median at the project’s easterly entry and the height and number of dwelling units on the west and north boundaries of the project were modified in response to suggestions from neighboring residents that was received at two community meetings.

2. Be detrimental to the use enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

   The proposed use is a significant improvement over the existing mobile home park and will benefit surrounding commercial uses, broaden the existing property tax base, increase school district revenues, increase ridership on the local area bus system, and create local housing options for senior citizens.

3. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

   The project includes a swimming pool that will be subject to and operate under the requirements of a permit issued by under the Environmental Health - Recreational Waters Program of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health.

B. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, wall, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.

   The features and specifications of project’s common area are consistent with current planning standards. All parking will be accommodated on site, its perimeter walls were analyzed as part of the project’s noise assessment, and waste hauling trucks will utilize the interior drive aisles of the project.
C. That the proposed site is adequately served:

1. By highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate:

   The project entries conform to current traffic guidelines and are located on major arterials with design specifications that meet or exceed anticipated traffic volume and vehicle loads.

2. By other public or private service facilities as are required.

   The project’s internal driveways accommodate fire safety vehicles, emergency vehicles, and waste hauling trucks.

D. That the proposed project at the location proposed has been designed to be complementary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design.

   The project’s land use is consistent with surrounding residential uses and will be complementary to surrounding commercial uses. Its building set-backs and the height of the end units of its perimeter buildings are less than what would otherwise be allowed under either an R-1500 or an R-2 zone designation; and the project’s density is concentrated in centrally located buildings that are beyond the view of adjacent residences.

E. That the proposed project will assist in satisfying housing needs, and is viable in term of continuing availability to meet such housing needs.

   The availability of the proposed 314 dwelling units is responsive to State of California’s housing element mandates for local area general plans and provides an opportunity for surrounding seniors to capture equity in their existing homes and relocate within the social matrix of their existing community.
Monday, October 04, 2010

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attention: Jodie Sackett

Project: TRO68400-5 Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003
Project Address: 4241 East Live Oak Avenue Arcadia, CA

Dear Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning:

This Review Report of the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park ("Park") Closure Impact Report ("Report") prepared by Overland, Pacific and Cutler (OPC) is intended for Prime Enterprises, LLC, to fulfill its due diligence requirement that is required by the Los Angeles County Code Chapter 8.57 and the state Mobilehome relocation throughout Southern California. Epic is familiar with regulations and guidelines governing the relocation process.

Epic has reviewed the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park Closure Impact Report thoroughly, paying close attention to compliance with Chapter 8.57 and State Mobilehome Residency Law.

Additional fact checking was performed for verification of pertinent information contained in the Closure Impact Report in relation to the compliance with applicable regulations, letters and maps and available resources. Below are the findings and recommendations.

Compliance with Applicable Regulations:

The Closure Impact Report which is the subject of this Review has been found to be compliance with the governing regulations. Although not specifically outlined in the Mobilehome Residency Law or County Code 8.57, Epic suggests that the following will enhance the Report and make the relocation activities as smooth as possible:

Creating Land Solutions for the Public Good
www.epicland.com
The Report did not include photographs of the 37 coaches that are being affected by the closure. These photos can help document the condition of the coaches before closure.

The Report did not mention availability of temporary housing for those households which may have a more difficult time finding a replacement. Related to the fact that the Report stated that some park residents could face special challenges finding a replacement due to age of the coaches and finances, health and age of the occupants.

Verification of Maps, Relocation Benefits and Letters Presented in the Report:

Epic has reviewed the letters, maps and relocation benefits that were used in the Report as its exhibits. They all appeared to be adequate and seem to provide sufficient information pursuant to the governing regulations.

Available Resources

Epic has reviewed the available data which was used as the basis for the Report. The available resource section of the Report appears to meet all the requirements. However, as noted above, it is recommended that this section of the Report be amended to include available resources for the households which might require temporary displacement in order to meet project schedule.

Conclusion

Epic affirms that this Report complies with County Code Chapter 8.57 and the state Mobilehome Residency Law. Epic’s suggestions to add photos of the coaches involved in the relocation and include resources for temporary housing are merely suggestions to enhance the Report and are not required for compliance with the County and State regulations. Overall, the Report was well structured and informative.

Sincerely,

Ray Mehler
Regional Manager

Cc: Steve Zuckerman

www.epicland.com

RIGHT OF WAY SOLUTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD
## Closure Impact Report Review Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Information</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
<th>Action Suggested</th>
<th>Action Recommended (but not required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Site Photos</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Photos of coaches that have to be relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Costs</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Mitigation Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Housing</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Possible temporary housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The photos and temporary housing information may be provided in a separate supplement to the report and notices may be delivered to residents prior or as part of the state required 6 Month Notice of Closure.
Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park
Closure Impact Report

Prepared by:
Overland, Pacific & Cutler, Inc.
3750 Schaufele Ave., Suite 150
Long Beach, California 90808
www.opcservices.com

February 24, 2010
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Prime Enterprises, LLC (the "Owner"), owner of the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park (the "Park") located at 4241 East Live Oak, Arcadia, California is proposing a five-phase 318 unit residential townhouse-condominium development with three- and four-story mid-rise podium residential structures with subterranean parking. No governmental assistance in any part of the proposed development is proposed. As a result of the proposed development, the closure of the Park will be required.

Pursuant to the Los Angeles County Code, Title 8, Chapter 8.57.300 (the "Code"), prior to the change of use or closure of the Park, the Owner is required to file with the Los Angeles County Planning Director, a report on the impact of the closure upon the residents who will be displaced (the "Closure Impact Report" or "CIR"). The requirements of the Code are also consistent with the requirements of California Government Code Section 65863.7; hereinafter to be also known as the "Code".

The Park, located in an unincorporated area of the County of Los Angeles within a South Arcadia community, is situated on approximately 12 acres. The Park has a total of 228 mobile home spaces. Currently, only 37 spaces are occupied and the rest are vacant (See Exhibit A for a map of the Park). Of the 37 occupied spaces, 23 are occupied by residents who own their mobile home and 14 are occupied by tenants renting Park owned mobile homes.

The Owner has contracted with Overland, Pacific & Cutler, Inc. (OPC), a firm with relevant experience in the closure of mobile home parks and relocation of residents from all types of housing types, to prepare the necessary CIR on the impact of the closure upon the residents of the Santa Anita Village Mobile Home Park.
In order to prepare the CIR, OPC analyzed resident data provided by the Owner, performed a comprehensive study of mobile home park and other housing resources in the surrounding area of the Park.

Consistent with the Code, the CIR presents:

1. Demographic data from the survey of the Park residents who will be displaced;
2. The availability of adequate replacement housing;
3. Reasonable relocation costs for each resident of the Park;
4. Identification of the adverse impacts of the closure; and
5. Proposed steps to be taken to mitigate adverse impacts associated with the proposed closure of the Park.
A. THE REGIONAL LOCATION

The proposed Project is located in an unincorporated area of the County of Los Angeles, within a southern area of the City of Arcadia, approximately 10 miles north-east of downtown Los Angeles. Surrounding Cities include Arcadia to the west and north, Monrovia, Irwindale and Baldwin Park to the east, El Monte to the south, and Temple City to the west. The Project site is easily accessible by Interstate Freeways 10, 210 and 605. (See Figure 1: Regional Project Location)

Figure 1: Regional Project Location
B. PROJECT SITE LOCATION

The proposed Project site is located at 4241 East Live Oak Avenue and it encompasses approximately 12 acres. The Project is generally bounded by East Birchcroft Street on the north, South 10th Avenue on the west, South Mayflower Avenue on the east and East Live Oak Avenue on the south. (See Figure 2: Park Site Location)

Figure 2: Park Site Location
C. LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Lot: 1 Tract No: 14525 Abbreviated Description: LOT COM AT SE COR OF LOT 1 TR # 14525 TH N 0 14'23" W 731.77 FT TH N 89 45'20" E 734.04 FT TH S ON W LINE OF MAYFLOWER AVE City/Muni/Twp: REGION/CLUSTER: 05/05416

D. TIMETABLE FOR CLOSURE OF THE PARK

After all required permits requesting the change of use for the proposed project have been approved by the Los Angeles County Planning Director; the Owner shall give the mobile home homeowners six months' or more written notice of termination of tenancy.
A. METHODOLOGY

Park resident information was provided by the Owner from survey information collected by Park management in July 2007 and updated in January 2010. Information was received from 36 of the 37 Park residents (97.3%). Survey questions of Park residents concerned contact information, household size and composition, income, employment, coach size and age, length and type of occupancy, disabilities/health problems and mortgage information, if any. An information and introduction letter regarding the preparation of the CIR was delivered to residents the week of December 10, 2007 (see Exhibit B).

B. SURVEY DATA

The Park has a total of 228 mobile home spaces. Currently, only 37 spaces are occupied and the rest are vacant (191). Of the 37 occupied spaces, 23 are occupied by residents who own their mobile home and are paying space rents ranging from $465 to $680 per month, with an average of $566; 14 are occupied by tenants renting Park owned mobile homes on a month-to-month basis. Among the 36 respondents, all 36 identified themselves as full-time Park residents. The residency status of the 1 household which did not respond to the survey was assumed to be permanent based on mailing address provided by the on-site Park manager.

The resident survey data described below in sub-sections 1-4 concern respondent Park residents as well as certain assumptions made about the non-respondent household. A table summarizing survey information for all Park residents is included as Exhibit C to this Report.

1) Full-Time Population

Among the 37 permanent Park resident households, there are 60 adults and 6 children for a total of 66 residents. The tenure of Park residents
range from less than 1 year to 29 years with an average of 10 years.

2) Occupancy

Household size ranges from 1 to 4 individuals. The household size mix is shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size (number of occupants)</th>
<th># of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Senior/Handicapped Households

There are 17 individuals 62 years or older residing in the Park. Four households have individuals with mobility problems expressing a preference for ground level accommodations or stair rails and ramps. Several other residents have moderate to serious health issues that, at this time, would not appear to restrict potential housing choices, but prefer to stay close to doctors, hospitals and other medical care.

4) Income

Income information was provided by 34 of 37 Park households. According to income standards for the County of Los Angeles (Exhibit D) adjusted for family size as published by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in April 2009, 4 households qualify as extremely low (EL) income (30% or less of area median), 17 households qualify as very low (VL) income (31%-50% of area median), 10 qualify as low (L) income (51%-80% of area median), 1 qualifies as moderate (M) income (81%-120% of area median) and 2 qualify as above
moderate (AM) income (over 120% of area median). **Table 2** below outlines this information. The range of reported annual household income among the respondents was $6,000-$81,600.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Income Levels of Respondent Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) **Coach Data**

The 23 resident-owned mobile homes in the Park range in size from 8 by 32 feet (256 square feet) to 20 by 56 feet (1,120 square feet). Most of the units have been modified with interior and exterior improvements, i.e. Expando or room additions, awnings, carports. According to the Park performed survey, excluding the Park owned mobile homes, there were 13 single-wide coaches, with or without additions, and 10 double-wide coaches.

Coach ages range from 22 years to 57 years corresponding with dates of manufacture from 1953 to 1988. **Table 3** identifies the age of Park coaches as reported by the Owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Mobile Home Ages within the Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior - 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958 - 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 - 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 - 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 - current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the age range of coaches in the Park is significant, it is often difficult, by exterior physical inspection, to make age distinctions because of the general level of upgrades and modifications observable throughout
the Park. These modifications range from simple family room cabanas added to older single-wide mobile homes to major interior design work in some of the double-wide mobile homes. The exteriors of most coaches reflect a mix of various improvements including porches, painting, brick work, roofs, walkways and landscaping.

6) Mortgage Data

There are no coaches in the Park with mortgage or any outstanding loans.
One of the specific requirements of the Los Angeles County Code is to address the availability of adequate replacement housing in mobile home parks. Following is information on the availability of replacement sites in mobile home parks within a 20-mile radius of the City of Arcadia. Additionally, other available replacement housing resources have been researched, including mobile homes for sale, rental housing in Arcadia and surrounding cities and affordable/subsidized housing resources.

A. METHODOLOGY

Survey work was conducted in February 2010 using the following means and resources:

- Telephone survey of individual parks and apartment complexes
- Use of existing, proprietary mobile home park and rental apartment data from an OPC database
- Telephone contact with real estate companies specializing in mobile home properties

B. SURVEY RESULTS

1) Mobile Home Park Space

There are over 100 mobile home parks located within a 20-mile radius from the Park which includes both family and senior parks. Our survey included mobile home parks within Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Orange County. A complete list of the parks with the number of available spaces and conditions which were reported on the type of mobile homes and residents accepted is presented in Exhibit E. Based on the survey of
mobile home parks within a 20 mile radius, 79 available spaces were identified.

To further analyze the mobile home parks that may potentially accept mobile homes from the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park, the reported restrictions/conditions were reviewed. The main restrictions or conditions that would disqualify the Park units were the need for a new mobile home to be placed in the space. Other restrictions/conditions were spaces only available for recreational vehicles, size restrictions or spaces for owner occupied use. If the mobile home park would accept a used mobile home, it was typically qualified that the mobile home would have to be approved by management.

Based on the reported specific restrictions or conditions of mobile home parks that accept used mobile homes, 59 spaces have been identified (see Exhibit F).

Pad rent for mobile home spaces that may accept mobile homes from the Park ranged from $268 - $1,030 with an average of $890.

2) Mobile Homes for Sale

A survey of for sale mobile homes currently on the market within Los Angeles County identified 127 mobile homes, with prices ranging from $8,000 to $139,000. The available mobile homes for sale that were surveyed can be found as Exhibit G.

3) Condominiums for Sale

While the Code requires a focus on the availability of replacement housing in mobile home parks, other alternative housing options were pursued. A survey of available condominium units in Arcadia and nearby communities was conducted. The lowest priced condominium available has an asking price of $149,000 for a two-bedroom, three bath unit and the prices go up to $798,000, depending on the location. The complete list of available condominium units is presented in Exhibit H.
4) Rental Housing

While the Code requires a focus on the availability of replacement housing in mobile home parks, other alternative housing options were pursued. In that regard, a replacement housing survey was conducted to determine the availability and cost of one-, two-, and three-bedroom rental housing units in and near Arcadia. Table 4 shows the availability of rental units, rent ranges of available units and median rent per bedroom size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedroom Size</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Found</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Range</td>
<td>$625-$1,475</td>
<td>$870-$2,500</td>
<td>$1,395-$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These potential replacement housing resources offer full amenities, with prices ranging from $625 to $1,475 for a one-bedroom unit; $870 to $2,500 for a two-bedroom unit and $1,395 to $3,800 for a three-bedroom unit. The survey identified 462 available units currently available on open market for rent either in Arcadia or within the surrounding communities.
IV. RELLOCATION COSTS

The CIR shall address relocation costs for each resident of the mobile home park. The assumption in the Code is that the mobile homes can be moved. Based on the information gathered in the resource study from the mobile home parks that would accept used mobile homes within an approximate 20 mile radius of the Park, there are 59 available spaces with various requirements, including size of the mobile home. Therefore, while there are enough reported available spaces within a 20 mile radius of the Park for the 23 mobile homes proposed to be displaced, it is not likely that any of the 23 would meet the specific configuration and other requirements for those available spaces.

Additionally, while space may be identified as available and accept a used mobile home, most mobile home park operator responses qualify the statement that the mobile home would have to be approved by management. Approval by mobile home park operator management is generally concerned with condition of the unit and if it meets California Health and Safety Code and certifications of California State Housing and Community Development (HCD). Furthermore, consideration has to be given to the condition of the mobile home to determine if the condition would even allow it to be transported.

The experience of OPC has shown a preference for a new or newer mobile home in order to upgrade the quality of the park or to only accept mobile homes that are in very good condition, meeting the requirements of the California Health and Safety Code and certifications of HCD. While age is not generally stated as a factor that would prohibit the mobile home from entering a mobile home park, older mobile homes of 15+ years of age generally do not get accepted. Based on age of the mobile homes in the Park, it is believed that none of the 23 mobile homes in the Park could be moved and accepted into another mobile home park.

Notwithstanding the above, the Code requires the CIR to address the cost of relocation for each resident. For those mobile homes that can be moved, a moving estimate will be conducted and provided to the owner. However, since
the majority of the mobile homes could not be moved, coming up with a “relocation cost” would be speculative and subjective. Therefore, in 1991 the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission created a Summary of Benefits that is implied to be part of the Los Angeles County Code and is recommended be used in determining the “reasonable costs of relocation”. Although the Code does not actually specify any such relocation benefits, it is the intention of the Owner and this CIR to accept the County’s recommended Summary of Benefits as a determination of the reasonable costs of relocation.

The Summary of Benefits is enclosed as Exhibit I, with an updated Summary of Benefits adjusted for inflation through January 2010, along with the accompanying All Urban Consumers Price Index for the Los Angeles, Riverside and Orange County area, showing the percentage increase since 1991.

The Summary of Benefits provides for a basic flat fee benefit along with potential supplemental benefits depending on the distance of the move of the mobile home; size of the mobile home; disability, income and or age of the resident; or if a qualifying resident instead moves to other conventional housing. Additionally, if residents have a mortgage, depending on the original purchase price of the mobile home and if it cannot be moved, an additional payment can be made based on the provisions in the Summary of Benefits.

Since a number of the relocation cost items in the Summary of Benefits are based on specific criteria and the survey information gathered was anecdotal and not supported by actual documentation, it would not be appropriate to identify the relocation costs based on the County’s Summary of Benefits for each resident in the CIR. Rather, it is proposed that within a month of approval of the CIR by the advisory agency, each resident will be provided with a calculated benefit from a Summary Benefit Worksheet (see Exhibit J) of the relocation benefits they would be eligible to receive assuming appropriate documentation is received to support the benefit category. Otherwise, if after a month of the approval of the CIR, no supporting documentation is provided, only those items that are known will be calculated and the Summary Benefit Worksheet provided.
In addition to addressing the availability of adequate replacement housing and relocation costs, as described in the previous Sections, the Owner must report on the impacts of the closure upon the displaced residents. From data gathered in the surveys, along with the information on the availability of replacement housing resources, certain impacts are noted:

1) Increase in Rental Costs

Current space rents, which have not been increased since 2008, range from $465 to $680 per month, with an average of $566. Replacement space rents range from $268 to $1,030 per month and indicate an average increase of $324. Current Park renters pay monthly between $550 and $1,000, with an average of $779. Conventional replacement rental rates for one-, two- and three-bedroom rental units range from $625 to $1,475 for one-bedroom units, $870 to $2,500 for two-bedroom units and from $1,395 to $3,800 for three-bedroom units and indicate average increases of $384, $734 and $1,354, respectively for mobile home owners and $171, $521 and $1,141, respectively for current Park renters. Based on #2 below, increase in housing costs and or pad rents will potentially have an adverse impact on most residents.

2) Low Income or Residents on Fixed Income

Of those reporting on income, 91% of the Park residents fall within or below the Low Income Category (4 - extremely low income, 17 - very low income and 10 - low income) (see Exhibit D for income limits). The fixed and low income of certain Park residents may adversely impact their ability to pay for first months rent and any security deposits, as well as pay for increased housing or qualify for a loan to purchase similar replacement housing.
3) **Elderly, Disability and or Health Issues**

The impact of the closure on residents who reported age, disability and health issues may limit their ability in getting to, finding and securing adequate replacement housing. Additionally, mobility or other health issues may require replacement housing with a preference for ground level accommodations or stair rails and ramps and replacement housing close to doctors, hospitals, other medical care and shopping.

4) **Inability to Move Mobile Home**

Coach ages range from 22 years to 57 years with 21 of the 23 being 30 years or greater. While coaches may be able to be physically “moved”, it is unlikely coaches of greater than 10 years old would be accepted into other mobile home parks. The impact of not being able to move a coach into another Park requires a resident to either purchase a replacement mobile home, which they may not qualify for or have insufficient funds for such a transaction, or rent other conventional housing, e.g. an apartment.

5) **Outstanding Mortgage Balances**

There are no outstanding mortgage balances.

6) **Disposition of Mobile Homes**

All residents who cannot move their mobile home to another mobile home park face the issue of disposition of their coach. The coordination and cost will be an adverse impact to these residents as a result of the proposed closure.
The CIR is to specify the steps to be taken by the Owner to mitigate actual adverse impacts of the proposed closure on the residents who will be displaced. However, in accordance with the Code and the State Mobile Home Residency Law, any mitigating benefits provided by the Owner shall not exceed the reasonable costs of relocation. Adverse impacts that were noted earlier were possible increases in rental costs, especially those residents that are low income or on a fixed income; elderly, disabled or health issues requiring assistance on specific replacement sites; an inability to move mobile homes to other mobile home parks; and disposition of the mobile home.

The identified adverse impacts have two main components that should be mitigated, 1) monetary assistance, and 2) advisory assistance needs. Therefore, the Owner is proposing a monetary benefit and an advisory services program which are estimated to provide reasonable costs of relocation. These mitigation measures are as follows:

A. MONETARY BENEFIT MEASURE

Residents can choose one of two options:

Option 1 - Actual Physical Move Costs

Any mobile home owner, who chooses and is able to move their mobile home, will be offered the following:

1. The reasonable cost of physically moving the mobile home and movable improvements such as patios, carports and porches, to a new site, which includes but is not limited to, dismantling, packing, moving, reassembling, rebuilding, including skirting and tie-downs, utility connections and unpacking, as necessary. Payment for the physical
transportation costs to another mobile home park shall not exceed 50 miles;

2. Payment of moving costs associated with moving all personal property based on 1) an actual move by a professional moving company not to exceed the lower of at least two written estimates to a new location up to 50 miles, or 2) a fixed moving schedule based on the number of rooms occupied (excluding hallways, bathrooms and closets) from the schedule shown in Table 5, below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Fixed Payment Moving Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupant Owns Furniture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupant Does NOT Own Furniture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Federal Highway Administration (8-22-08)

3. Payment of temporary lodging/per diem expenses for the household, if the mobile home relocation results in the homeowner being displaced over one or more nights, up to a maximum of $150 per day not to exceed 5 days.
Option 2 - County Guideline Summary of Benefits

As a second option all mobile home owners will be offered the County’s Summary of Benefits (see Exhibit I) as a determination for the reasonable costs of relocation. For those residents that cannot move their mobile home, the assumption will be made that it could be moved and the Owner will provide the eligible identified Summary of Benefits as if it was being moved within a 50 mile radius even though residents will have to purchase a replacement mobile home or move to other conventional housing.

One item that is not addressed in the County’s Summary of Benefits is the disposition of the mobile home and attached improvements that cannot be moved. While this would be the mobile home owners obligation to remove, the Owner, upon transfer of clear title to the Owner, will take responsibility for the demolition and removal of the mobile home. Otherwise, if the mobile home owner leaves the mobile home and improvements, the calculated Summary of Benefits will be offset by the cost of demolition and removal of the mobile home.

In summary, the monetary benefit measure will:

A. Provide all mobile home residents who can move their mobile home with their actual costs of relocation or provide a lump sum monetary amount with the appropriate Summary of Benefits calculation with an assumption their mobile home can be moved;

B. Pay for the demolition and removal of mobile homes that cannot be moved if they are transferred to the Owner with clear title.

B. ADVISORY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The process of having to move and find replacement housing and all that it entails is a difficult process even under the best of circumstances. Therefore, the Owner has proposed an advisory assistance program that will provide a relocation specialist to provide non-monetary assistance in the form of housing counseling to the residents, as needed.
To start, the relocation specialist will meet with each resident and verify information collected in the tenant survey supplied for the CIR. Appropriate documentation will be requested as needed and a Summary of Benefits Worksheet will be completed and delivered to each resident showing their monetary benefit calculation. From this point and in conjunction with the Owners notice to vacate, the resident can avail themselves to their Summary Benefit. This process and procedures for residents claiming their benefit is as follows:

1. Residents will provide all necessary documentation to substantiate eligibility for the monetary assistance;
2. Assistance amounts will be determined using a Summary of Benefits Worksheet and delivered to resident;
3. Resident will notify relocation specialist of intent to move and relocation specialist, in conjunction with resident, will complete and submit to Owner required claim forms to request eligible funds;
4. Owner will review and, if in conformance with previously approved Summary of Benefits worksheet, will approve and authorize payment, or request additional information;
5. The relocation specialist will issue benefit checks, which will be available at their offices for pick-up, delivered personally or mailed, depending on circumstances;
6. Final payments will be issued after confirmation that the Project area premises have been completely vacated;
7. Receipts of payment will be obtained and maintained in the relocation case file.

It is proposed that benefit payments be managed by the relocation specialist through a trust account funded by the Owner. Easy and understandable claim forms will be provided and payments based on the Summary of Benefits Worksheet. Adequate, advance payments will be made to assist residents in securing their replacement housing choice and final payments will be made after the resident has vacated the mobile home park with any deductions made, if any, for the removal of the mobile home if left in place without transfer of clear title to Owner.
Additionally, throughout the entire relocation process, the relocation specialist will be available to assist residents with their relocation assistance needs including the following:

1. Be available to provide continuous explanation of benefits so residents have a full understanding of the issues related to the closure of the mobile home park.
2. Provide residents with on-going reports of available replacement housing to preferred locations of the resident.
3. Provide assistance as needed and requested to lessen hardships by working with the resident and real estate agents, property managers, lenders in their efforts to secure replacement housing.
4. Facilitate interaction between resident and professional furniture movers and companies that will disassemble, transport and reinstall a mobile home, health care providers and others.
5. Assist residents in inspecting replacement housing if resident does not have a car or cannot drive by coordinating transportation so resident can inspect replacement housing opportunities.
6. Provide assistance in claiming eligible monetary benefits from Owner.
7. Other individual assistance that may be required on a case by case basis.

**Tenant Occupants**

There are 14 tenants who are renting Park owned mobile or manufactured homes. If no waiver of relocation benefits have been signed by a tenant occupant, the tenant will be offered the County’s Summary of Benefits (see **Exhibit I**) as a determination for the reasonable costs of relocation. This fee is $1,600.
VI. CONCLUSION

The Owner of the Santa Anita Village Mobile Park has proposed a 318 unit residential development that would require the closure of the Park. The Los Angeles County Code, Title 8, Chapter 8.57.300 and California Government Code Section 65863.7, require a report on the impact the closure will have upon the residents who will be displaced. The report shall address the availability of adequate replacement housing in mobile home parks and relocation costs. Furthermore, steps are to be taken to mitigate the adverse impacts the closure of the Park may have on the residents; however, the steps to be taken shall not exceed the reasonable costs of relocation.

A search of available mobile home replacement spaces and mobile homes for sale indicated ample available space that Park mobile homes could be moved as well as mobile homes for sale. Additionally, considerable rental housing could be found in the Cities surrounding the Park. Therefore, adequate replacement housing in a variety of housing choices is available for the Park residents.

Based on the information gathered for the Report, impacts to Park residents were identified and measures were identified that could mitigate the adverse impacts the closure would have on Park residents. The mitigation measures provided adopted the County’s benefit program to meet the requirements of "reasonable relocation costs". Furthermore, all options provide for a comprehensive relocation assistance program to assist residents with replacement housing resources, assisting with the securing of replacement housing by working with landlords and property managers, driving residents to replacement locations and coordinating advance and final payments of appropriate benefits.

It is believed that the CIR contains the information required by the Code and the State Mobile Home Residency Law, provides for adequate measures to mitigate impacts on the residents as a result of the proposed closure by accepting the County’s Summary of Benefits which address the reasonable costs of relocation and provides for an advisory assistance program to assist
residents in their efforts to secure replacement housing. Therefore, the advisory agency for the County should approve this CIR without further conditions.
Santa Anita Village
4241 E. Live Oak Avenue
Arcadia, CA 91006

March 1, 2004

All Residents and Prospective Residents
Santa Anita Village
4241 E. Live Oak Avenue
Arcadia, CA 91006

Re. Potential Closure of Santa Anita Village

Dear Resident and Prospective Resident:

This letter is to advise you that at some future date, possibly within the next three (3) years, the owner of Santa Anita Village may begin the process of closing the Park. In such event, the Park would be closed in accordance with the provisions of the Mobilehome Residency Law (Civil Code § 798 et seq.) and all other applicable law.

In the event the decision is made to close the Park, you will receive advance notice in accordance with the provisions of the Mobilehome Residency Law and will be required, upon expiration of the period specified in said notice, to move from the space you occupy and remove your mobilehome or trailer.

This letter is given to you as a courtesy so as to make you aware of the possibility of the Park’s closure. This letter is not intended as a notice of closure as required by the Mobilehome Residency Law. Please sign this letter in the space indicated to acknowledge that you have read, understood and received a copy of this letter.

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please contact on-site Management.

Very truly yours,

Park Management

I have read, understood and received a copy of the foregoing letter.

Dated: ____________________________

Space #_______
Santa Anita Village
4241 E. Live Oak Avenue
Arcadia, CA 91006
(626) 447-3878

Statement Regarding Potential Park Closure

I/We the undersigned, hereby acknowledge that we are applying to rent a mobilehome/trailer unit in Santa Anita Village; and we understand that our relationship with Santa Anita Village, if approved for tenancy, would be that of a "renter" only and not as a "homeowner" as defined by the California Mobilehome Residency Laws.

I/We the undersigned, further acknowledge that the owners of Santa Anita Village are planning the redevelopment of Santa Anita Village in the near future, possibly within two years from now. We further understand that when the redevelopment takes place, although we will be given at least sixty (60) days' notice to move from the property, we will not be provided with any assistance or consideration of any nature for the purposes of relocation at the time the park is closed or redeveloped.

Per the above declaration, I/we are willing to enter into a rental agreement with Santa Anita Village for the rental of a mobilehome/trailer unit if our application for tenancy is approved, with the full knowledge that the park will be closing in the near future and that we will not be participating in any relocation program established for the "mobilehome owners" of the park.

Dated: ___________________________

________________________________
Signature of Applicant

________________________________
Printed Full Name of Applicant

Dated: ___________________________

________________________________
Signature of Applicant

________________________________
Printed Full Name of Applicant

_______________________________
Park Management
## Santa Anita Village - Resident Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space #</th>
<th># Adults 62 &amp; Over</th>
<th>Occupants</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>MH YR Model</th>
<th>Single Wide</th>
<th>Double Wide</th>
<th>Enclosure</th>
<th>Move-In Date</th>
<th>Space Rent</th>
<th>Tenure at Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>20x56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-91</td>
<td>$501</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>8x44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-96</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>12x55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-01</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>8X40</td>
<td>10X16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-98</td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>20X53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-97</td>
<td>$639</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>12x56 slide out</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-98</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>20x55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-99</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>16x30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec-81</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>10x40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-96</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>18x40 slide out</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-94</td>
<td>$552</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8x37</td>
<td>pop out</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-82</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>8x32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-90</td>
<td>$471</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>10x37</td>
<td>10x10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-91</td>
<td>$568</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>12x48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-98</td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>10x28</td>
<td>add on</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-98</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10x40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May-98</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>10x40 slide out</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-98</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>20x44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-83</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>20x40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-99</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>20x43 expando</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-99</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>8x44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>20x45 expando</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-02</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>10x48 expando</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-90</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>$565</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-07</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-09</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
<td>$920</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- owned by resident, owner occupied
- owned by Park, renter occupied
- Park employee
The following figures are approved by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.U.D.) for use in the County of Los Angeles to define and determine housing eligibility by income level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Extremely Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>16,650</td>
<td>27,750</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>43,450</td>
<td>52,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person</td>
<td>19,050</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>50,750</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td>59,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>67,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>39,650</td>
<td>63,450</td>
<td>62,100</td>
<td>74,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Person</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>68,550</td>
<td>66,050</td>
<td>80,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Person</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>73,600</td>
<td>72,050</td>
<td>86,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Person</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>49,150</td>
<td>78,700</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>92,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Person</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>52,350</td>
<td>83,750</td>
<td>81,950</td>
<td>98,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are per the Department of Housing and Community Development (California), Division of Housing Policy Development, effective **April 2, 2009**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plantation Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Belle Fontaine Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anaheim Shores MH Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Sunset Mobile Homes Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Del Este Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anaheim Royal Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satellite Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anaheim Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Del Ray Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palm Lodge MH Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Village of Anaheim</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Skies MH Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goldie Skies MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rio Vista Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Huntington Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walnut Creek Mobile Lodge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday Dodge Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain Blue Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bell Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skylark Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Van's Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rancho Brea MH Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hollydale MH Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crestmont MH Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buena Park Manor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rancho Monte Vista</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lake Los Serranos MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pembroke Downs Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lampightler Chino Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ramona MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Rancho Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orange Grove Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile Aire Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tumbling Waters Mobile Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Royal Palms Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starlite Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrow Glen Manor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rancho San Jose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln Center MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orange Grove Trailer Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keeler’s Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869 Random Lane, Duarte, CA 91010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 582-8001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they don’t have any available spaces and no mobile homes for sale right now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brookside Mobile Country Club</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12700 E. Holt Ave, El Monte, CA (626) 448-6727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to set up appointment and fill out application, then they will give you space rent it varies. Need to submit the following info. To Anna Yazawre (909) 360-1646, used mobile homes new paint on outside, title paper, and pictures for approval, also need to show $5 for set up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capti Gardens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3541 Baldwin, El Monte, CA 91731 (626) 643-0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need to set up an appointment to look at the available homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Place MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 W. Orangethrowe, Fullerton, CA 92833 (714) 890-5447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space available for 12x40, 1 home for sale need little work for $29,000.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cedarhill Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051 Rolling Hills Dr, Fullerton, CA 92835 (714) 554-5951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to come into office to get info on sale homes would not give any info over the phone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonita Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925 Bonita Ave, Glendora, CA 91740 (626) 331-5405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need to drive around park to get info on for sale homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrowhead Mobile Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy, Glendora, CA 91740 (626) 863-2756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive around park to get info on for sale homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildwood Mobile Country Club</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6885 W. Hacienda Heights, Ca 91745 (626) 068-2398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda Heights, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$850-$865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to drive around park to see homes for sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rancho La Seda Mobile Home Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660 La Seda Rd, La Puente, CA 91744 (626) 584-2213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Puente, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One for Mid $70,000, 2 bd. For $35,000, 1 bd. For $10,000.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copacabana Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2717 Arrow Hwy, La Verne, CA 91750 (909) 393-2441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$450-$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to drive around park to get info on for sale homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingsway Gardens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2755 Arrow Hwy, La Verne, CA 91750 (626) 523-7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to drive around to get info. On home for sale, park owns a few homes that they can take out if new home is brought in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shady Lane Mobile Lodge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villa Montclair Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunset Trailer Grove</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hacienda Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monterey Manor MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montebello Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperial Village</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Del Cerro Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Crest Mobile Manor               | Pomona, CA    | 141 | 0   | 8   | $546   | 1 space for new home, need to get info. On who will be bringing the home in. |
| **Monterey Manor Mobile Home Park** | Pomona, CA    | 140 | 0   | 4   | $500-$560 | Need to drive around, for MH sales info. |
| **Pomona Islander Mobile Home Park** | Pomona, CA    | 229 | 3   | 10  | $600   | Need to drive around, for MH sales info. & Homes need to be inspected by property management. |
| **Thunderbird Trailer Park**     | Pomona, CA    | 61  | 0   | 1   | $450   | 1 home for sale double wide $39,000.00, space rent starts at $450.00. |
| **Foothill Mobile Park**         | Pomona, CA    | 73  | 0   | 2   | $650   | Need to get home info from owners. |
| **Montclair Mobile Home Park**   | Pomona, CA    | 45  | 0   | 2   | $550   | No vacant spaces. |
| **Hacienda Mobile Home Park**    | Pomona, CA    | 204 | 0   | 1   | $600   | No vacant spaces. |
| **Trade Winds Mobile Estates**   | Rosemead, CA  | 22  | 0   | 2   | $770   | 1 home for $70,000, 2nd for $28,000.00 |
| **Rowland Mobile Home Park**     | Rowland Heights, CA | 327 | Few | $585 | Need to drive around, for MH sales info. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fernwood MHP</th>
<th>Stanton, CA</th>
<th>165</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>$650</th>
<th>Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10550 Western Ave. Stanton, CA 90680</strong></td>
<td>Stanton, CA</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upland Cascade MHP</td>
<td>1350 San Bernardino Ave., Upland, CA 91786</td>
<td>Upland, CA</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(909)360-1646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to call Anna Yzaguirre @ (909) 360-1646 / Per the assistant the following information has to be submitted to Anna for approval to move used mobile home; will need copy of Title Papers, pictures of mobile home, and bank statements to show there $15,000.00-$20,000.00 to move mobile home. Once following information is received and reviewed by Anna. She will contact if mobile home is approved to be moved into desired mobile home park; if not she can provide referrals to other mobile home parks. Mailing Address to submit required info: CMS 6800 Hammer Ave., Mira Loma, CA 91762.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar Mobile Estates</td>
<td>21217 E. Washington Ave., Walnut, CA 91789</td>
<td>Walnut, CA</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(909)894-0911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No spaces available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek Mobile Estates</td>
<td>20739 Lycoming St., Walnut, CA 91780</td>
<td>Walnut, CA</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(909)965-2753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Hills Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>3745 Valley Blvd., Walnut, CA 91780</td>
<td>Walnut, CA</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(909)564-0113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Mobile Estates</td>
<td>2131 W. San Bernardino Rd., West Covina, CA 91790</td>
<td>West Covina, CA</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(626)962-4707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space available, need to drive by to see homes for sale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Family Park
- Senior Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Baths</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Move-in Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Le Bella Fontaine Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>200 N. Cedars Ave, Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Western Glen MH Estates</td>
<td>2770 W. Lincoln Ave, Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rancho Monte Vista</td>
<td>15000 Monte Vista Ave, Chino Hills, CA</td>
<td>Chino Hills, CA</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$700-800</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orange Grove Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>19549 E. Cypress St, Covina, CA</td>
<td>Covina, CA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Royal Palms Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>5423 W. Arrow Hwy, Covina, CA</td>
<td>Covina, CA</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brookside Mobile Country Club</td>
<td>12700 Eucal. St, El Monte, CA</td>
<td>El Monte, CA</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Country Place MHP</td>
<td>1850 W. Gurneeho Farm, Ca 92633</td>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$775</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shady Lane Mobile Lodge</td>
<td>4155 Mission Blvd, Montclair, Ca 91763</td>
<td>Montclair, CA</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$250-350</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pomona Islander Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>3067 W. Valley Blvd, Pomona, CA 91765</td>
<td>Pomona, CA</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Upland Cascade MHP</td>
<td>1350 E. Britton Ave, Upland, CA 91786</td>
<td>Upland, CA</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 15
## Mobile Homes for Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 84</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 26</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12700 Elliott 273</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$14,944</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1380 N Citrus G16</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$16,990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1020 Bradbourne 51</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 3</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 89</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega Blvd 150</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>630 South Maple Avenue 19</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>$22,900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 221</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 165</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1020 Bradbourne 85</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 18</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 152</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 163</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1020 S Mountain Ave 23</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 142</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Avenue 95</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega Ave 188</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 84</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3620 Moreno Ave 3</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>630 South Maple Avenue 13</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3530 Damien 248</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12700 Elliott 367</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>801 W Covina Blvd 130</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1765 N Puente 15</td>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10484 Valley Blvd 4</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$34,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2717 Arrow Hwy 67</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>840 E Foothill Blvd 60</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Highway 83</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>716 North Grand Avenue E8</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 73</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2717 Arrow Hwy 2</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1630 South Barranca 24</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>716 N Grand Ave G-1</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$39,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3745 Valley Blvd 139</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$39,990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca 40</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3530 Damien 90</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega 79</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>208 S Barranca Ave 59</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 304</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1035 E Huntington Dr 54</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 217</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>346 N. Sunset Ave 168</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 230</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4800 North Daleview Ave 68</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3107 San Gabriel Blvd 21</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>$45,888</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>19850 E Arrow Hwy E12</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mobile Homes for Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 158</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 67</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2131 W San Bernardino Rd 37</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>17350 Temple Ave 475</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>17350 Temple Ave 139</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 251</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>208 S Barranca Ave 56</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$40,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 64</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 89</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 485</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 119</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 181</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 143</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1635 W Covina Blvd 83</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$53,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>208 S Barranca Ave 44</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$54,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>4096 Fruit St 159</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$54,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 107</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>21310 E Covina Blvd 50</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 60</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2755 Arrow Hwy 111</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$57,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>17350 Temple Ave 365</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3033 Valley Blvd 84</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 48</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1630 W Covina Blvd 23</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>21010 E Arrow Hwy 4</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>17350 East Temple Ave 486</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>17350 East Temple Ave 43</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>830 South Azusa Avenue 11</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>925 W Bonita 41</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$59,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>21217 E Washington St 97</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$59,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>650 La Seda Rd 3b</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1630 W Covina Blvd 26</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4096 Fruit St 114</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>20739 Lycoming St 47</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 74</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4849 Peck Rd 73</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>19850 E Arrow Hwy F2</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3945 Bradford St 21</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>4095 Fruit 930</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 77</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1630 W Covina Blvd 95</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 48</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 35</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa 58</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 312</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>201 W Arrow Hwy 65</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1205 W Cypress Ave 238</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$66,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 239</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mobile Homes for Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 155</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega 223</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$74,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 40</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3033 Valley Blvd 74</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 151</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1205 Cypress St 94</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>3530 Damien 290</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1205 W Cypress 17</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 98</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 171</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1360 N Citrus Ave C3</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>21217 Washington Ave 36</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1550 S La Seda Rd 10</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>3530 Damien Ave 288</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 453</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>3800 Bradford St 302</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$88,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1735 Puente Ave 15</td>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 8</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 108</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>3745 Valley Blvd 178</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 51</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>3800 Bradford St 22</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$99,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>3033 Valley Blvd 123</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$99,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1245 West Cienega Ave 140</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1635 W Covina Blvd 34</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 30</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 279</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>21210 East Arrow Hwy 84</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega Ave 120</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>3800 Bradford St 42</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>17350 East Temple Ave 400</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$139,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1025 West Huntington Drive E</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>812 Cinnamon Ln 30</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2660 Lake Ave 2</td>
<td>Altadena</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>343 West Central Avenue A</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$209,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>845 Cinnamon Ln</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1504 Mountain Avenue 201</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>351 S Alhambra St 6</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1630 Huntington Drive 14</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>999 E Valley blvd</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5536 Westland AV 9</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$259,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2680 Lake Ave 7</td>
<td>Altadena</td>
<td>$269,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>874 Cinnamon Ln 62</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$276,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>210 N Atlantic Blvd C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6532 N Glady's Ave D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$298,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>790 W Main St 218</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$299,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2422 Birch St C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$309,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>752 West Foothill Boulevard</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$316,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>330 North Chapel Avenue 215</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$316,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>521 W Duarte Dr C</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1122 W Huntington Dr 5</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$319,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>112 N Atlantic Blvd A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$328,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1330 S Mayflower Ave L</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1621 S 3rd St E</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>333 W Duarte Rd B</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>626 S 6th St 7</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>117 W Marshall St D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>560 W Main St 316</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>845 E Foothill Blvd J</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$339,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>551 Limon Ave E</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$339,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>604 Swiss Ave</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>210 E Walnut Ave A</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>108 N 4th St 309</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>749 W Camino Real Ave A</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1124 West Huntington Drive 2</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1020 S Marengo Ave 3</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$355,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1128 W Duarte Rd Q</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$356,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>777 E Valley Blvd 129</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$358,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>530 Fairview Ave 12</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$358,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>21 Palmetto Dr E</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200 N 5th St 108</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>582 W Huntington Dr L</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$369,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1522 S Baldwin Ave 14</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>129 S Marguerita Ave 6</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>88 E Bay State St 3b</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$379,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>812 S Stoneman Ave F</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$379,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>585 W Duarte Rd 30</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$379,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>106 N Chapel Ave 14</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$383,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>138 Alta St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$389,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1522 S Baldwin Ave 17</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>131 S Atlantic Blvd C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>801 W Mission Rd A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$393,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>511 E Live Oak Ave 13</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1128 Duarte Road J</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>535 W Duarte Rd 1</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>930 Oceanview Ave B</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2411 S Baldwin Ave D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>218 N Mariposa Ave B</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>100 N Electric Ave 14</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>400 S Garfield Ave 1</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>446 W Duarte Rd 1</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>712 S Sierra Vista Ave A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>25 N 4th St D</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1231 S Golden West Ave 30</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>736 Southview Rd 2</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>211 E Commonwealth Ave</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$426,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>215 E Commonwealth Ave D</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$428,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>8605 Longdon Ave</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$438,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>431 E Mission Rd 51</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$438,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>819 S Canyon Blvd E</td>
<td>Morenovia</td>
<td>$438,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>76 E Bay State St 1B</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1390 Stevens Ave C</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1390 Stevens Ave G</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1708 S 8th St 6</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$448,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1102 Fairview Ave D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>903 W Mission Rd B</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>88 E Bay State St 1d</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$449,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>5239 Village Circle</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$454,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>228 S Olive Ave A219</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$458,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>5235 Rosemead Blvd C</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$465,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1140 E Arcadia Ave 006E</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$467,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>653 Fairview Ave 4</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1102 La Cadena Ave 5</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>9407 Duarte Rd 1/2</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>309 S Arroyo Dr D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$473,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1136 Arcadia Ave F</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$478,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>121 S Walnut Grove</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>5241 Rosemead Blvd B</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$485,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>205 N Palm Ave A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$496,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1620 8th St 19</td>
<td>Morenovia</td>
<td>$496,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>45 Alice St H</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$498,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>9012 E Fairview Ave D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>505 E Live Oak St F</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1604 South Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>928 Arcadia Ave 107</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$528,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>9012 E Fairview Ave A</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$529,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>245 S Pine St F</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$529,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>6039 Primrose Ave</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$538,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>89 E Commonwealth Ave 1M</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>503 W Duarte Rd 3</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$548,688</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>447 Fairview Ave 3</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$549,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1950 Nov Ave B</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$555,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>88 E Bay State St 1C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>816 Fairview Avenue F</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$576,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>160 Diamond St D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$585,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>247 S Arroyo Dr 4</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$586,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>4825 Arden</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>4827 Arden</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>4829 Arden</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>126 Fair St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$608,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>32 Diamond St D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$668,686</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>101 Esperanza Ave B</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1115 Arcadia Ave B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>166 California St D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$599,800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1014 Fairview Ave 7</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$618,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>5228 McCulloch Ave B</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>5228 McCulloch Ave C</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>5228 McCulloch Ave D</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>5228 McCulloch Ave E</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>5228 McCulloch Ave A</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>5312 McCulloch Ave</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$639,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1008 Arcadia Ave D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$659,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>8169 Temple City Blvd</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$668,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>140 Genoa St</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$696,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>152 El Dorado St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Condominiums for Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>331 Diamond St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>156 El Dorado St A</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$709,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>19 Genoa St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$738,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>57 Alice St G</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$738,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>49 E Colorado Blvd S</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>527 S 3rd Ave C</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$798,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Los Angeles County Code Title 8, Chapter 8.57.300
Mobilehome Impact Report - Summary of Relocation Benefits
CPI Increase by 59.7% as of December 2009 from January 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Potential Supplemental Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Flat Fee</td>
<td>$9,580 + $3,195 Doublewide unit move within 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,580 + $6,390 Triplewide unit move within 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,580 + $3,995 Move over 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,580 + $800 Disabled Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,580 + $960 Qualified Resident*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,580 + $2,875 Qualified Resident* Move to Conv. Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception A</td>
<td>$3,355 + $1,120 Move 20 to 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unit under 320 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>$3,355 + $2,395 Move over 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,355 + $800 Disabled Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,355 + $640 Qualified Resident*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,355 + $5,270 Move to Conv. Housing if unit cannot move</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception B</td>
<td>Up to $25,555</td>
<td>Includes up to $15,970 for outstanding mortgage, plus basic benefit, plus any qualifying Supplemental Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Original purchase price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$43,120 to $95,820 with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outstanding mortgage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception C</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Includes any qualifying Supplemental Benefits and the greater of 1) $11,980 plus Basic Benefit plus up to $15,970 for outstanding mortgage, or 2) 60% of the difference between on-site and off-site value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Original purchase price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$95,820 with outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mortgage and cannot move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within 50 miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>Recreational Vehicle (Motorhome, Camper, Fifth Wheel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,075</td>
<td>Minimum payment if Benefits waived for a Mobilehome Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Minimum payment if Benefits waived for Tenant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Qualified Resident may waive Option to Elect Move to Conventional Housing
- The increase from 1991 was calculated based on the US Department of Labor-Bureau of Labor Statistics Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers – All Items, Jan 1991 = 140.0, Dec 2009 = 223.643, CPI increase = 59.7%

*Qualified Resident
(a) Very Low Income; or
(b) Low Income Senior Citizen (62); or
(c) Low Income and Disabled per Federal Regulations
### SUMMARY BENEFIT WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic &amp; Supplemental Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Flat Fee</td>
<td>$9,580.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublewide move within 50 miles</td>
<td>$3,195.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplewide move within 50 miles</td>
<td>$6,390.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move over 50 miles</td>
<td>$3,995.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Resident</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Resident*</td>
<td>$960.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Resident* Move to Conv. Housing</td>
<td>$2,875.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exception A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Unit &lt;320 s.f.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 20 to 50 Miles</td>
<td>$3,356.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move over 50 miles</td>
<td>$1,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Resident</td>
<td>$2,395.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Resident*</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to Conv. Housing if unit cannot move</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to Conv. Housing if unit cannot move</td>
<td>$5,270.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exception B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Original purchase price $43,120 to $95,820 with outstanding mortgage and cannot move within 50 miles)</em></td>
<td>See Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exception C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Original purchase price over $95,820 with outstanding mortgage and cannot move within 50 miles)</em></td>
<td>See Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Vehicle</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits waived if mobile home owner</td>
<td>$2,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits waived if tenant</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Summary Benefit</strong></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

*Qualified Resident
(a) Very Low Income; or
(b) Low Income Senior Citizen (62); or
(c) Low Income and Disabled per Federal Regs.*

**Agreed:**

**Approved:**
Mr. Jodie Sackett  
Land Division Section  
Los Angeles County  
Department of Regional Planning  
320 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Sackett:

Tract No. 068400

This is in reply to your notice, which was received by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) on September 17, 2010. The proposed development is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of District No. 15. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

1. The wastewater flow originating from the proposed project will discharge to a local sewer line, which is not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to the Districts' Joint Outfall B Unit 8F Trunk Sewer, located in Live Oak Avenue between Mayflower and 10th Avenues. This 24 to 27-inch diameter trunk sewer has a design capacity of 7.2 to 8.5 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 2.6 mgd when last measured in 2008.

2. The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) located adjacent to the City of Industry, which has a design capacity of 100 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 75.8 mgd, or the Whittier Narrows WRP located near the City of South El Monte, which has a design capacity of 15 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 4.7 mgd.

3. The expected increase in average wastewater flow from the project site is 26,442 gallons per day. For a copy of the Districts' average wastewater generation factors, go to www.lacsd.org, Information Center, Will Serve Program, Obtain Will Serve Letter, and click on the appropriate link on page 2.

4. The Districts are authorized by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee for the privilege of connecting (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System or increasing the strength or quantity of wastewater attributable to a particular parcel or operation already connected. This connection fee is a capital facilities fee that is imposed in an amount sufficient to construct an incremental expansion of the Sewerage System to accommodate the proposed project. Payment of a connection fee will be required before a permit to connect to the sewer is issued. For a copy of the Connection Fee Information Sheet, go to www.lacsd.org, Information.
Center, Will Serve Program, Obtain Will Serve Letter, and click on the appropriate link on page 2. For more specific information regarding the connection fee application procedure and fees, please contact the Connection Fee Counter at extension 2727.

5. In order for the Districts to conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the design capacities of the Districts’ wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Specific policies included in the development of the SCAG regional growth forecast are incorporated into clean air plans, which are prepared by the South Coast and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Districts in order to improve air quality in the South Coast and Mojave Desert Air Basins as mandated by the CAA. All expansions of Districts’ facilities must be sized and service phased in a manner that will be consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. The available capacity of the Districts’ treatment facilities will, therefore, be limited to levels associated with the approved growth identified by SCAG. As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise you that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform you of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts’ facilities.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

Stephen R. Maguin

[Signature]
Adriana Raza
Customer Service Specialist
Facilities Planning Department

AR:ar
February 23, 2009

Jodie Sackett, Planner
Susie Tae, Section Supervisor
County Regional Planning – Subdivision Section
320 Temple Ave., 13th Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 4241 Live Oak Ave. – Proposed Residential Development – Santa Anita Village (“SAV”)
Summary of Comments and Responses – Neighborhood Meetings

Dear Susie and Jodie:

In advance of any public hearings for SAV – a proposed market rate condominium and townhouse project - the applicant and its representatives solicited and addressed comments and questions from mass mailings, and at four public meetings.

The attachment presents the comments by residents, responses and changes to the plans. Please note that many comments were repeated over time, so once the comment and response are stated, we do not repeat them again. A minimum of the following information was presented at each of the four meetings:

- **Project Fact Sheet**: The Fact Sheet used at the first meeting on 3/13/08, has a unit count of 334; by the last meeting on 10/21/08, the unit count was 318.

- **Project Plans**: The architect designed the open space, landscaping and homes at a scale and density that enhances and blends with the community.

- **Density and Height**: The unit count has been reduced by 16 units since the first filing to the County. The importance of this reduction lies in the fact that the units that were eliminated and downgraded in height were closest to the existing single family homes to the north and west. Building heights of the taller units – would be isolated away from the north and west in the centrally-located podium building.

- **Concern Regarding Entitlement Precedent Setting Implications**: A significant effort has been made to minimize neighbor’s fears that the County will be forced to approve any and all projects in the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte area if SAV is approved. The applicant’s representatives have discussed this matter openly and have explained that a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change from to R-3 will not set precedent and will not erode the County’s ability and mandate for case-by-case review of future projects.

SAV has undergone considerable redesign since it was first conceptually designed five years ago as a 900 unit all senior project. On behalf of the applicant, we look forward to finalizing the Subdivision Committee process and moving towards the first public hearing for this infill residential project.

Sincerely,

Gerry Hernandez, Planner

cc: Prime Enterprises, LLC

David E. Moss, President
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

1. 3/13/08 Mailing Requesting Neighborhood Input prior to meeting (many of the comments addressed by telephone after this mailing were again addressed at the public meetings).

   a) Comment: "I always assumed that something would be built on this property and likely be two-stories".

      Response: Perimeter buildings adjacent to residences facing Birchcroft St. and 10th St. may have to be reconfigured to be one-story set back 15 ft., two-story set back 21 ft. (minimum), and three-story set back 37 ft. (minimum) based on neighbor concerns here today.

      Change to Plan: Revised so that only a seven-unit building with a tiered roof line will face Birchcroft St. and 10th St.

   b) Comment: "The neighborhood would prefer an internal private driveway contiguous to the rear property line of homes fronting Birchcroft St. to the north".

      Response: An internal driveway would promote loitering, increase the need for more security lighting and creates glare, and add a 'street-like' use instead of a passive buffer area. These additional impacts cannot be avoided if the driveway is placed between the existing homes and the proposed units.

      Change to Plan: No change made.

   c) Comment: "I am concerned by the 15 ft. setback between perimeter property line and three-story building".

      Response: The architect will analyze mitigation of loss of privacy from 16 buildings facing Birchcroft St. and 10th St.

      Change to Plan: Altered so that only 1-story sections will exist within 15 ft. of the property line with even larger setbacks for the 2nd and 3rd story sections.

   d) Comment: "Can an additional entrance into SAV be provided".

      Response: County Departments -- Roads, Traffic and Lighting do not support entry from Live Oak Ave., and do not encourage pedestrian or vehicle entry/exit onto 10th St.

      Change to Plan: No change due to lack of County support.

   e) Comment: "Commercial along Live Oak Ave, is underperforming as a commercial draw for residents".

      Response: "Future SAV residents may support more local serving businesses. At DRP's request, Prime considered and then determined that a mixed-use commercial-residential building fronting Live Oak Ave. and Mayflower Ave. is neither viable nor beneficial to the neighborhood".

      Change to Plan: No change due to lack of current support for enhancing the Commercial corridor.

   f) Comment: "SAV's density is too high and needs to be reduced; the preferred project is one and two-story single family residential".

      Response: There is a need for infill multi-family housing in this area of the 5th District. The current density is approved for 232 mobile homes. The site can support significantly increased density if coupled with ample open space and recreational amenities far beyond what is available on-site today as long as privacy and traffic issues are mitigated to the satisfaction of the neighborhood.
Change to Plan: Reduce unit count from 334 to 318.

Comment: “Residents do not want development or design similar to Peck Rd., between Live Oak Ave. and Longden, and Longden Ave. at Peck Rd”.

Response: Approvals will be reviewed and site visits for both projects will be undertaken.

Change to Plan: A 15 ft. setback minimum to any window or door facing Birchcroft St. and 10th St.; all buildings backing onto homes fronting Birchcroft St. and 10th St., will be one-two-three story tiers.

Comment: “Residents oppose affordable and senior housing; affordable housing will reduce resale, and senior housing concentrates emergency vehicle trips to one location via local streets”.

Response: SAV proposes market rate housing only but there is DRP staff support and pressure for both age-restricted and affordable housing.

Change to Plan: No change.

Comment: “What is the County’s review process for SAV entitlement?”

Response: The process was explained in detail. Residents were advised that the proposed density would be clearly stated in the hearing notice.

Change to Plan: None needed.

Comment: “What are the SAV case numbers?”

Response: Case number provided.

Change to Plan: None needed.

Comment: “Prime appears to be acting in good faith”.

Response: Confirmed.

Change to Plan: No change.

Comment: “Ashmont and Mayflower Aves. are shortcuts by neighbors to the 210 Fwy via Longden St. and Myrtle Ave. Ashmont Ave is used by children as a play area”. 10th St., Birchcroft St., and Mayflower Ave. are used as shortcuts for neighborhood residents”. Longden Ave. is used by local residents to drive to the 210 Fwy via Peck Ave”.

Response: The applicant will support and lobby DPW to implement measures to reduce cut-through traffic.

Change to Plan: No change.

Comment: “The County needs to install traffic calming improvements – speed humps, along Ashmont Ave; but stated that traffic volumes do not justify installation of speed humps”.

Response: The applicant will support and lobby DPW to implement measures to mitigate.

Change to Plan: No change.

Comment: “The Mayflower Ave. driveway design should not permit SAV homeowners to drive through Ashmont Ave to access the 210 Fwy”.

Response: Design changes will be considered.
Change to Plan: Implement Mayflower Ave. median or other barrier to restrict exiting vehicles to a right-turn only movement south on Mayflower Ave., toward Live Oak Ave.

o) Comment: “I am concerned that eliminating access to alley (north of Live Oak Ave), and to Lovejoy St., increases traffic flow onto Mayflower Ave. and Live Oak Ave”.

Response: The 221 unit mobile home park historically has six entry/exit driveways fronting Mayflower Ave., which do not restrict right or left turn movements and SAV proposes one driveway onto Mayflower Ave. DPW requires (i) the main entry be on Mayflower Ave., (ii) limiting Live Oak Ave (Major Highway), to “exit only”, and (iii) continuing to restrict pedestrian and vehicle exiting from SAV to 10th St.

Change to Plan: None due to opposition from DPW.

p) Comment: The mobile home park is underutilized, and SAV would be good for the neighborhood.

Response: We appreciate your comment.

Change to Plan: No change.

q) Comment: We need the applicant to meet separately with Ashmont Ave residents.

Response: That is an excellent suggestion and will occur prior to a public hearing.

Change to Plan: No change.

r) Comment: The three story building – set back 15 ft from the rear yards of homes fronting onto Birchcroft St., impact residents privacy and is not acceptable.

Response: The architect will rework the perimeter units to maintain reasonable privacy – don’t forget that by right – a single family home could be built up to 35 ft tall and within the same distance from the rear yards of existing homes.

Change to Plan: No change.

s) Comment: Can a residential design similar to the existing development at Peck Rd. and Live Oak Ave was considered.

Response: There is a need for infill multi-family housing in this area of the 5th District. The current density is approved for 232 mobile homes. The site can support significantly increased density if coupled with ample open space and recreational amenities far beyond what is available on-site today as long as privacy and traffic issues are mitigated to the satisfaction of the neighborhood.

Change to Plan: No change.

t) Comment: I am not aware of another 3-story building along Live Oak Ave. but I do support 3-story adjacent Live Oak Ave. a 4-story along Live Oak is pushing the envelope of acceptability. Some other residents believe three stories is to tall.

Response: The goal is to provide reasonably dense infill market rate housing and localize the taller buildings away from the existing single family homes.

Change to Plan: No change.

u) Comment: Landscaping by itself will not mitigate privacy impacts.

Response: The architect will come out to the field and house by house, look at the potential and landscape needed on a lot by lot basis to accomplish the goal of enhancing privacy with landscaping combined with the elimination of 16 perimeter units.

Change to Plan: No change.
v) **Comment:** Some residents are discussing impacts directly with the 5th District and others are choosing to first speak with Prime at its neighborhood meeting.

**Response:** All responses that we provide will be provided to the 5th District.

**Change to Plan:** No change.

w) **Comment:** Residents view their home as their retirement account, and would want a project that does not hurt local resale. Some residents believe that those homes closest to SAV would not share in the economic "bump" that SAV will generate for the area.

**Response:** The elimination of the MHP, the elimination of 16 perimeter units, and the increased setbacks to perimeter structures will help considerably in this regard.

**Change to Plan:** No change.

x) **Comment:** We want only single story height for buildings fronting onto the rear yard of homes fronting onto Birchcroft St.

**Response:** The architect will rework the design so that only one-story height is within 15 ft of the rear yards.

**Change to Plan:** No change.

y) **Comment:** I advised my neighbors that putting up roadblocks to redevelopment of the mobile home park improves Prime’s potential to obtain its entitlements.

**Response:** We don’t have an opinion on that comment. Ultimately, the Planning Commission will make the decision if the request is reasonable and compatible with the neighborhood.

**Change to Plan:** No change.

z) **Comment:** Two stories – for buildings fronting the rear yards of homes fronting Birchcroft Ave., could be acceptable if privacy issues are resolved.

**Response:** We believe we may seek only 1-story height within 15 ft of the rear yards – which is a concession that even single family would not offer.

**Change to Plan:** No change.

aa) **Comment:** Resident wants Prime to building masonry wall tall enough to screen three-story building.

**Response:** Planning codes prevent this and we think that landscaping and greater setbacks are a better option.

**Change to Plan:** No change.

bb) **Comment:** Longden Ave is a heavily traveled road serving families wanting to connect to the 210 Fwy. And kids play in Birchcroft St. – there are no sidewalks along Birchcroft St.

**Response:** The applicant will work closely with residents and County staff to devise ingress/egress conditions of approval that minimize increased danger to the patterns of use of the public streets.

**Change to Plan:** No change.

cc) **Comment:** The developer should support us in our goal to ease existing traffic problems impacting Birchcroft St. and Ashmont Ave. For example, lack of a stop sign at Birchcroft St. and Mayflower Ave. makes Birchcroft St. a better “short-cut” for local neighbors to drive.
Response: The developer will cooperate fully.
Change to Plan: No change.

dd) Comment: What about stalkers residing in the three-story building along the rear yards of SFR.
Response: It is difficult to respond – we don’t believe that a new market rate condominium attracts any particular type of person.
Change to Plan: No change.

e) Comment: I prefer one-story home with no windows to front onto the rear yards of homes fronting onto Birchoft St.
Response: The architect will redesign the frontages accordingly.
Change to Plan: No change.

ff) Comment: Residents within 1,000 ft of SAV should receive public notice about redevelopment of the mobile home park.
Response: This comment should be made directly to DRP staff.
Change to Plan: No change.

gg) Comment: A local primary school was impacted by a recently constructed SFR development. Local residents impacted by design of SFR.
Response: The developer must pay applicable school fees set by state law and adopted at the county level.
Change to Plan: No change.

hh) Comment: Residents do not want SAV to become a senior nor affordable housing project. Senior only will increase emergency vehicle activity. Residents want family housing.
Response: There is interest among DRP staff for either senior and/or affordable housing to entitle the proposed density.
Change to Plan: No change.

ii) Comment: During construction, we are worried about adequate rodent prevention controls.
Response: Controls will be considered and put in place prior to any demolition or coach removal.
Change to Plan: No change.

jj) Comment: A neighborhood meeting should be held locally near Longden Ave, at Peck Rd.
Response: We have done our best to identify a central and close location to the project.
Change to Plan: No change.

2. MAD Meeting - 4/15/08

a) Comment: ON behalf of the MAD Council, we agree to accept Prime’s transmittal, Fact Sheet, and renderings, and to allow residents to respond directly to Prime at future meetings.
Response: Thank you.

Change to Plan: No change.

b) Comment: What will the townhouses and condominiums sell for?
Response: Uncertain in this changing market – but the goal has been to offer area residents an opportunity to stay in the neighborhood, and unlock equity in their single family homes.
Change to Plan: No change.

c) Comment: When will the mobile home park be closed?
Response: It is difficult to state a timeline given that no public hearings have been held and the market is relatively uncertain at this time for new housing.
Change to Plan: No change.

d) Comment: What are the traffic impacts?
Response: The study prepared by a 3rd-party engineer shows no intersection impacts, but several design standards will be required - along with the intent of the neighborhood to restrict left turn movements exiting from the main Mayflower driveway.
Change to Plan: No change.

3. 10th St./Birchcroft St. Meeting – 5/7/08

a) Comment: We prefer that the mobile home park stay – we like that they are one story.
Response: Santa Anita Village 221-unit mobile home park is over 30 years old and is at its economic, and development design age. Prime is proposing an infill project with taller building and density towards Live Oak Ave. – a 120 ft. wide major highway
Change to Plan: None.

b) Comment: I support the redevelopment of mobile home park – it is an eyesore.
Response: We are trying to build a project that all neighbors can be proud of.
Change to Plan: None.

c) Comment: The density of 334 units is too high.
Response: We are rethinking the density and will provide the neighbors with a reduced density plan.
Change to Plan: To be provided.

d) Comment: The three story townhouse units backing onto home fronting Birchcroft St. and 10th St. and four story condominium are too tall. The three story townhouses show windows facing the rear yards of SFR units, and impact SFR rear yard privacy. Townhouses of single and two story heights with no windows/doors facing a SFR rear yard are preferred.
Response: There have been enough comments so that the architect is re-working those aspects.
Change to Plan: None at this time.

e) Comment: Is SAV entirely fenced off from the neighborhood? Can the neighborhood use the community center and recreational facilities.
Response: The front door of each townhouse unit fronting onto Mayflower Ave. opens onto Mayflower Ave to mimic how existing SFRs promote pedestrian access to Mayflower Ave. SAV is fenced and gated except for homes fronting Mayflower Ave. There will be pedestrian gates at the Live Oak Ave. and Mayflower Ave. driveway entries. Amenities will be restricted to SAV homeowners. There will be a HOA, which will adopt rules and regulations governing use of common amenities.

Change to Plan: None.

f) Comment: A perimeter wall greater than 8 ft. tall is preferred. Landscaping -- trees, along the perimeter will not visually buffer the townhouses. Construction of the perimeter wall should not impact privacy.

Response: County code limits the wall height to 8 ft. Specimen trees are proposed within the 15 ft. landscape yard separating the townhouse from the rear property line of SFRs. Prime will work with the neighbors at the time of construction to reduce any impacts.

Changes to Plan: None.

g) Comment: The main access should not align with Ashmont Ave., and should be moved to Live Oak Ave. There should be more entry and exit points into SAV, which should not increase traffic on local streets. Drive-through traffic from surrounding neighborhoods, are using Birchcroft St., 10th St., and Ashcroft Ave. as a shortcut to the freeway. Install new traffic restrictions along Birchcroft St., Mayflower Ave., and Ashmont Ave. -- stop signs, medians, and cul-de-sacs. The signal at Live Oak Ave. and Mayflower Ave is an impediment for traffic exiting the neighborhood.

Response: Traffic and Lighting directed Prime to: 1) locate its main entry on Mayflower Ave., 2) align its main entry with Ashmont Ave., restrict the Live Oak Ave. driveway for exit only purposes, 3) eliminate access onto 10th St. via the alley north of Live Oak Ave., and onto Lovejoy St. The traffic analysis shows no increase of local and regional traffic above the capacity of Live Oak -- designated a Major Highway, and Mayflower Ave. -- designated a Secondary Highway (80 ft. right-of-way). Adding more entries increases the number of travel routes through the neighborhood to SAV. Signals along Live Oak Ave. are synchronized to expedite traffic along Live Oak Ave -- making local streets less effective travel routes. Mayflower is a Secondary Highway designed to carry more traffic than 10th St., Ashmont Ave, and Birchcroft, which are all local collector streets.

Change to Plan: None at this time -- Prime will meet with Traffic and Lighting to discuss community input.

h) Comment: Is on-street parking proposed?

Response: No. SAV's parking exceeds County-parking requirements. Parking on either side of the main entry -- located within Prime's property, is proposed.

Change to Plan: None at this time.

i) Comments: Why didn't residents along Ashmont Ave receive a letter about the neighborhood meeting. Ashmont residents want to meet to discuss traffic impacts on Ashmont Ave.

Response: Our first step is to address design issues which who affect neighbors who back onto SAV. Future meetings -- with MAD, are to address bigger picture issues, as well as design issues. We agreed to meet Ashmont Ave residents at its regularly scheduled Friday night meeting.
Change to Plan: None at this time.

j) Comments: For some of us, SAV is preferred over that of the existing mobile home park, and will increase home values in the area.
Response: SAV is intended to be an economic and design plus for the neighborhood.
Change to Plan: None at this time.

k) Comment: Supports only two-story on entire project site.
Response: The current and proposed zoning and General Plan support greater height.
Change to Plan: No change.

l) Comment: Three story buildings will affect current breezes and airflow.
Response: This has not been studied.
Change to Plan: No change.

m) Comment: Our neighborhood does not get enough local police traffic patrols.
Response: That matter should be taken up directly with the County sheriff.
Change to Plan: No change.

n) Comment: Building will block view of mountains for property owners fronting onto 10th St.
Response: We can look at specific view corridors with you, but it may be that even 2-story single family homes would do the same. Our goal is to mitigate the loss of privacy.
Change to Plan: No change.

o) Comment: Does not want SAV to proceed, and wants the mobile home park to remain.
Response: That seems contrary to the thoughts of several others.
Change to Plan: No change.

4. Ashmont Ave Neighbor Meeting – 5/9/08

a) Comment: Can Prime support neighborhood traffic calming improvements on Ashmont – cul-de-sac, restriping, do not align SAV Mayflower Ave Driveway with Ashmont.
Response: Yes. We repeated the answers provided at earlier meetings.
Change to Plans: T & L and DPW-Roads agreed that the best option is to keep SAV's main entrance on Mayflower Ave., to restrict Live Oak Ave. driveway to exit only, and to prohibit access onto the alley north of Live Oak Ave. and on Lovejoy St.

5. Neighborhood Meeting – 10/6/08

a) Comment: DMA's letter dated 9/24/08 did not clearly relate that a "stepped" or "wedding-cake" tiered three-story building is proposed.
Response: DMA apologized for the poorly worded letter. A second letter to residents dated 10/9/08 was mailed explaining the one, two, and three-story heights of the adjacent building. Prime offered to meet with residents to redesign the building or site plan layout to reduce privacy impacts. To reduce the concern of privacy impacts, the following changes were made to the plan:
i) One-story building is setback 15 ft. from rear yard of homes fronting Birchcroft St. and 10th St.

ii) No window or door is proposed on the building side facing homes fronting Birchcroft St. and 10th St.

iii) Second-story building is setback 21 ft. to 31 ft. from homes fronting Birchcroft St. and 10th St.

iv) Third-story building is setback 36 ft. to 47 ft. from homes fronting Birchcroft St. and 10th St.

v) Homeowner only owns airspace rights cannot on their own add windows and doors to their unit.

vi) The –DP CUP covenants the design of all buildings facing homes fronting onto Birchcroft St. and 10th St. A revised Exhibit “A” — public hearing, would likely be required to amend the County’s –DP covenant.

vii) Prime reduced density from 334 units to 318 units.

viii) The internal driveway design is re-oriented to maximize how privacy impacts are reduced.

ix) Prime added a third building design – 7 units, which permits the tiered elevation design.

x) Mayflower Avenue median is redesigned to direct exiting vehicles south along Mayflower Ave., to Live Oak Ave.

xi) Prime will publicly support traffic calming improvements – speed bumps, on local serving streets, if approved by County DPW.

xii) Prime will publicly support resident case-by-case review of tree locations within the 15 ft. yard facing homes fronting onto Birchcroft St. and 10th St.

6. MAD Meeting – 10/21/08

a) **Comment:** New homeowners can always add a window or door at a later time through a building permit – no notice is required for the building permit.

**Response:** This will be conditioned by DRP under the –DP CUP conditions, which regulates building elevations.

**Change to Plan:** None.

b) **Comment:** School fees are general fund payments, and not earmarked to a school local to the neighborhood – South Arcadia/Monrovia.

**Response:** The developer has little control over this, and must pay all required school fees.

**Change to Plan:** None.

c) **Comment:** The alignment of the Mayflower Ave. driveway with Ashmont Ave., directs the headlights of existing cars onto the corner parcel located at Ashmont Ave. and Mayflower Ave.

**Response:** Driveway intersections focus traffic and related headlight glare, onto adjacent properties. Prime is reducing the existing number of driveways and intersections from six to one driveway. Prime is offering to the installation of landscape along the property owner’s yard fronting Mayflower Ave. The property owner would need to agree to allow Prime to install landscaping and extend irrigation lines; the property owner would need to maintain landscape improvements.
d) **Comment:** Can a new entry on Live Oak be added?

**Response:** Prime discussed with Traffic & Lighting and Roads the options of: 1) adding a median on Mayflower Ave., between Live Oak Ave. and Birchcroft St., 2) traffic calming options listed in T&L's traffic guidelines.

**Change to Plan:** Changes to restrict the Mayflower exist to right turn only have been made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Applicant's Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transmit Letter to Adjacent Property Owners</td>
<td>3/13/08</td>
<td>- Letter to residents consisted of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Request for resident comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Project Fact Sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Colored site plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Colored rendering - townhouses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Colored rendering - condominiums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Notice that future meetings to be scheduled with residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Prime's mailing lists enclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attended Monrovia, Arcadia Duarte Town Council (&quot;MAD&quot;)</td>
<td>4/15/08</td>
<td>- Copy of Item No. 1 provided to MAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mad Agenda Item No. 4 – Public Comments; DMA advised MAD and audience that first set of meeting likely to be with residents along Birchcroft St., and 10th St., and that future meeting to be held at MAD. No sign-in sheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neighborhood Meeting</td>
<td>5/7/08</td>
<td>- Letter to residents consisted of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting time and date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Project description and Project Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Colored rendering - townhouses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Colored rendering - condominiums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Written response from Richard &amp; Karlyne Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Prime's mailing lists and 5/7/08 Sign-In Sheet enclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ashmont Ave Neighborhood Meeting</td>
<td>5/9/08</td>
<td>- DMA Summary: At 5/7/08 meeting, Ashmont representative asked Prime to attend monthly Friday meeting held by Ashmont Ave, residents. No agenda, mailing or sign-in sheets created or taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhood Meeting</td>
<td>10/6/08</td>
<td>- Letter to residents consisted of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting time and date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Revised project description and Project Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Revised Colored rendering - townhouses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Revised elevation of townhouses facing SFR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Prime's mailing lists and 10/6/08 Sign-In Sheet enclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transmit Letter to Residents</td>
<td>10/9/08</td>
<td>- Follow up letter to residents clarifying project description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site plan, elevations, and rendering presented at 10/6/08 neighborhood meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Summary of changes made to project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MAD Meeting</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>- Posted notice at 4241 Live Oak of MAD meeting to discuss Santa Anita Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Prime's 10/21/08 Sign-in Sheet enclosed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Report No. 10
#### Neighborhood Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transmit Letter to Adjacent Property Owners</td>
<td>3/13/08</td>
<td>• Letter to residents consisted of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Request for resident comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Project Fact Sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Colored site plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Colored rendering - townhouses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Colored rendering – condominiums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Notice that future meetings to be scheduled with residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prime’s mailing lists enclosed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOSS & ASSOCIATES, Inc.
Permitting / Environmental Compliance / Development Consultation
613 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 105, Santa Monica, CA 90401, Tel 310.395.3481, Fax 310.395.8191

Via U.S. Mail
March 13, 2008
Re: Santa Anita Village Town Homes and Condominiums

Dear Neighbor:

Mobile Home Park Status

Prime Enterprises, Inc. ("Prime") owns and operates the mobile home park at 4241 Live Oak Ave, on 12 acres with access from Live Oak and Mayflower Aves. After operating the Park for 20 years, the time has come to redevelop the site for family and community-oriented housing.

Residential Project Proposed

Prime has asked Moss & Associates, an environmental and land use planning firm to assist with the outreach to local neighbors. The goal is to make sure that everyone knows all the details about this residential project and has an opportunity to ask questions and help refine design details. As a starting point for this, we are enclosing:

- A Project Fact Sheet with commonly asked questions and answers;
- A Site Plan showing residential and community buildings, and landscape plans, and
- Color renderings of the project when seen from Mayflower Ave. and Live Oak Ave.

County Permit Process

- Prime has engaged a team of architects, engineers, planners and environmental specialists to assist with the submittal and processing of County permits.
- Prior to closure of the Park, the remaining coach owners will be provided relocation assistance per applicable law.
- There will be only one entrance on Mayflower Ave.
- Dense landscaping and an 8 ft. tall decorative wall will surround the project, and buffer the single-family neighborhood, and
- Prior to a County public hearing sometime before summer 2008, the County will send out a hearing notice to all neighbors within 1,000 ft.

Request for Comments

Prime wants to first talk or meet with homeowners whose property backs onto the existing mobile home park, and then schedule at least one community meeting in April or May 2008. We believe that our meeting(s) with homeowners who live next to the mobile home park will provide Prime and its architect with a "snap shot" image of issues to ponder prior to a community meeting.

Community Meeting

Prime will mail to you and your neighbors the time, date and location of the first community meeting.

Please review the enclosed materials. If you have questions or comments, please call David Moss or me. Thank you for enabling Prime to work closely with the neighborhood on this exciting all - residential project.

Sincerely,

Gerald Hernandez
Project Planner

David E. Moss
Principal

Moss & Associates, Inc.
PROJECT FACT SHEET
4241 Live Oak Ave – Santa Anita Village Condominiums/Townhomes
This FACT SHEET addresses questions of interest for area residents

Who is Prime Enterprises, Inc. and What is the Site History?

- Prime Enterprises, Inc. ("Prime") is a real estate developer headquartered in San Gabriel CA. In addition to development projects, Prime has owned and operated the 12-acre site and Mobile Home Park adjacent to Live Oak Ave. for 20 years. Prime has undertaken extensive architectural analyses of the site in preparation for closing the park and building a residential condominium and townhome project.
- Four years ago, Prime investigated a larger and denser project to be restricted to senior citizens. After meetings with County staff, it was determined that a proposed density of 500 units was not appropriate. In addition, an all-senior project was not as viable as family and lateral move-up housing.

Tell Us About the Residential Project?

- Prime wants to build an attractively designed residential project that avoids traffic, parking and circulation impacts, and enhances the existing community by attracting like-minded new residents, or enabling existing residents to unlock equity in their single family homes and move to new housing with ample open and community space. The project includes:
  - 186 three story town homes – maximum 37 ft. tall, grouped in eight- and ten- unit buildings.
  - 148 four story units in two buildings – maximum 66 ft. tall, along the commercial Live Oak Ave. corridor.
  - A one-story, 2,850 sq. ft. Club House set back 200 ft. from existing single family homes on Birchcroft Ave. and 10th St.
  - A one-story, 2,900 sq. ft. Community Building facing Live Oak Ave. as part of a proposed residential building.
  - 776 parking spaces – 24 more than the County requires; all spaces are either hidden from view or will be screened by the new homes and landscaping.
  - A pool, Village Green Park, and Tot Lot – to promote a village feel and community spirit.

What will happen to the existing Mobile Home Park facility?

- Most of the mobile homes no longer comply with building codes. Any remaining owners will be relocated to various locations – Prime will likely have to assist in the costs – including another mobile home park, apartments, or care facilities as needed.

Who will the Homes Be Marketed To?

- Single-family owners who no longer require a single-family residence but want to stay in the community.
- Residents who have a significant equity in their home who want to transition to a less-expensive market rate home without leaving the South Arcadia - Monrovia community area.

What Site improvements are proposed?

- A gated entry off Mayflower Ave extensively landscaped using large olive trees. (See Mayflower Ave color rendering).
- A gated entry on Live Oak Ave. extensively landscaped using large tipu trees.
- Eliminate pedestrian and vehicle access to 10th St., from Love Joy Ave., and to the commercial alley north of Live Oak Ave.
- A gated access off of Live Oak Ave. restricted to emergency vehicles.

How does the project benefit the neighborhood?

- Strengthens the community by providing quality move-up family housing.
- Reduces Mayflower Ave driveways from five to one.
- Provides a 15 ft. landscape yard along the side and rear property lines.

Where is the project in the County process?

- Prime applied for County zoning permits to construct the project. A public hearing will be held prior to Summer 2008 and all residents within 1,000 ft will receive a public notice of the time and place.

Who do I call for more information?

- David Moss, or Gerry Hernandez, the environmental/permitting consultants, (310) 395-3481.

Prime Enterprises provided quality infill development. Thank you for allowing us to work closely with you. A public meeting and site tour will be forthcoming.

Moss & Associates, Inc.
Report No. 10
Neighborhood Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attended Monrovia, Arcadia Duarte Town Council (&quot;MAD&quot;)</td>
<td>4/15/08</td>
<td>* Copy of Item No. 1 provided to MAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Mad Agenda Item No. 4 – Public Comments: DMA advised MAD and audience that first meetings are with residents along Birchcroft St., and 10th St., and that future meetings will be held at MAD. No sign-in sheets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Report No. 10
Neighborhood Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2       | Attended Monrovia, Arcadia Duarte Town Council ("MAD")                    | 4/15/08 | • Copy of Item No. 1 provided to MAD.  
• Mad Agenda Item No. 4 – Public Comments: DMA advised MAD and audience that first meetings are with residents along Birchoft St., and 10th St., and that future meetings will be held at MAD. No sign-in sheets. |
M.A.D. Town Council
Meeting Agenda
April 15, 2008

1. Flag Salute

2. Roll Call- Quorum- Bullock, Hall, Hüss, Nicoloro-

3. Committee Reports
   A. LA County Sheriffs Dept
   B. Pamela Park Staff
   C. Guest Speakers-Live Oak Library, CHP, LA County Police, Assembly Office
   D. Supervisors Office
   E. Council Reports

4. Public Comments

   DMA introduction to community, noting that letters notifying adjacent property owners of meeting dates/times to be mailed.

5. Adjournment
Report No. 10
Neighborhood Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3       | Neighborhood Meeting| 5/7/08 | • Letter to residents consisted of:  
|         |                     |       |   o Meeting time and date.        |
|         |                     |       |   o Project description and Project Fact Sheet |
|         |                     |       |   o Colored rendering – townhouses. |
|         |                     |       |   o Colored rendering – condominiums. |
|         |                     |       | • Written response from Richard & Karlyne Smith |
|         |                     |       | • Prime’s mailing lists and 5/7/08 Sign-In Sheet enclosed. |
April 30, 2008

Re: Meeting with Birchcroft Ave. and 10th St. Residents – 6:30 PM, May 7, 2008
   Santa Anita Village Town Homes and Condominiums

Dear Neighbor:

Purpose of Meeting

On behalf of Prime Enterprises ("Developer"), Moss & Associates, Inc. - an environmental and land use planning firm – is inviting local neighbors to a meeting regarding the proposed development of townhomes and condominiums on 12 acres located along Live Oak and Mayflower Avenues - the site of the existing trailer park which will be demolished.

We will have large-scale plans for review, ample time to discuss the residential project and enable the closest neighbors to the site to ask questions and identify design details that need to be considered prior to any final review and approval by the greater community at large, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Neighborhood Council, or County Regional Planning Commission.

- A Project Fact Sheet with commonly asked questions and answers;
- A Site Plan showing residential and community buildings, and landscape plans, and
- Color renderings of the project when seen from Mayflower Ave. and Live Oak Ave.

Meeting Time, Date, and Location

Date: 6:30PM, May 7, 2008 at the Annunciation Catholic School Assembly Room.

Access: The main driveway serving the Assembly Room is located on Peck Rd., approximately 200 ft north of Longden Ave.

Location: Annunciation Catholic School - 1307 East Longden Ave. - Arcadia CA 91006

Contact on Day of Meeting: Gerry Hernandez - 310-702-2399

Request for Comments

Please review the enclosed materials. If you have questions or comments, please call David Moss or Gerry Hernandez prior to the May 7th meeting. Thank you for enabling Prime to work closely with the neighborhood on this exciting residential project.

Sincerely,

Gerald Hernandez
Project Planner

David E. Moss
Principal

Moss & Associates, Inc. H04Ltr 4-30-08
April 29, 2008

Re: Meeting with Birchcroft Ave. and 10th St. Residents - May 7, 2008
Santa Anita Village Town Homes and Condominiums

Dear Neighbor:

Purpose of Meeting

On behalf of Prime Enterprises ("Developer"), Moss & Associates, Inc. - an environmental and land use planning firm - is inviting local neighbors to a meeting regarding the proposed development of townhomes and condominiums on 12 acres located along Live Oak and Mayflower Avenues - the site of the existing trailer park which will be demolished.

We will have large-scale plans for review, ample time to discuss the residential project and enable the closest neighbors to the site to ask questions and identify design details that need to be considered prior to any final review and approval by the greater community at large, the Monrovia-Arcadia-Duarte Neighborhood Council, or County Regional Planning Commission.

- A Project Fact Sheet with commonly asked questions and answers;
- A Site Plan showing residential and community buildings, and landscape plans, and
- Color renderings of the project when seen from Mayflower Ave. and Live Oak Ave.

Meeting Time, Date, and Location

Date: May 7, 2008 at the Annunciation Catholic School Assembly Room.

Access: The main driveway serving the Assembly Room is located on Peck Rd., approximately 200 ft north of Longden Ave.

Location: Annunciation Catholic School. - 1307 East Longden Ave. - Arcadia CA 91006

Contact on Day of Meeting: Gerry Hernandez - 310-702-2399

Request for Comments

Please review the enclosed materials. If you have questions or comments, please call David Moss or Gerry Hernandez prior to the May 7th meeting. Thank you for enabling Prime to work closely with the neighborhood on this exciting residential project.

Sincerely,

Gerald Hernandez
Project Planner

David E. Moss
Principal
PROJECT FACT SHEET
4241 Live Oak Ave – Santa Anita Village Condominiums/Townhomes

This FACT SHEET addresses questions of interest for area residents

Who is Prime Enterprises, Inc. and What is the Site History?

- Prime Enterprises, Inc. ("Prime") is a real estate developer headquartered in San Gabriel CA. In addition to development projects, Prime has owned and operated the 12-acre site and Mobile Home Park adjacent to Live Oak Ave. for 20 years. Prime has undertaken extensive architectural analyses of the site in preparation for closing the park and building a residential condominium and townhome project.

- Four years ago, Prime investigated a larger and denser project to be restricted to senior citizens. After meetings with County staff, it was determined that a proposed density of 900 units was not appropriate. In addition, an all-senior project was not as viable as family and lateral move-up housing.

Tell Us About the Residential Project?

- Prime wants to build an attractively-designed residential project that avoids traffic, parking and circulation impacts, and enhances the existing community by attracting like-minded new residents, or enabling existing residents to unlock equity in their single family homes and move to new housing with ample open and community space. The project includes:
  - 186 three-story town homes – maximum 37 ft. tall, grouped in eight- and ten-unit buildings.
  - 148 four story units in two buildings – maximum 66 ft. tall, along the commercial Live Oak Ave. corridor.
  - A one-story, 2,850 sq. ft. Club House set back 200 ft. from existing single family homes on Birchcroft Ave. and 10th St.
  - A one-story, 2,900 sq. ft. Community Building facing Live Oak Ave. as part of a proposed residential building.
  - 776 parking spaces – 24 more than the County requires; all spaces are either hidden from view or will be screened by the new homes and landscaping.
  - A pool, Village Green Park, and Tot Lot – to promote a village feel and community spirit.

What will happen to the existing Mobile Home Park facility?

- Most of the mobile homes no longer comply with building codes. Any remaining owners will be relocated to various locations – Prime will likely have to assist in the costs – including another mobile home park, apartments, or care facilities as needed.

Who will the Homes Be Marketed To?

- Single-family owners who no longer require a single-family residence but want to stay in the community.
- Residents who have a significant equity in their home who want to transition to a less-expensive market rate home without leaving the South Arcadia - Monrovia community area.

What Site improvements are proposed?

- A gated entry off Mayflower Ave extensively landscaped using large olive trees. (See Mayflower Ave color rendering).
- A gated entry on Live Oak Ave. extensively landscaped using large tipu trees.
- Eliminate pedestrian and vehicle access to 10th St., from Love Joy Ave., and to the commercial alley north of Live Oak Ave.
- A gated access off of Live Oak Ave. restricted to emergency vehicles.

How does the project benefit the neighborhood?

- Strengthens the community by providing quality move-up family housing.
- Reduces Mayflower Ave driveways from five to one.
- Provides a 15 ft. landscape yard along the side and rear property lines.

Where is the project in the County process?

- Prime applied for County zoning permits to construct the project. A public hearing will be held prior to Summer 2008 and all residents within 1,000 ft will receive a public notice of the time and place.

Who do I call for more information?

- David Moss, or Gerry Hernandez, the environmental/permitting consultants, (310) 395-3481.

Prime Enterprises provides quality infill development. Thank you for allowing us to work closely with you.

Moss & Associates, Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name, Address and Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Louis Fazzio  
2884 S 10th Ave  
6-786-2332                                    |
| 2   | Gloria Ramirez  
2916 S. Tenth Ave                                                        |
| 3   | Ron Bagwell  
2854 Mayflower Ave  
626-447-8734                            |
| 4   | Tom McFadden  
2854 Ashmont  
626-646-5495 |   |
| 5   | DeVito  
2816 Ashmont Ave  
626-397-3735                     |   |
| 6   | David Westenhaever  
2851                            |
| 7   | Susan Westenhaever  
2857 Ashmont                             |
| 8   | Caroline Bloomer  
2812 Mayflower  
6-294-9615                      |
| 9   | Robert Bloomer  
2854 Lawndale           |   |
| 10  | Hung Chou  
2894 Lawndale                     |
| 11  | Karen & Jim Muskaeye  
2917 Ashmont Ave  
626-397-3735                   |
| 12  | Robert Robert Anderson  
2936 S. Tenth  
626-397-3735                       |
| 13  | Mike & Shariel Herdening  
2914 Ashmont Ave                         |
| 14  | Andrew Hellmanner  
2875 Ashmont Ave          |
| 15  | Kim Murawage  
2832 Mayflower Ave |   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name, Address and Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.N. MASTERS 626-446-9783 910-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BILL ZAPPEN 1018 BIRCHCROFT 626-447-3994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bardsley McInthyre 5637 Avondale Ave 344-5144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BILL STICKER 2902 TENTH AVE 446-9025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MARY JANE STICKER 2308 TENTH AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JOE ZAPPEN 1022 BIRCHCROFT 447-0088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GARY HAWTHORNE 1102 E BIRCHCROFT ST 376-1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gloria Ruiz 2912 Tenth Ave 574-1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jeannine Schmidt 1112 E BIRCHCROFT ST 447-4828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike Schmidt 1112 E BIRCHCROFT ST 447-4828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LEC VILANDER 1146 E BIRCHCROFT ST 907-908-0813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Frank Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Diane Cusarelli 1008 E BIRCHCROFT ST Arcadia 6146-237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lynn Worley 1142 E BIRCHCROFT St Arcadia Ca 91056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Carol Manwaren 1132 E BIRCHCROFT St Arcadia 447-971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrice Reinhard 2808 Larkfield Ave 6146-0582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name, Address and Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Branch, M.T. 2828 S. Mayflower Ave., Arcadia, CA 91006 61447-4621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Long Tang 2932 S. 10th Ave. Arcadia, CA 91006 620-465-9881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Angela Lemus 2431 Ashmun Ave Arcadia, CA 91006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guadalupe J. 2830 S. Mayflower Ave. Arcadia, CA 91006 0243-0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tina Dryer 2858 Ashmun Ave. Arcadia, CA 91006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Anita Village  
4241 Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia CA  
May 7, 2008 Birchcroft – 10th St. MEETING  
SIGN IN SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name, Address and Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ken Johnson 2884 Asbury Ave - 510-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1/4\]
Why was not Ashmont Area Notified about this project? Only 10th Ave & Birchcroft were.

Why is the entrance to this project only on Mayflower Ave (which is right in front of our house) and also where Ashmont Av. intersects with Mayflower? There will be approx. 992 or 668 (depending on which one of your sheets we look at) extra vehicles on Mayflower and Ashmont. These extra vehicles will be on these streets every morning and every night, in addition to the already several hundred that are already using these streets. Why is the main entrance to this project not on Live Oak Av, where it should be??? The traffic and noise is bad enough now, the noise and traffic is going to be unbearable! We live on the corner of Ashmont and Mayflower and our driveway is on Mayflower. We have lived here since 1972.

The speed limit is posted 25 mph, as this is a residential neighborhood. Traffic speeds as you know, are much greater. What is your proposed planned traffic control?

Point of information….Lovejoy Av and the alley way to 10th have always been sealed off with brick.

How much street parking is going to be lost from Mayflower between Live Oak Ave and Larkfield?

How much noise are we going to hear from the swimming pool? If your driveways stay where proposed there is nothing to block the noise. They said we would not hear the Race Track, but wrong….wrong …..wrong.

The existing 2 Fire Hydrants located at driveway B & E to remain??

Olive Trees are very very messy.
Tipu Trees which are Simi-evergreen. The flowers and leaves do drop. This tree grows to a 100’ high. What’s to stop all the leaves and stuff from blowing into our yard?? We don’t feel we should have to cleanup your mess.

Richard & Karlyne Smith
2952 Ashmont Av.
Arcadia, Ca. 91006
262-446-1380
richkar@charter.net
# Report No. 10

## Neighborhood Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ashmont Ave Neighborhood Meeting</td>
<td>5/9/08</td>
<td>- DMA Summary: At 5/7/08 meeting, Ashmont representative asked Prime to attend monthly Friday meeting held by Ashmont Ave. residents. No agenda, mailing or sign-in sheets created or taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5/9/08 MEETING AT 2854 ASHMONT AVE - TOM McFADDEN'S HOME

7:00 PM FRONT LAWN MEETING

NO ATTENDANCE TAKEN

APPROXIMATELY 10 PERSONS AT MEETING.

AT 5/7/08 MEETING, PRIME AGREED TO MR McFADDEN'S REQUEST TO MEET AGAIN ON FRIDAY EVENING – 5/9/08 TO DISCUSS SANTA ANITA VILLAGE PROJECT
Report No. 10
Neighborhood Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5        | Neighborhood Meeting| 10/6/08| • Letter to residents consisted of:  
|          |                     |        | o Meeting time and date.          |
|          |                     |        | o Revised project description and Project Fact Sheet |
|          |                     |        | o Revised Colored rendering – townhouses. |
|          |                     |        | o Revised elevation of townhouses facing SFR. |
|          |                     |        | • Prime’s mailing lists and 10/6/08 Sign-In Sheet enclosed. |
September 24, 2008

Dear Neighbor:

**Community Meeting**

Thank you for your patience – great progress has been made and we are finally ready to bring you up to date with the many project revisions.

Your comments and concerns resulted in numerous meetings with County staff and significant project redesign.

Thanks to you, the Developer worked closely with the architect – Withee Malcom Architects, the Civil Engineer – B & E, and the project manager – Moss & Associates, to collectively brainstorm several changes.

We are excited to host this meeting so you can see how the project has changed: Highlights include:

- One story building heights adjacent to the rear yards of homes along 10th St., Lovejoy St., and Birchcroft Ave.
- A revised Mayflower Ave. driveway median.

**Meeting Time, Date, and Location**

**Date:** 7:00 PM, Monday, October 6, 2008 at the Annunciation Catholic School.

**Location:** Annunciation Catholic School, Assembly Room - 1307 East Longden Ave. - Arcadia

**Access:** The driveway serving the Assembly Room is located on Peck Rd., approximately 200 ft north of Longden Ave.

**Request for Comments**

There will be full-sized plans for review and we look forward to seeing you.

If you have comments and/or cannot attend, please call David Moss or Gerry Hernandez prior to the October 6th meeting.

Thank you for enabling Prime to work closely with its neighbors to redevelop the mobile home park.

Sincerely,

Gerry Hernandez, Planner

David Moss, President
PROJECT FACT SHEET
4241 Live Oak Ave – Santa Anita Village Condominiums/Townhomes
This FACT SHEET addresses questions of interest for area residents

What were the Previous Community Comments?
- Reduce privacy impacts.
- Reduce the potential for new traffic to take shortcuts through the local neighborhood.
- Support local residents preference to have speed bumps on select local roads.
- Consider optional entry and exit plans, and internal driveway layouts.
- Maintain property values.
- Reduce the potential of future homeowners to modify the exterior of buildings backing onto the rear yard of homes fronting onto 10th St., Lovejoy St., and Birchcroft Ave.

REVISED PLANS – WHAT IS NOW PROPOSED
- 16 homes have been eliminated.
- Maximum 16 one story units (11 ft. 4-in. tall) setback 15 ft from the 28 rear yards of homes fronting onto 10th St., Lovejoy St., and Birchcroft Ave.
- Windows and doors setback 15 ft from the rear yard of homes fronting onto 10th St., Lovejoy Ave., and Birchcroft Ave. are a maximum of 8 ft. tall screened by an 8 - ft. masonry wall and landscaping.
- No changes to gated entries, pedestrian access, extensive landscaping – soft- and hard-scape areas, open space, pools, tot lots, community buildings, and building materials is proposed.
- 742 parking spaces – 26 more than the County requires; all spaces are either hidden from view or will be screened by the new homes and landscaping.
- The Mayflower Ave. driveway has been redesigned to direct exiting traffic south along Mayflower Ave. towards Live Oak Ave.
- The Developer will publicly support traffic calming improvements – speed bumps, on local serving streets, if approved by County DPW.

Where is the project in the County process?
- A public hearing may be held prior to the end of 2008 and all residents within 1,000 ft and those that have attended our meetings will receive a notice from the County of the time and place.

Who do I call for more information?
- David Moss, or Gerry Hernandez, the environmental/permitting consultants, (310) 395-3481.

Prime Enterprises provides quality infill development. Thank you for enabling Prime’s team to work closely with you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>8511-025-006</td>
<td>Xiaodong Zhou</td>
<td>2832 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>8511-025-007</td>
<td>Ralph F &amp; Mary E Green</td>
<td>16724 Gleniopoe Dr</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91044-4212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>8511-025-008</td>
<td>Peter J &amp; Phyllis Rock</td>
<td>2802 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>8511-025-009</td>
<td>Monica Y Tien</td>
<td>2803 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>8511-025-010</td>
<td>Javier A Lopez</td>
<td>2809 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>8511-025-011</td>
<td>Timothy Taylor</td>
<td>2813 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>8511-025-012</td>
<td>David P &amp; Peggy Larsen</td>
<td>2819 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>8511-025-013</td>
<td>Dustin Dostalek</td>
<td>2823 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>8511-025-014</td>
<td>Wendy W Cheung</td>
<td>2829 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>8511-025-015</td>
<td>Tommy Jo Leung</td>
<td>2833 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>8511-025-016</td>
<td>Dave &amp; Sandra French</td>
<td>2839 Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>8511-026-001</td>
<td>Paul V Vasquez</td>
<td>2838 S 10Th Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>8511-026-002</td>
<td>Mary F Markley</td>
<td>2832 S 10Th Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>8511-026-003</td>
<td>Sidney Chiu</td>
<td>2828 S 10Th Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>8511-026-004</td>
<td>George T &amp; Richard Uhl</td>
<td>2822 S 10Th Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>8511-026-005</td>
<td>Margaret Tengan</td>
<td>2818 S 10Th Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>8511-026-006</td>
<td>Eloisa P Same</td>
<td>2812 S 10Th Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>8511-026-007</td>
<td>Anna M Yuen</td>
<td>1844 Tyler Dr</td>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91753-4133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>8511-026-008</td>
<td>Cesar &amp; Noemi Aguirre</td>
<td>1008 E Longden Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>8511-026-009</td>
<td>Piroon Ounchareonpornsornpat</td>
<td>2803 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>8511-026-010</td>
<td>John P &amp; Sue E Szabo</td>
<td>2809 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>8511-026-011</td>
<td>Norman J &amp; Pauline M Cahill</td>
<td>2813 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>8511-026-012</td>
<td>James C Achedafty</td>
<td>2819 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>8511-026-013</td>
<td>Mimi Win</td>
<td>2823 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>8511-026-014</td>
<td>Curavo Living Trust</td>
<td>2829 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>8511-026-015</td>
<td>Marion Train</td>
<td>2833 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>8511-026-016</td>
<td>Oscar G &amp; Randi T Martinez</td>
<td>2839 Loganrita Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>8511-027-001</td>
<td>Burton Mayers</td>
<td>2851 Mayflower Ave</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>8511-027-007</td>
<td>Forrest Vilander</td>
<td>1146 E Birchcroft St</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>8511-027-003</td>
<td>Kenneth V Worley</td>
<td>1142 E Birchcroft St</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91006-5521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Richard & Karyne Smith
2952 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia, CA 91006

Tom McFadden
2854 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Bill Zappan
1018 Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Louis Fallico
2884 S 10th Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

David Westenhauer
2851 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Hung Chou
2894 Larkfield Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Andrew Hernandez
2889 S. Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Bill Stickel
2902 10th Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Gloria Ruiz
2912 10th Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Frank & Diane Coscarelli
1008 E. Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

M. & M. Branch
2828 S. Mayflower Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Tina Darnery
2858 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Vicki Barstow

Gary Hawthorne C 21
38 W. Sierra Madre Blvd.
Sierra Madre CA 91024

Craig DeVito
2816 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Steve Zuckerman
900 S. San Gabriel Blvd. #200
San Gabriel, CA

Gloria Rameriz
2916 S. 10th Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Susan Westenhauer
2851 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Karen & Jim Musekamp
2917 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Pam Marago
2832 Mayflower Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Mary Jane Stickel
2902 10th Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Jeannine Schmidt
1112 E. Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Lynn Worley
1142 E. Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Long Tang
2832 S. 10th Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Ken Johnson
2884 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Lyn
1142 Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Huny Choe

Bill Sterkon

Ron Bagwell
2854 Mayflower Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Caroline Bloomer
2812 Mayflower Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Robert Anderson
2936 S. 10th Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

B. & N. Mayers
2851 S. Mayflower Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Joe Zappan
1022 Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Joe Zappan
1022 Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Mike Schmidt
1112 E. Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Carol Manwarren
1132 E. Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Angel lemus
2831 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

David Hall, President
MAD Town Council

Carol
1948 Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Denis Michman

Gloria Rameriz
2912 10th Ave
Arcadia CA 91006

DeVito
2816 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Robert Bloomer
2812 Mayflower Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Mike & Sharrel Herdering
2914 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Barbara McIntosh
2870 Ashmont Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Gary Hawthorne
1102 E. Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Eric Vilander
1146 E. Birchcroft St.
Arcadia CA 91006

Patrice Reinhard
2868 Larkfield Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

J. Espinosa
2833 S. Mayflower Ave.
Arcadia CA 91006

Tony Ogaze
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name, Address and Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barbara McIntosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mark Stuhlmans, Stearns Ave, C2C 215 6245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carol Manwarren, 1132 E Birchcroft, 447-4713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Margaret Cude, 2832 Halsey Ave, 445-6244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eric Vilauber, 1146 E Birchcroft (626) 496-4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tom McFadden, 2854 Ashmont, 626-446-5695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name, Address and Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>SUSAN WESTENHAVER</strong> 2651 ASHMORE 359-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Bill Zappen</strong> 1018 BIRCHCROFT 447-3994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robert Heath 2329 S. Santa Anita 445-8814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frank Cesarelli 1008 E Birchcroft st 446-2841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Santa Anita Village
4241 Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia CA
October 6, 2008 Birchcroft – 10th St. MEETING
SIGN IN SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name, Address and Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andrey y Cecilia Hernandez 2875 Ashmore Ave 91006 415-2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bill y Janie Stickle 2902 10th Ave 91006 446-9025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gloria Ramirez 2916 S. Tenth Ave 91006 447-1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>David Westernhaver 2851 Ashmore Ave 9006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name, Address and Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Louis Fallco 2884 5 10th Ave Arcadia 91006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gloria Mosqueda-Ruiz 2912 10th Ave Arcadia 91006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bob &amp; Caroline Bloomer 2812 Mayflower Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tina &amp; Will Dancey 2858 Estabrook Ave. Arcadia CA 91006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report No. 10
Neighborhood Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6        | Transmit Letter to Residents | 10/9/08 | - Follow up letter to residents clarifying project description.  
|          |                           |        |   o Site plan, elevations, and rendering presented at 10/6/08 neighborhood meeting.  
|          |                           |        |   o Summary of changes made to project. |
Via U.S. Mail

October 9, 2008

Re: 10/6/08 Santa Anita Village - Adjacent neighbor Meeting and Fact Sheet Clarification

Dear Neighbor:

Fact Sheet Clarification

One purpose of this additional mailing is to clear up the confusion we may have created unintentionally in the "Fact Sheet" mailed two weeks ago regarding the height and number of stories of the units along the north and west perimeter of Santa Anita Village. Enclosed are drawings and elevations shown at the 10/6/08 meeting, summarized as follows:

- Site plan showing the increased distances of buildings from the north and west property lines.
- Two set of elevations showing (i) one, two and three-story heights, (ii) extreme reduction of windows along the north and west perimeter of buildings, and (iii) substantial setback to 1st, 2nd and 3rd levels.
- Proposed landscaping between existing houses and Santa Anita Village.
- Two renderings showing the setback and diverse massing of the rear elevations facing existing houses. The intention was to break up the massing and give the appearance of less density.

There are indeed one-story elements adjacent to the single family houses fronting along Birchcroft Ave. and 10th Ave., but there are also two and three-story rooftops set back 21 ft. and 37 ft. respectively, from the property line. All have significant changes to reduce windows and maintain single family privacy.

At the meeting we apologized for any confusion we created and we promised the attendees that we would send this additional mailing fully describing the design changes made to create privacy and enhance the quality of life for single family neighbors along the north and west boundaries.

Meeting Summary and Continuation of Design Changes

The second reason for this mailing is to let you know that many attended last night’s meeting and the developer appreciated the feedback – as a team – we are pleased to hear that many neighbors appreciated the project redesign which includes improved driveway design along Mayflower Ave., reduced density, reduced building massing and enhanced privacy at the rear of homes fronting Birchcroft Ave. and 10th Ave.

We have again rolled up our sleeves to make additional design changes to one building at the northwest corner and will be working closely with the most affected neighbors adjacent to that building to reasonably provide the same quality of life and privacy that we believe has been created by the redesign for other perimeter buildings.

Request for Comments

Please review the enclosed materials. If you did not attend the meeting and you have comments, we encourage you to call David Moss or Gerry Hernandez at (310) 395-3481. Thank you for enabling the development team to work closely with the neighborhood on this infill residential project.

Sincerely,

Gerald Hernandez
Project Planner

David E. Moss
Principal

Moss & Associates, Inc.
## Report No. 10

**Neighborhood Outreach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence/Summary Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7        | MAD Meeting    | 10/21/08 | • Posted notice at 4241 Live Oak of MAD meeting to discuss Santa Anita Village.  
• Prime's 10/21/08 Sign-In Sheet enclosed. |
Dear Neighbor:

MAD Meeting

At the request of the MAD Towne Council, Prime Enterprises ("Prime") – the owner and manager of the Santa Anita Mobile Home Park will present development plans for 4241 Live Oak Ave. at the MAD Towne Council meeting of 10/21/08.

Prime has met several times with local neighbors and has made significant design changes.

The Prime design and permit team is excited to present at MAD so you can hear and see how the mobile home park will be redeveloped to benefit the South Monrovia/Arcadia community. Highlights of changes to date include:

- The closest portion of the buildings adjacent to homes along 10th Ave., Lovejoy St., and Birchcroft Ave is one-story (11 ft. 4-in. tall) set back 15 ft from existing yards. The second and third story are set back 21 and 37 ft and have solid walls with no windows looking down on the existing homes.

- Mayflower Ave. driveway exiting uses a median to force south bound right turns only.

MAD Meeting Time, Date, and Location

Date: 7:00 PM, Tuesday, October 21, 2008 at the Annunciation Catholic School.

Location: Annunciation Catholic School. Assembly Room - 1307 East Longden Ave. - Arcadia

Access: The driveway serving the Assembly Room is located on Peck Rd., approximately 200 ft north of Longden Ave.

Request for Comments

There will be full-sized plans for review at MAD, and we look forward to seeing you.

If you have comments and/or cannot attend, please call David Moss or Gerry Hernandez prior to the October 21st meeting.

Thank you for enabling Prime to work closely with its neighbors to redevelop the mobile home park.

Sincerely,

Gerry Hernandez, Planner

David Moss, President
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Santa Anita Village Condominiums/Townhomes

This FACT SHEET addresses questions of interest for area residents

Who is Prime Enterprises, Inc. and What is the Site History?

- Prime is a real estate developer headquartered in San Gabriel CA. Prime has owned and operated the 12-acre Mobile Home Park adjacent to Live Oak Ave. for 20 years. Prime has undertaken extensive architectural analyses in preparation for closing the Park and building residential condominiums and townhomes.

Who will the Homes Be Marketed To?

- Residents who no longer require a single-family house but want to stay in the community.
- Residents who have equity in their homes who want to transition to less-expensive market rate multi-family units without leaving the South Arcadia - Monrovia community area.
- The project is not proposed as affordable, rental or senior oriented – it is a “for-sale” project.

What Design Changes Were Made For The Neighbors Along Birchcroft Ave., 10th Ave. and Ashmont Ave?

- Maintain privacy.
- Minimize additional traffic through the local neighborhood.
- Support local residents’ goal to have speed bumps on select local roads.
- Improve circulation and access and comply with County requirements.
- Propose a quality for-sale project that doesn’t impact property values.
- Control future homeowners so they can’t modify building exteriors backing onto the rear yards of homes along 10th St., Lovejoy St., and Birchcroft Ave.

The Project:

- 318 Attractively-designed residences with ample open space.
  - 170 three story town homes – maximum 37 ft. tall, grouped in seven –, eight- and ten-unit buildings. The closest portion of the buildings adjacent to homes along 10th Ave., Lovejoy St., and Birchcroft Ave is one-story (11 ft. 4-in. tall) set back 15 ft from existing yards. The second and third story are set back 21 and 37 ft and have solid walls with no windows looking down on the existing homes.
  - 148 four-story units in two buildings – maximum 66 ft. tall, along the commercial Live Oak Ave. corridor. These buildings are the most distant from the existing single family homes.
  - A one-story, 2,850 sq. ft. Club House set back 200 ft. from homes on Birchcroft Ave. and 10th Ave.
  - A one-story, 2,900 sq. ft. Community Building facing Live Oak Ave.
  - 776 parking spaces – 25 more than the County requires; all spaces are either hidden from view or will be screened by the new homes and landscaping.
  - A pool, Village Green Park, and Tot Lot – to promote a village feel and community spirit.
  - A maximum 8 ft. masonry wall and landscaping along the project’s perimeter.

Where is the project in the County process?

- Prime applied for County zoning permits to construct the project. A public hearing may be held prior to the end of 2008; all residents within 1,000 ft will receive a public notice from the County of the time and place.

Who do I call for more information?

- David Moss, or Gerry Hernandez, the environmental/permitting consultants, (310) 395-3481.

Prime Enterprises provides quality infill development. Thank you for enabling Prime’s team to work closely with you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name, Address and Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andrew Garcia, 3985 Ashmont Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dep. Nielsen, Temple Station 626-392-3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lt. Sanchez, Temple Station 626-285-7171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SGT. Lopez, Temple Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dep. Vasquez, Temple Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ed Lopez, 4241 E. Live Oak Arcadia 626-447-0832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name, Address and Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ARCADIA 91006 626-446-9785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. MAHERS, 2851 S. MAYFLOWER AV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>626-447-6989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara McIntosh, 2820 Ashmont Ave, Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>626-447-6934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Manning, 2823 S. Mayflower Ave, Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name, Address and Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stilin &amp; Delia, 2647 Loganita Ave, Az, (626) 447-7158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BRIAN MENTJA Supervisor Antiochade 91394-2264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name, Address and Telephone No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lucie S. 4241 E. Live Oak Ave., Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paul Novak 500 W. Temple St., #869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Felix Lopez 4241 Live Oak Ave., Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dennis Mackoff Live Oak Lib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Margie Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jim Rohan 4244 Live Oak 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nguyen Mayflower Ave., Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mary Bolick Ashmont Ave., Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ray Tan Ashmont Ave., Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sylvia Bonita Mayflower Ave., Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 21, 2008 MAD TOWNE COUNCIL MEETING
Santa Anita Village
4241 Live Oak Avenue, Arcadia CA
SIGN IN SHEET
MOSS & ASSOCIATES, Inc.
Environmental Compliance / Permitting / Development Consultation
613 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 105, Santa Monica, CA 90401, Tel 310.395.3481, Fax 310.395.8191

Via U.S. Mail

October 17, 2007
Ray Hamada, Director
Department of Planning
City of Irwindale
5050 N. Irwindale Ave.
Irwindale, CA 91706

Re: 4241 E. Live Oak Ave. – Unincorporated South Monrovia, County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles County Request to Notify Irwindale of Proposed Development

Dear Ray,

Introduction
At the request of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, Moss & Associates – a full-service land use planning firm, was asked to forward to Irwindale a description of Prime Enterprises's ("Prime") entitlement request to development 334 townhouse and condominium units on 12 acres in the unincorporated South Monrovia area. It is our understanding that the County’s Impact Analysis Section – at a later time, will forward CEQA information to the City.

Project Description - Entitlement
DMA is enclosing a copy of the County Subdivision Application, Application Attachment, Initial Study, architectural plans, and phasing plan. We are also enclosing colored building elevations.

- **Requested Entitlements**: Plan Amendment, Zone Change, CUP, and VTTM entitlements for a five phase, 334 unit project. Each phase complies or exceeds County recreation and parking requirements.

- **Family Sized Residential Units**: There are 15 unit types, 1,340 to 1,688 sq. ft. for two, three and four bedroom townhouses, and 704 to 1,371 sq. ft. for one, two and three bedroom condominiums.

- **Recreation Amenities**: A Club House, Lap Pool, Village Green Park, Tot Lot, and Community Center are proposed. The Community Center will be constructed as part of Phase V; all other amenities will be constructed as part of Phase I.

City Comment
Please forward City comments to the DRP Land Divisions - 30 days, addressed to Mr. Jodie Sackett, Los Angeles County DRP – Land Divisions, 320 Temple Ave., 13th Flr., Los Angeles 90012. As a courtesy, forward a copy of City comments to us.

We are committed to working closely with the City and look forward to the development of a regional serving housing project that we will make us proud.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Prime Enterprise

Moss & Associates, Inc.

Trans PD 10-12-07 Irwindale
October 17, 2007

Steve Sizemore, Division Manager
Community Development – Planning
City of Monrovia
415 S. Ivy Ave.
Monrovia, CA 91016

Re: 4241 E. Live Oak Ave. – Unincorporated South Monrovia, County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles County Request to Notify Monrovia of Proposed Development

Dear Steve,

Introduction

At the request of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, Moss & Associates – a full-service land use planning firm, was asked to forward to Monrovia a description of Prime Enterprises’s ("Prime") entitlement request to develop 334 townhouse and condominium units on 12 acres in the unincorporated South Monrovia area. It is our understanding that the County's Impact Analysis Section – at a later time, will forward CEQA Information to the City.

Project Description - Entitlement

DMA is enclosing a copy of the County Subdivision Application, Application Attachment, Initial Study, architectural plans, and phasing plan. We are also enclosing colored building elevations.

- Requested Entitlements: Plan Amendment, Zone Change, CUP, and VTTM entitlements for a five phase, 334 unit project. Each phase complies or exceeds County recreation and parking requirements.

- Family Sized Residential Units: There are 15 unit types, 1,340 to 1,686 sq. ft. for two, three and four bedroom townhouses, and 704 to 1,371 sq. ft. for one, two and three bedroom condominiums.

- Recreation Amenities: A Club House, Lap Pool, Village Green Park, Tot Lot, and Community Center are proposed. The Community Center will be constructed as part of Phase V; all other amenities will be constructed as part of Phase I.

City Comment

Please forward City comments to the DRP Land Divisions - 30 days, addressed to Mr. Jodie Sackett, Los Angeles County DRP – Land Divisions, 320 Temple Ave., 13th Flr., Los Angeles 90012. As a courtesy, forward a copy of City comments to us.

We are committed to working closely with the City and look forward to the development of a regional serving housing project that we will make us proud.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Prime Enterprise

Moss & Associates, Inc.
October 17, 2007

Jason Kruckenberg, Administrator
City of Arcadia – Community Development
240 W. Huntington Dr.
Arcadia, CA 91007

Re: 4241 E. Live Oak Ave. – Unincorporated South Monrovia, County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles County Request to Notify Arcadia of Proposed Development

Dear Jason,

Introduction

At the request of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, Moss & Associates – a full-service land use planning firm, was asked to forward to Arcadia a description of Prime Enterprises’s (“Prime”) entitlement request to development 334 townhouse and condominium units on 12 acres in the unincorporated South Monrovia area. It is our understanding that the County’s Impact Analysis Section – at a later time, will forward CEQA information to the City.

Project Description - Entitlement

DMA is enclosing a copy of the County Subdivision Application, Application Attachment, Initial Study, architectural plans, and phasing plan. We are also enclosing colored building elevations.

- **Requested Entitlements:** Plan Amendment, Zone Change, CUP, and VTTM entitlements for a five phase, 334 unit project. Each phase complies or exceeds County recreation and parking requirements.

- **Family Sized Residential Units:** There are 15 unit types, 1,340 to 1,686 sq. ft. for two, three and four bedroom townhouses, and 704 to 1,371 sq. ft. for one, two and three bedroom condominiums.

- **Recreation Amenities:** A Club House, Lap Pool, Village Green Park, Tot Lot, and Community Center are proposed. The Community Center will be constructed as part of Phase V; all other amenities will be constructed as part of Phase I.

City Comment

Please forward City comments to the DRP Land Divisions - 30 days, addressed to Mr. Jodie Sackett, Los Angeles County DRP – Land Divisions, 320 Temple Ave., 13th Flr., Los Angeles 90012. As a courtesy, forward a copy of City comments to us.

We are committed to working closely with the City and look forward to the development of a regional serving housing project that we will make us proud.

Sincerely,

David E. Moss
President

cc: Prime Enterprise

Moss & Associates, Inc.

Trans PD 10-12-07
Monday, October 04, 2010

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attention: Jodie Sackett

Project: TRO68400-5 Mobilehome Permit No. 201000003
Project Address: 4241 East Live Oak Avenue Arcadia, CA

Dear Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning:

This Review Report of the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park ("Park") Closure Impact Report ("Report") prepared by Overland, Pacific and Cutler (OPC) is intended for Prime Enterprises, LLC, to fulfill its due diligence requirement that is required by the Los Angeles County Code Chapter 8.57 and the state Mobilehome relocation throughout Southern California. Epic is familiar with regulations and guidelines governing the relocation process.

Epic has reviewed the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park Closure Impact Report thoroughly, paying close attention to compliance with Chapter 8.57 and State Mobilehome Residency Law.

Additional fact checking was performed for verification of pertinent information contained in the Closure Impact Report in relation to the compliance with applicable regulations, letters and maps and available resources. Below are the findings and recommendations.

Compliance with Applicable Regulations:

The Closure Impact Report which is the subject of this Review has been found to be compliance with the governing regulations. Although not specifically outlined in the Mobilehome Residency Law or County Code 8.57, Epic suggests that the following will enhance the Report and make the relocation activities as smooth as possible:

Creating Land Solutions for the Public Good
www.epicland.com
October 4, 2010
Page 2

- The Report did not include photographs of the 37 coaches that are being affected by the closure. These photos can help document the condition of the coaches before closure.

- The Report did not mention availability of temporary housing for those households which may have a more difficult time finding a replacement. Related to the fact that the Report stated that some park residents could face special challenges finding a replacement due to age of the coaches and finances, health and age of the occupants.

**Verification of Maps, Relocation Benefits and Letters Presented in the Report:**

Epic has reviewed the letters, maps and relocation benefits that were used in the Report as its exhibits. They all appeared to be adequate and seem to provide the sufficient information pursuant to the governing regulations.

**Available Resources**

Epic has reviewed the available data which was used as the basis for the Report. The available resource section of the Report appears to meet all the requirements. However, as noted above, it is recommended that this section of the Report be amended to include available resources for the households which might require temporary displacement in order to meet project schedule.

**Conclusion**

Epic affirms that this Report complies with County Code Chapter 8.57 and the state Mobilehome Residency Law. Epic’s suggestions to add photos of the coaches involved in the relocation and include resources for temporary housing are merely suggestions to enhance the Report and are not required for compliance with the County and State regulations. Overall, the Report was well structured and informative.

Sincerely,

Ray Meiner
Regional Manager

Cc: Steve Zuckerman

www.epicland.com
RIGHT OF WAY SOLUTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD
Closure Impact Report Review Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closure Impact Report</td>
<td>Overland, Pacific &amp; Cutler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparer:</td>
<td>Epic Land Solutions, Inc. – Kathy Cabanilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed For:</td>
<td>Prime Enterprises, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Information</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
<th>Action Suggested</th>
<th>Action Recommended (but not required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Site Photos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos of coaches that have to be relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Mitigation Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible temporary housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The photos and temporary housing information may be provided in a separate supplement to the report and notices may be delivered to residents prior or as part of the state required 6 Month Notice of Closure.
Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park
Closure Impact Report

Prepared by:
Overland, Pacific & Cutler, Inc.
3750 Schaufele Ave., Suite 150
Long Beach, California 90808
www.opcservices.com

February 24, 2010
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Prime Enterprises, LLC (the “Owner”), owner of the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park (the “Park”) located at 4241 East Live Oak, Arcadia, California is proposing a five-phase 318 unit residential townhouse-condominium development with three- and four-story mid-rise podium residential structures with subterranean parking. No governmental assistance in any part of the proposed development is proposed. As a result of the proposed development, the closure of the Park will be required.

Pursuant to the Los Angeles County Code, Title 8, Chapter 8.57.300 (the “Code”), prior to the change of use or closure of the Park, the Owner is required to file with the Los Angeles County Planning Director, a report on the impact of the closure upon the residents who will be displaced (the “Closure Impact Report” or “CIR”). The requirements of the Code are also consistent with the requirements of California Government Code Section 65863.7; hereinafter to be also known as the “Code”.

The Park, located in an unincorporated area of the County of Los Angeles within a South Arcadia community, is situated on approximately 12 acres. The Park has a total of 228 mobile home spaces. Currently, only 37 spaces are occupied and the rest are vacant (See Exhibit A for a map of the Park). Of the 37 occupied spaces, 23 are occupied by residents who own their mobile home and 14 are occupied by tenants renting Park owned mobile homes.

The Owner has contracted with Overland, Pacific & Cutler, Inc. (OPC), a firm with relevant experience in the closure of mobile home parks and relocation of residents from all types of housing types, to prepare the necessary CIR on the impact of the closure upon the residents of the Santa Anita Village Mobile Home Park.
In order to prepare the CIR, OPC analyzed resident data provided by the Owner, performed a comprehensive study of mobile home park and other housing resources in the surrounding area of the Park.

Consistent with the Code, the CIR presents:

1. Demographic data from the survey of the Park residents who will be displaced;
2. The availability of adequate replacement housing;
3. Reasonable relocation costs for each resident of the Park;
4. Identification of the adverse impacts of the closure; and
5. Proposed steps to be taken to mitigate adverse impacts associated with the proposed closure of the Park.
A. THE REGIONAL LOCATION

The proposed Project is located in an unincorporated area of the County of Los Angeles, within a southern area of the City of Arcadia, approximately 10 miles north-east of downtown Los Angeles. Surrounding Cities include Arcadia to the west and north, Monrovia, Irwindale and Baldwin Park to the east, El Monte to the south, and Temple City to the west. The Project site is easily accessible by Interstate Freeways 10, 210 and 605. (See Figure 1: Regional Project Location)
B. PROJECT SITE LOCATION

The proposed Project site is located at 4241 East Live Oak Avenue and it encompasses approximately 12 acres. The Project is generally bounded by East Birchcroft Street on the north, South 10th Avenue on the west, South Mayflower Avenue on the east and East Live Oak Avenue on the south. (See Figure 2: Park Site Location)

Figure 2: Park Site Location
C. LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Lot: 1 Tract No: 14525 Abbreviated Description: LOT COM AT SE COR OF LOT 1 TR # 14525 TH N 0 14'23" W 731.77 FT TH N 89 45'20" E 734.04 FT TH S ON W LINE OF MAYFLOWER AVE City/Muni/Twp: REGION/CLUSTER: 05/05416

D. TIMETABLE FOR CLOSURE OF THE PARK

After all required permits requesting the change of use for the proposed project have been approved by the Los Angeles County Planning Director, the Owner shall give the mobile home homeowners six months' or more written notice of termination of tenancy.
A. METHODOLOGY

Park resident information was provided by the Owner from survey information collected by Park management in July 2007 and updated in January 2010. Information was received from 36 of the 37 Park residents (97.3%). Survey questions of Park residents concerned contact information, household size and composition, income, employment, coach size and age, length and type of occupancy, disabilities/health problems and mortgage information, if any. An information and introduction letter regarding the preparation of the CIR was delivered to residents the week of December 10, 2007 (see Exhibit B).

B. SURVEY DATA

The Park has a total of 228 mobile home spaces. Currently, only 37 spaces are occupied and the rest are vacant (191). Of the 37 occupied spaces, 23 are occupied by residents who own their mobile home and are paying space rents ranging from $465 to $680 per month, with an average of $566; 14 are occupied by tenants renting Park owned mobile homes on a month-to-month basis. Among the 36 respondents, all 36 identified themselves as full-time Park residents. The residency status of the 1 household which did not respond to the survey was assumed to be permanent based on mailing address provided by the on-site Park manager.

The resident survey data described below in sub-sections 1-4 concern respondent Park residents as well as certain assumptions made about the non-respondent household. A table summarizing survey information for all Park residents is included as Exhibit C to this Report.

1) Full-Time Population

Among the 37 permanent Park resident households, there are 60 adults and 6 children for a total of 66 residents. The tenure of Park residents
range from less than 1 year to 29 years with an average of 10 years.

2) Occupancy

Household size ranges from 1 to 4 individuals. The household size mix is shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size (# of occupants)</th>
<th># of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Senior/Handicapped Households

There are 17 individuals 62 years or older residing in the Park. Four households have individuals with mobility problems expressing a preference for ground level accommodations or stair rails and ramps. Several other residents have moderate to serious health issues that, at this time, would not appear to restrict potential housing choices, but prefer to stay close to doctors, hospitals and other medical care.

4) Income

Income information was provided by 34 of 37 Park households. According to income standards for the County of Los Angeles (Exhibit D) adjusted for family size as published by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in April 2009, 4 households qualify as extremely low (EL) income (30% or less of area median), 17 households qualify as very low (VL) income (31%-50% of area median), 10 qualify as low (L) income (51%-80% of area median), 1 qualifies as moderate (M) income (81%-120% of area median) and 2 qualify as above
moderate (AM) income (over 120% of area median). Table 2 below outlines this information. The range of reported annual household income among the respondents was $6,000-$81,600.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Income Levels of Respondent Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Coach Data

The 23 resident-owned mobile homes in the Park range in size from 8 by 32 feet (256 square feet) to 20 by 56 feet (1,120 square feet). Most of the units have been modified with interior and exterior improvements, i.e. Expando or room additions, awnings, carports. According to the Park performed survey, excluding the Park owned mobile homes, there were 13 single-wide coaches, with or without additions, and 10 double-wide coaches.

Coach ages range from 22 years to 57 years corresponding with dates of manufacture from 1953 to 1988. Table 3 identifies the age of Park coaches as reported by the Owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Mobile Home Ages within the Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior - 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958 - 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 - 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 - 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 - current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the age range of coaches in the Park is significant, it is often difficult, by exterior physical inspection, to make age distinctions because of the general level of upgrades and modifications observable throughout
the Park. These modifications range from simple family room cabanas added to older single-wide mobile homes to major interior design work in some of the double-wide mobile homes. The exteriors of most coaches reflect a mix of various improvements including porches, painting, brick work, roofs, walkways and landscaping.

6) Mortgage Data

There are no coaches in the Park with mortgage or any outstanding loans.
One of the specific requirements of the Los Angeles County Code is to address the availability of adequate replacement housing in mobile home parks. Following is information on the availability of replacement sites in mobile home parks within a 20-mile radius of the City of Arcadia. Additionally, other available replacement housing resources have been researched, including mobile homes for sale, rental housing in Arcadia and surrounding cities and affordable/subsidized housing resources.

A. METHODOLOGY

Survey work was conducted in February 2010 using the following means and resources:

- Telephone survey of individual parks and apartment complexes
- Use of existing, proprietary mobile home park and rental apartment data from an OPC database
- Telephone contact with real estate companies specializing in mobile home properties

B. SURVEY RESULTS

1) Mobile Home Park Space

There are over 100 mobile home parks located within a 20-mile radius from the Park which includes both family and senior parks. Our survey included mobile home parks within Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Orange County. A complete list of the parks with the number of available spaces and conditions which were reported on the type of mobile homes and residents accepted is presented in Exhibit E. Based on the survey of
mobile home parks within a 20 mile radius, 79 available spaces were identified.

To further analyze the mobile home parks that may potentially accept mobile homes from the Santa Anita Village Mobilehome Park, the reported restrictions/conditions were reviewed. The main restrictions or conditions that would disqualify the Park units were the need for a new mobile home to be placed in the space. Other restrictions/conditions were spaces only available for recreational vehicles, size restrictions or spaces for owner occupied use. If the mobile home park would accept a used mobile home, it was typically qualified that the mobile home would have to be approved by management.

Based on the reported specific restrictions or conditions of mobile home parks that accept used mobile homes, 59 spaces have been identified (see Exhibit F).

Pad rent for mobile home spaces that may accept mobile homes from the Park ranged from $268 - $1,030 with an average of $890.

2) Mobile Homes for Sale

A survey of for sale mobile homes currently on the market within Los Angeles County identified 127 mobile homes, with prices ranging from $8,000 to $139,000. The available mobile homes for sale that were surveyed can be found as Exhibit G.

3) Condominiums for Sale

While the Code requires a focus on the availability of replacement housing in mobile home parks, other alternative housing options were pursued. A survey of available condominium units in Arcadia and nearby communities was conducted. The lowest priced condominium available has an asking price of $149,000 for a two-bedroom, three bath unit and the prices go up to $798,000, depending on the location. The complete list of available condominium units is presented in Exhibit H.
4) Rental Housing

While the Code requires a focus on the availability of replacement housing in mobile home parks, other alternative housing options were pursued. In that regard, a replacement housing survey was conducted to determine the availability and cost of one-, two-, and three-bedroom rental housing units in and near Arcadia. Table 4 shows the availability of rental units, rent ranges of available units and median rent per bedroom size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedroom Size</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Found</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Range</td>
<td>$625-$1,475</td>
<td>$870-$2,500</td>
<td>$1,395-$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These potential replacement housing resources offer full amenities, with prices ranging from $625 to $1,475 for a one-bedroom unit; $870 to $2,500 for a two-bedroom unit and $1,395 to $3,800 for a three-bedroom unit. The survey identified 462 available units currently available on open market for rent either in Arcadia or within the surrounding communities.
IV. RELocation Costs

The CIR shall address relocation costs for each resident of the mobile home park. The assumption in the Code is that the mobile homes can be moved. Based on the information gathered in the resource study from the mobile home parks that would accept used mobile homes within an approximate 20 mile radius of the Park, there are 59 available spaces with various requirements, including size of the mobile home. Therefore, while there are enough reported available spaces within a 20 mile radius of the Park for the 23 mobile homes proposed to be displaced, it is not likely that any of the 23 would meet the specific configuration and other requirements for those available spaces.

Additionally, while space may be identified as available and accept a used mobile home, most mobile home park operator responses qualify the statement that the mobile home would have to be approved by management. Approval by mobile home park operator management is generally concerned with condition of the unit and if it meets California Health and Safety Code and certifications of California State Housing and Community Development (HCD). Furthermore, consideration has to be given to the condition of the mobile home to determine if the condition would even allow it to be transported.

The experience of OPC has shown a preference for a new or newer mobile home in order to upgrade the quality of the park or to only accept mobile homes that are in very good condition, meeting the requirements of the California Health and Safety Code and certifications of HCD. While age is not generally stated as a factor that would prohibit the mobile home from entering a mobile home park, older mobile homes of 15+ years of age generally do not get accepted. Based on age of the mobile homes in the Park, it is believed that none of the 23 mobile homes in the Park could be moved and accepted into another mobile home park.

Notwithstanding the above, the Code requires the CIR to address the cost of relocation for each resident. For those mobile homes that can be moved, a moving estimate will be conducted and provided to the owner. However, since
the majority of the mobile homes could not be moved, coming up with a “relocation cost” would be speculative and subjective. Therefore, in 1991 the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission created a Summary of Benefits that is implied to be part of the Los Angeles County Code and is recommended be used in determining the “reasonable costs of relocation”. Although the Code does not actually specify any such relocation benefits, it is the intention of the Owner and this CIR to accept the County’s recommended Summary of Benefits as a determination of the reasonable costs of relocation.

The Summary of Benefits is enclosed as Exhibit I, with an updated Summary of Benefits adjusted for inflation through January 2010, along with the accompanying All Urban Consumers Price Index for the Los Angeles, Riverside and Orange County area, showing the percentage increase since 1991.

The Summary of Benefits provides for a basic flat fee benefit along with potential supplemental benefits depending on the distance of the move of the mobile home; size of the mobile home; disability, income and or age of the resident; or if a qualifying resident instead moves to other conventional housing. Additionally, if residents have a mortgage, depending on the original purchase price of the mobile home and if it cannot be moved, an additional payment can be made based on the provisions in the Summary of Benefits.

Since a number of the relocation cost items in the Summary of Benefits are based on specific criteria and the survey information gathered was anecdotal and not supported by actual documentation, it would not be appropriate to identify the relocation costs based on the County’s Summary of Benefits for each resident in the CIR. Rather, it is proposed that within a month of approval of the CIR by the advisory agency, each resident will be provided with a calculated benefit from a Summary Benefit Worksheet (see Exhibit J) of the relocation benefits they would be eligible to receive assuming appropriate documentation is received to support the benefit category. Otherwise, if after a month of the approval of the CIR, no supporting documentation is provided, only those items that are known will be calculated and the Summary Benefit Worksheet provided.
In addition to addressing the availability of adequate replacement housing and relocation costs, as described in the previous Sections, the Owner must report on the impacts of the closure upon the displaced residents. From data gathered in the surveys, along with the information on the availability of replacement housing resources, certain impacts are noted:

1) Increase in Rental Costs

Current space rents, which have not been increased since 2008, range from $465 to $680 per month, with an average of $566. Replacement space rents range from $268 to $1,030 per month and indicate an average increase of $324. Current Park renters pay monthly between $550 and $1,000, with an average of $779. Conventional replacement rental rates for one-, two- and three-bedroom rental units range from $625 to $1,475 for one-bedroom units, $870 to $2,500 for two-bedroom units and from $1,395 to $3,800 for three-bedroom units and indicate average increases of $384, $734 and $1,354, respectively for mobile home owners and $171, $521 and $1,141, respectively for current Park renters. Based on #2 below, increase in housing costs and or pad rents will potentially have an adverse impact on most residents.

2) Low Income or Residents on Fixed Income

Of those reporting on income, 91% of the Park residents fall within or below the Low Income Category (4 - extremely low income, 17 - very low income and 10 - low income) (see Exhibit D for income limits). The fixed and low income of certain Park residents may adversely impact their ability to pay for first months rent and any security deposits, as well as pay for increased housing or qualify for a loan to purchase similar replacement housing.
3) Elderly, Disability and or Health Issues

The impact of the closure on residents who reported age, disability and health issues may limit their ability in getting to, finding and securing adequate replacement housing. Additionally, mobility or other health issues may require replacement housing with a preference for ground level accommodations or stair rails and ramps and replacement housing close to doctors, hospitals, other medical care and shopping.

4) Inability to Move Mobile Home

Coach ages range from 22 years to 57 years with 21 of the 23 being 30 years or greater. While coaches may be able to be physically "moved", it is unlikely coaches of greater than 10 years old would be accepted into other mobile home parks. The impact of not being able to move a coach into another Park requires a resident to either purchase a replacement mobile home, which they may not qualify for or have insufficient funds for such a transaction, or rent other conventional housing, e.g. an apartment.

5) Outstanding Mortgage Balances

There are no outstanding mortgage balances.

6) Disposition of Mobile Homes

All residents who cannot move their mobile home to another mobile home park face the issue of disposition of their coach. The coordination and cost will be an adverse impact to these residents as a result of the proposed closure.
The CIR is to specify the steps to be taken by the Owner to mitigate actual adverse impacts of the proposed closure on the residents who will be displaced. However, in accordance with the Code and the State Mobile Home Residency Law, any mitigating benefits provided by the Owner shall not exceed the reasonable costs of relocation. Adverse impacts that were noted earlier were possible increases in rental costs, especially those residents that are low income or on a fixed income; elderly, disabled or health issues requiring assistance on specific replacement sites; an inability to move mobile homes to other mobile home parks; and disposition of the mobile home.

The identified adverse impacts have two main components that should be mitigated, 1) monetary assistance, and 2) advisory assistance needs. Therefore, the Owner is proposing a monetary benefit and an advisory services program which are estimated to provide reasonable costs of relocation. These mitigation measures are as follows:

A. MONETARY BENEFIT MEASURE

Residents can choose one of two options:

Option 1 - Actual Physical Move Costs

Any mobile home owner, who chooses and is able to move their mobile home, will be offered the following:

1. The reasonable cost of physically moving the mobile home and movable improvements such as patios, carports and porches, to a new site, which includes but is not limited to, dismantling, packing, moving, reassembling, rebuilding, including skirting and tie-downs, utility connections and unpacking, as necessary. Payment for the physical
transportation costs to another mobile home park shall not exceed 50 miles;

2. Payment of moving costs associated with moving all personal property based on 1) an actual move by a professional moving company not to exceed the lower of at least two written estimates to a new location up to 50 miles, or 2) a fixed moving schedule based on the number of rooms occupied (excluding hallways, bathrooms and closets) from the schedule shown in Table 5, below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Fixed Payment Moving Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupant Owns Furniture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Occupant Does NOT Own Furniture**     |
| First Room                              | $400.00 |
| each additional room                    | $65.00 |

Source: Federal Highway Administration (8-22-08)

3. Payment of temporary lodging/per diem expenses for the household, if the mobile home relocation results in the homeowner being displaced over one or more nights, up to a maximum of $150 per day not to exceed 5 days.
Option 2 - County Guideline Summary of Benefits

As a second option all mobile home owners will be offered the County’s Summary of Benefits (see Exhibit I) as a determination for the reasonable costs of relocation. For those residents that cannot move their mobile home, the assumption will be made that it could be moved and the Owner will provide the eligible identified Summary of Benefits as if it was being moved within a 50 mile radius even though residents will have to purchase a replacement mobile home or move to other conventional housing.

One item that is not addressed in the County’s Summary of Benefits is the disposition of the mobile home and attached improvements that cannot be moved. While this would be the mobile home owners obligation to remove, the Owner, upon transfer of clear title to the Owner, will take responsibility for the demolition and removal of the mobile home. Otherwise, if the mobile home owner leaves the mobile home and improvements, the calculated Summary of Benefits will be offset by the cost of demolition and removal of the mobile home.

In summary, the monetary benefit measure will:

A. Provide all mobile home residents who can move their mobile home with their actual costs of relocation or provide a lump sum monetary amount with the appropriate Summary of Benefits calculation with an assumption their mobile home can be moved;

B. Pay for the demolition and removal of mobile homes that cannot be moved if they are transferred to the Owner with clear title.

B. ADVISORY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The process of having to move and find replacement housing and all that it entails is a difficult process even under the best of circumstances. Therefore, the Owner has proposed an advisory assistance program that will provide a relocation specialist to provide non-monetary assistance in the form of housing counseling to the residents, as needed.
To start, the relocation specialist will meet with each resident and verify information collected in the tenant survey supplied for the CIR. Appropriate documentation will be requested as needed and a Summary of Benefits Worksheet will be completed and delivered to each resident showing their monetary benefit calculation. From this point and in conjunction with the Owners notice to vacate, the resident can avail themselves to their Summary Benefit. This process and procedures for residents claiming their benefit is as follows:

1. Residents will provide all necessary documentation to substantiate eligibility for the monetary assistance;
2. Assistance amounts will be determined using a Summary of Benefits Worksheet and delivered to resident;
3. Resident will notify relocation specialist of intent to move and relocation specialist, in conjunction with resident, will complete and submit to Owner required claim forms to request eligible funds;
4. Owner will review and, if in conformance with previously approved Summary of Benefits worksheet, will approve and authorize payment, or request additional information;
5. The relocation specialist will issue benefit checks, which will be available at their offices for pick-up, delivered personally or mailed, depending on circumstances;
6. Final payments will be issued after confirmation that the Project area premises have been completely vacated;
7. Receipts of payment will be obtained and maintained in the relocation case file.

It is proposed that benefit payments be managed by the relocation specialist through a trust account funded by the Owner. Easy and understandable claim forms will be provided and payments based on the Summary of Benefits Worksheet. Adequate, advance payments will be made to assist residents in securing their replacement housing choice and final payments will be made after the resident has vacated the mobile home park with any deductions made, if any, for the removal of the mobile home if left in place without transfer of clear title to Owner.
Additionally, throughout the entire relocation process, the relocation specialist will be available to assist residents with their relocation assistance needs including the following:

1. Be available to provide continuous explanation of benefits so residents have a full understanding of the issues related to the closure of the mobile home park.
2. Provide residents with on-going reports of available replacement housing to preferred locations of the resident.
3. Provide assistance as needed and requested to lessen hardships by working with the resident and real estate agents, property managers, lenders in their efforts to secure replacement housing.
4. Facilitate interaction between resident and professional furniture movers and companies that will disassemble, transport and reinstall a mobile home, health care providers and others.
5. Assist residents in inspecting replacement housing if resident does not have a car or cannot drive by coordinating transportation so resident can inspect replacement housing opportunities.
6. Provide assistance in claiming eligible monetary benefits from Owner.
7. Other individual assistance that may be required on a case by case basis.

**Tenant Occupants**

There are 14 tenants who are renting Park owned mobile or manufactured homes. If no waiver of relocation benefits have been signed by a tenant occupant, the tenant will be offered the County’s Summary of Benefits (see Exhibit I) as a determination for the reasonable costs of relocation. This fee is $1,600.
The Owner of the Santa Anita Village Mobile Park has proposed a 318 unit residential development that would require the closure of the Park. The Los Angeles County Code, Title 8, Chapter 8.57.300 and California Government Code Section 65863.7, require a report on the impact the closure will have upon the residents who will be displaced. The report shall address the availability of adequate replacement housing in mobile home parks and relocation costs. Furthermore, steps are to be taken to mitigate the adverse impacts the closure of the Park may have on the residents; however, the steps to be taken shall not exceed the reasonable costs of relocation.

A search of available mobile home replacement spaces and mobile homes for sale indicated ample available space that Park mobile homes could be moved as well as mobile homes for sale. Additionally, considerable rental housing could be found in the Cities surrounding the Park. Therefore, adequate replacement housing in a variety of housing choices is available for the Park residents.

Based on the information gathered for the Report, impacts to Park residents were identified and measures were identified that could mitigate the adverse impacts the closure would have on Park residents. The mitigation measures provided adopted the County’s benefit program to meet the requirements of “reasonable relocation costs”. Furthermore, all options provide for a comprehensive relocation assistance program to assist residents with replacement housing resources, assisting with the securing of replacement housing by working with landlords and property managers, driving residents to replacement locations and coordinating advance and final payments of appropriate benefits.

It is believed that the CIR contains the information required by the Code and the State Mobile Home Residency Law, provides for adequate measures to mitigate impacts on the residents as a result of the proposed closure by accepting the County’s Summary of Benefits which address the reasonable costs of relocation and provides for an advisory assistance program to assist
residents in their efforts to secure replacement housing. Therefore, the advisory agency for the County should approve this CIR without further conditions.
March 1, 2004

All Residents and Prospective Residents
Santa Anita Village
4241 E. Live Oak Avenue
Arcadia, CA 91006

Re. Potential Closure of Santa Anita Village

Dear Resident and Prospective Resident:

This letter is to advise you that at some future date, possibly within the next three (3) years, the owner of Santa Anita Village may begin the process of closing the Park. In such event, the Park would be closed in accordance with the provisions of the Mobilehome Residency Law (Civil Code § 798 et seq.) and all other applicable law.

In the event the decision is made to close the Park, you will receive advance notice in accordance with the provisions of the Mobilehome Residency Law and will be required, upon expiration of the period specified in said notice, to move from the space you occupy and remove your mobilehome or trailer.

This letter is given to you as a courtesy so as to make you aware of the possibility of the Park's closure. This letter is not intended as a notice of closure as required by the Mobilehome Residency Law. Please sign this letter in the space indicated to acknowledge that you have read, understood and received a copy of this letter.

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please contact on-site Management.

Very truly yours,

Park Management

I have read, understood and received a copy of the foregoing letter.

Dated: ________________________________

Space #____
Santa Anita Village
4241 E. Live Oak Avenue
Arcadia, CA 91006
(626) 447-3878

Statement Regarding Potential Park Closure

I/We, the undersigned, hereby acknowledge that we are applying to rent a mobilehome/trailer unit in Santa Anita Village; and we understand that our relationship with Santa Anita Village, if approved for tenancy, would be that of a "renter" only and not as a "homeowner" as defined by the California Mobilehome Residency Laws.

I/We, the undersigned, further acknowledge that the owners of Santa Anita Village are planning the redevelopment of Santa Anita Village in the near future, possibly within two years from now. We further understand that when the redevelopment takes place, although we will be given at least sixty (60) days' notice to move from the property, we will not be provided with any assistance or consideration of any nature for the purposes of relocation at the time the park is closed or redeveloped.

Per the above declaration, I/we are willing to enter into a rental agreement with Santa Anita Village for the rental of a mobilehome/trailer unit if our application for tenancy is approved, with the full knowledge that the park will be closing in the near future and that we will not be participating in any relocation program established for the "mobilehome owners" of the park.

Dated: __________________________

Signature of Applicant

Printed Full Name of Applicant

Dated: __________________________

Signature of Applicant

Printed Full Name of Applicant

Park Management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space #</th>
<th># Adults 62 &amp; Over</th>
<th>Occupants</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>MH-YR Model</th>
<th>Single Wide</th>
<th>Double Wide</th>
<th>Enclosure</th>
<th>Move-In Date</th>
<th>Space Rent</th>
<th>Tenure at Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>20x56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-91</td>
<td>$501</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>8x44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-96</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>12x55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-01</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>8X40</td>
<td>10X16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-98</td>
<td>$568</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>20x53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-97</td>
<td>$639</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>12x56 slide out</td>
<td>Oct-98</td>
<td></td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>20x55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-99</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>16x30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec-81</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>10x40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-96</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>18x40 slide out</td>
<td>Jul-94</td>
<td></td>
<td>$552</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8x37</td>
<td>pop out</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-92</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>8x32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-90</td>
<td>$471</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>10x37</td>
<td>10x10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-91</td>
<td>$568</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>12x48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-98</td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>10x28</td>
<td>add on</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-98</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10x40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May-98</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>10x40 slide out</td>
<td>Jul-98</td>
<td></td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>20x44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-93</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>20x40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-99</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>20x43 expando</td>
<td>Aug-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>8x44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>20x45 expando</td>
<td>Oct-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>10x48 expando</td>
<td>Aug-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>$565</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-07</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-09</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
<td>$920</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  
- owned by resident, owner occupied  
- owned by Park, renter occupied  
- Park employee
The following figures are approved by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.U.D.) for use in the County of Los Angeles to define and determine housing eligibility by income level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Median:</th>
<th>$62,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Extremely Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>16,650</td>
<td>27,750</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>43,450</td>
<td>52,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person</td>
<td>19,050</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>50,750</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>59,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>67,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>39,650</td>
<td>63,450</td>
<td>62,100</td>
<td>74,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Person</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>68,550</td>
<td>67,050</td>
<td>80,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Person</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>73,600</td>
<td>72,050</td>
<td>86,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Person</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>49,150</td>
<td>78,700</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>92,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Person</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>52,350</td>
<td>83,750</td>
<td>81,950</td>
<td>98,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are per the Department of Housing and Community Development (California), Division of Housing Policy Development, effective **April 2, 2009**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plantation Mobile Estates</strong>, 1835 S. Manchester Ave, Anaheim, CA (714)770-2711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Belle Fontaine Mobile Home Park</strong>, 200 N. Grand Ave, Anaheim, CA (714)372-2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anaheim Shores MH Estates</strong>, 1919 W. Coronel Ave, Anaheim, CA 92801 (714)997-5889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Sunset Mobile Homes Estates</strong>, 211 S. Beach Blvd, Anaheim, CA (714)935-6510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Del Este Mobile Estates</strong>, 1241 N. East St, Anaheim, CA 92803 (714)271-2137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anaheim Royal Mobile Home Park</strong>, 1250 N State College Blvd, Anaheim, CA (714)935-6510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satellite Mobile Home Park</strong>, 1844 S. Haster St, Anaheim, CA (714)750-2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anaheim Mobile Estates</strong>, 3200 Bellwood, Anaheim, CA (714)428-6920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Del Ray Mobile Home Park</strong>, 1949 S. Manchester Ave, Anaheim, CA (714)750-2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palm Lodge MH Estates</strong>, 2627 E. La Palma Ave, Anaheim, CA 92806 (714)774-2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Village of Anaheim</strong>, 5815 E. La Palma Ave, Anaheim, CA (714)970-7575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Skies MH Estates</strong>, 2770 W. Linda Ave, Anaheim, CA 92801-1742 (714)282-2124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golden Skies MHP</strong>, 100 W. Midway Dr, Anaheim, CA 92805 (714)778-3508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rio Vista Mobile Estates</strong>, 320 N. Park Vista St, Anaheim, CA 92806 (714)928-2704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walden Creek Mobile Lodge</strong>, 1735 Puente Ave, Baldwin Park, CA 91706 (626)577-6296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday Lodge Mobile Home Park</strong>, 651 N. Puente Ave, Baldwin Park, CA 91706 (626)233-2867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain Blue Mobile Home Park</strong>, 1765 Puente Ave, Baldwin Park, CA 91706 (626)560-2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bell Mobile Home Park</strong>, 4874 Gage Ave, Bell, CA 90201 (323)565-1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Park &amp; Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyler Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var's Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollydale MH Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestmont MH Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7142 Orangethorpe Buena Park, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona MHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Serramonte MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke Downs Mobile Home Park, 15400 Cousino Ave., Chino, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamplighter Chino Mobile Home Park, 4400 Philadelphia St., Chino, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Grove Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Aire Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Palms Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045 N. Azusa Ave. Covina, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Glen Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Center MHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Grove Trailer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeler's Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859 Random Lane, Duarte, CA 91010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 853-8001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte Mobile Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 N. El Monte Bl, El Monte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 853-8001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookside Mobile Country Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave, El Monte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 448-9727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capri Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3541 Baldwin, El Monte, CA 91731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 443-5017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Place MHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 W. Orange Grove Fullerton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(714) 680-5447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedarhill Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2851 Rolling Hills Dr, Fullerton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(714) 524-5051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Mobile Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925 Bonita Ave, Glendora, CA 91740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 331-5405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead Mobile Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy, Glendora, CA 91740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 653-2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood Mobile Country Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991 8th Ave, Hacienda Heights, CA 91745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 893-2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda Heights, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho La Seda Mobile Home Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650 La Seda Rd, La Puente, CA 91744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 893-6213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Puente, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copacabana Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2717 Arrow Hwy, La Verne, CA 91750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 693-2044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Way Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2755 Arrow Hwy, La Verne, CA 91750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626) 783-7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Parks Within 20 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shady Lane Mobile Lodge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4138 Mission Blvd. Montclair, CA 91763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair, CA 75 1 6 $268-$310 Need to drive to see homes for sale. Used home needs to be inspected by property management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villa Montclair Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500 Moreno St. Montclair, CA 91763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair, CA 96 0 Need to drive &amp; See $440-$590 Need to drive around to get info on homes for sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunset Trailer Grove</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400 Holt Blvd. Montclair, CA 91763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair, CA 37 0 2 $600 No empty spaces available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hacienda Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4361 E. Mission Blvd. Montclair, CA 91763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair, CA 204 0 15 $380-$605 No empty spaces available, need to drive around for sale info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monterey Manor MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11250 Ramona Ave. Montclair, CA 91763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair, CA 140 0 1 $550 Only one space for 20 x 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montebello Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 E. Greenwood Ave. Montebello, CA 90640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello, CA 48 12(RV) 0 0 $425 $325 (RV) No empty spaces available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperial Village</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11101 Imperial Hwy Norwalk, CA 90651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk, CA 134 0 3 $675 Might have empty spaces in the month of March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Del Cerro Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 South Rose Dr. Placentia, CA 92870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia, CA 171 0 6 $775 Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crest Mobile Manor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3727 Easton Rd. Pomona, CA 91767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona, CA 141 0 8 $546 1 space for new home, need to get info. On who will be bringing the home in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monterey Manor Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11250 Ramona Ave. Pomona, CA 91766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona, CA 140 0 4 $500-$650 Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pomona Isla deer Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3667 W. Valley Blvd. Pomona, CA 91765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona, CA 229 3 10 $600 Need to drive around, for MH sales info. Homes need to be inspected by property management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thunderbird Trailer Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781 E. Mission Blvd. Pomona, CA 91766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona, CA 61 0 1 $450 1 home for sale double wide $30,000.00, space rent starts at $450.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Football Mobile Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 E. Football Blvd. Pomona, CA 91767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona, CA 73 0 2 $650 Need to get home info from owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montebello Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4161 E. Mission Blvd. Pomona, CA 91769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona, CA 45 0 2 $550 No vacant spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hacienda Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4361 Mission Blvd. Pomona, CA 91765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona, CA 204 0 1 $600 No vacant spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade Winds Mobile Estates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3107 N. San Gabriel Blvd. Rosemead, CA 91770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemead, CA 22 0 2 $770 1 home for $70,000, 2nd for $28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rowland Mobile Home Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441 Paso Real Rowland Heights, CA 91748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland Heights, CA 327 0 Few $885 Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fernwood MHP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10550 Western Ave. Stanton, CA 90680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton, CA 165 0 10 $950 Need to drive around, for MH sales info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland Cascade MHP 1350 San Bernardino Ave, Upland, Ca 91785 (951)360-1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar Mobile Estates 21217 E. Washington Ave., Walnut, CA 91789 (909)594-6391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek Mobile Estates 20730 Lycoming St., Walnut, CA 91789 (909)595-2753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Hills Mobile Home Park 3745 Valley Blvd., Walnut, CA 91789 (909)598-8112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Mobile Estates 2131 W. San Bernardino Rd., West Covina, CA 91700 (626)793-4707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- family park
- senior park

Need to call Anna Yzaguirre @(951)360-1649. Per the assistant the following information has to be submitted to Anna for approval to move used mobile home; will need copy of Title Papers, pictures of mobile home, and bank statements to show there $15,000.00-20,000.00 to move mobile home. Once information is received and reviewed by Anna. She will contact if mobile home in approved to be moved into desired mobile home park; if not she can provide referrals to other mobile home parks. Mailing Address to submit required info: CMS 2900 Hamner Ave., Mira Loma, CA 91752.

Need to drive around, for MH sales info.

Need to drive around, for MH sales info.

1 space available, need to drive by to see homes for sale.
Exhibit T

Parks accepting used mobile homes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Mobile Home Park Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
<th>Vacant Spaces</th>
<th>Age Requirement</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Le Belle Fontaine Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>200 N. Grand Ave, Anaheim, CA 92801</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>1/1/3</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mobile homes for sale, but you have to drive around the park to get info on them. No homes older than 10 years can be brought into the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Western Skies MH Estates</td>
<td>2770 W. Lincoln Ave, Anaheim, CA 92801</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>5/5/0</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Need to drive the park for sale info, sales handled by on-site management. Once the following information is received and reviewed by Anna, she will contact if mobile home is approved to be moved into desired mobile home park; she can provide referrals to other mobile home parks. Mailing Address to submit required info: CMS 5800 Hammer Ave., Mrs Lena, CA 92802.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rancho Monte Vista, 15850 Monte Vista Ave, Chino Hills, CA 91710</td>
<td>Chino Hills, CA</td>
<td>Chino Hills, CA</td>
<td>226/6</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>$700-$1,800</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orange Grove Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>16648 E. Orange Grove Blvd, Covina, CA 91724</td>
<td>Covina, CA</td>
<td>43/1</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Email pictures of the used home at royalpalmsunlawn.com, for move in approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Royal Palms Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>21210 E. Arrow Hwy, Covina, CA 91724</td>
<td>Covina, CA</td>
<td>167/3</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full clearance by management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brookeville Mobile Country Club</td>
<td>12700 Elcort Ave, El Monte, CA 91733</td>
<td>El Monte, CA</td>
<td>62/30</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Need to call Anna at 626-448-6727. Per the assistant, the following information has been submitted to Anna for approval to move used mobile home; will need copy of title papers, pictures of mobile home, and bank statements to show that $15,000-$20,000 is move mobile home. Once following information is received and reviewed by Anna, she will contact if mobile home is approved to be moved into desired mobile home park; she can provide referrals to other mobile home parks. Mailing Address to submit required info: CMS 5800 Hammer Ave., Mrs Lena, CA 92802.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Country Place MHP</td>
<td>1650 W. Orange Grove Blvd, Fullerton, CA 92831</td>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$775</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 space available for 12x49, no age requirements. 1 home for sale need little work for $25,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shady Lane Mobile Lodge</td>
<td>4138 Mission Blvd, Montclair, CA 91763</td>
<td>Montclair, CA</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>$200-$310</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 vacant space available for Travel Trailer, for sale by owner. Space does not include utilities. Used homes considered subject to inspection and approval by management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pomona Islander Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>3067 W. Valley Blvd, Pomona, CA 91768</td>
<td>Pomona, CA</td>
<td>72/3</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need to drive the park for owner MH info; few empty spaces available - subject to inspection and approval by management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Upland Cascade MHP</td>
<td>1350 San Bernardino Ave, Upland, CA 91786</td>
<td>Upland, CA</td>
<td>187/2</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need to drive the park for sale info; sales handled by on-site management. Per the assistant, the following information has been submitted to Anna for approval to move mobile home; will need copy of title papers, pictures of mobile home, and bank statements to show that $15,000-$20,000 is move mobile home. Once following information is received and reviewed by Anna, she will contact if mobile home is approved to be moved into desired mobile home park; she can provide referrals to other mobile home parks. Mailing Address to submit required info: CMS 5800 Hammer Ave., Mrs Lena, CA 92802.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 84</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 26</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12700 Elliott 273</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$14,944</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1380 N Citrus G16</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$19,990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1020 Bradbourne 51</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 3</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2120 E Arrow Hwy 89</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega Blvd 150</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>630 South Maple Avenue 19</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>$22,900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 221</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 165</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1020 Bradbourne 85</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 18</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 152</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 163</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1020 S Mountain Ave 23</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 142</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Avenue 95</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega Ave 188</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 84</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3620 Moreno Ave 3</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>630 South Maple Avenue 13</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3530 Damien 248</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12700 Elliott 367</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>801 W Covina Blvd 130</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1785 N Puente 15</td>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10484 Valley Blvd 4</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$34,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2717 Arrow Hwy 67</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>840 E Foothill Blvd 80</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Highway 83</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>716 North Grand Avenue E8</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>12700 Elliott Ave 73</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2717 Arrow Hwy 2</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1630 South Barranca 24</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>716 N Grand Ave G-1</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$39,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3745 Valley Blvd 139</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$39,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca 40</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3530 Damien 90</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega 79</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>208 S Barranca Ave 59</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 304</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1035 E Huntington Dr 54</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 217</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>346 N. Sunset Ave 168</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 230</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4800 North Daleview Ave 68</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3107 San Gabriel Blvd 21</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>$45,888</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>19850 E Arrow Hwy E12</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 158</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 67</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2131 W San Bernardino Rd 37</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>17350 Temple 476</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>17350 Temple Ave 139</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 251</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$49,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>208 S Barranca Ave 56</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$49,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 64</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 89</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 485</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 119</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 181</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 143</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1635 W Covina Blvd 83</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$53,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>208 S Barranca Ave 44</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$54,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>4095 Fruit St 159</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$54,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 107</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$56,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>21310 E Covina Blvd 50</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1630 S Barranca Ave 60</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2755 Arrow Hwy 111</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$57,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>17350 Temple Ave 365</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3033 Valley Blvd 84</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 48</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1630 W Covina Blvd 23</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>21010 E Arrow Hwy 4</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>17350 East Temple Ave 468</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>17350 East Temple Ave 43</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>830 South Azusa Avenue 11</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>925 W Bonita 41</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>21217 E Washington St 97</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$59,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>550 La Seda Rd 3b</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1630 W Covina Blvd 26</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4095 Fruit St 114</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>20739 Lycoming St 47</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 74</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4849 Peck Rd 73</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>19850 E Arrow Hwy F2</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3945 Bradford St 21</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>4095 Fruit 930</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 77</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1630 W Covina Blvd 95</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 48</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>201 E Arrow Hwy 35</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa 58</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 312</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>201 W Arrow Hwy 65</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1205 W Cypress Ave 238</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 239</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 155</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega 223</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$74,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 40</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3033 Valley Blvd 74</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1045 N Azusa Ave 151</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1205 Cypress St 94</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>3530 Damien 290</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1205 W Cypress 17</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 98</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$84,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 171</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1380 N Citrus Ave C3</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>21217 Washington Ave 36</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>650 S La Seda Rd 10</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>3530 Damien Ave 288</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 453</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>3800 Bradford St 302</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$88,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1735 Puente Ave 15</td>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 8</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 108</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>3745 Valley Blvd 178</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 51</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$97,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>3600 Bradford St 22</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$99,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>3033 Valley Blvd 123</td>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>$99,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1245 West Cienega Ave 140</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1635 W Covina Blvd 34</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>21210 E Arrow Hwy 30</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>17350 E Temple Ave 279</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>21210 East Arrow Hwy 84</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1245 W Cienega Ave 120</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>3800 Bradford St 42</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>17350 East Temple Ave 400</td>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>$139,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1075 West Huntington Drive E</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>812 Cinnamon Ln 30</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$169,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2660 Lake Ave 2</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>343 West Central Avenue A</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>$309,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>845 Cinnamon Ln</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$327,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1304 Mountain Avenue 201</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$320,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>315 S Alhambra St 6</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1830 Huntington Drive 14</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>999 E Valley Blvd</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1555 Welland Ave 9</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$259,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2260 Lake Ave 7</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$269,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>874 Cinnamon Ln 62</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$279,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>210 S Atlantic Blvd C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$286,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5632 N Gladye Ave D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>580 W Main St 218</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$299,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2422 Birch St C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$309,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>752 West Foothill Boulevard</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>330 North Chapel Avenue 215</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>521 W Duarte Dr C</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$319,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1122 W Huntington Dr S</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>112 N Atlantic Blvd A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1330 S Mayflower Ave L</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1821 S 3rd St 3</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>330 W Duarte Rd B</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>628 S 9th St 7</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>117 W Marshall St D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>580 W Main St 316</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>645 E Foothill Blvd J</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$339,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>551 Linwood Ave E</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$339,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>954 Swiss Trails</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>210 E Walnut Ave A</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>106 N 4th St 309</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>745 W Camino Real Ave A</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1124 West Huntington Drive 2</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1020 S Marengo Ave 3</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1128 W Duarte Rd Q</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$356,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>777 E Valley Blvd 129</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$356,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>500 Fairview Ave 12</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>21 Palmetto Dr E</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>209 N 5th St 108</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>582 W Huntington Dr L</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$389,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1522 S Baldwin Ave 14</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>129 S Marguerita Ave 6</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>88 E Bay State St 3b</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$378,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>812 S Stoneman Ave F</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$378,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>585 W Duarte Rd 30</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$379,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>106 N Chapel Ave 14</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>134 Alta St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1522 S Baldwin Ave 17</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>131 S Atlantic Blvd C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>907 W Mission Rd A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>511 E Live Oak Ave 13</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1126 Duarte Road J</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>535 W Duarte Rd 1</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>535 Oceanview Ave B</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2411 S Baldwin Ave D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>218 N Marguerita Ave B</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>100 N Electric Ave 14</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>400 S Garfield Ave 1 '</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>445 W Duarte Rd 1</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>712 S Sierra Vista Ave A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$399,990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>25 H 4th St D</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1231 S Golden West Ave 30</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>735 Southview Rd 2</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$419,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>211 E Commonwealth Ave</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>215 E Commonwealth Ave D</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$428,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>8905 Longden Ave</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$438,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>431 E Mission Rd 51</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$438,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>810 S Canyon Blvd E</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$458,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>78 E Bay State St 1B</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1309 Stevens Ave C</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1309 Stevens Ave G</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1708 S 6th St 6</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$448,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1102 Fairview Ave D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>903 W Mission Rd B</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>88 E Bay State St 1d</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$449,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>5239 Village Circle</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$454,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>228 S Olive Ave A219</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$458,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>5235 Rosemead Blvd C</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$465,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1140 E Arcadia Ave 608E</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$467,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>653 Fairview Ave 4</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1102 La Cadena St 5</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>9407 Duarte Rd 1/2</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>309 S Arroyo Dr D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$473,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1136 Arcadia Ave F</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>121 S Walnut Grove</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>5241 Rosemead Blvd B</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$486,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>205 N Palm Ave A</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1820 8th St 10</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>45 Alice St H</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$491,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>9012 E Fairview Ave D</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>505 E Live Oak St F</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1504 South Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>928 Arcadia Ave 107</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>9012 E Fairview Ave A</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$528,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>245 S Pine St E</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$529,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>6239 Primrose Ave</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$538,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>89 E Commonwealth Ave 1M</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>503 W Duarte Rd 3</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$548,888</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>447 Fairview Ave 3</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$549,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1950 New Ave B</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$559,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>88 E Bay State St 1C</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>818 Fairview Avenue F</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>150 Diamond St D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$589,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>247 S Arroyo Dr 4</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>$589,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>4825 Arden</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>4827 Arden</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>4829 Arden</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>126 Fano St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>32 Diamond St D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$598,888</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>191 Esperanza Ave B</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1115 Arcadia Ave D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>168 California St D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1014 Fairview Ave 7</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$616,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>5228 McCulloch Ave B</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>5226 McCulloch Ave C</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>5228 McCulloch Ave D</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>5238 McCulloch Ave E</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>5238 McCulloch Ave A</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$638,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>5312 McCulloch Ave</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$639,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1008 Arcadia Ave D</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$659,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>6159 Temple City Blvd</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>$668,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>140 Genoa St</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$686,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>152 El Dorado St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Condominiums for Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>331 Diamond St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$668,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>156 El Dorado St A</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$708,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>19 Genoa St B</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$738,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>57 Alice St G</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$738,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>49 E Colorado Blvd S</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>527 S 5th Ave C</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>$798,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Potential Supplemental Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Flat Fee</td>
<td>$9,580 + $3,195</td>
<td>Doublewide unit move within 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $6,390</td>
<td>Triplewide unit move within 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $3,995</td>
<td>Move over 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $800</td>
<td>Disabled Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $960</td>
<td>Qualified Resident*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $2,875</td>
<td>Qualified Resident* Move to Conv. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception A</td>
<td>$3,355 + $1,120</td>
<td>Move 20 to 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unit under 320 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>+ $2,395</td>
<td>Move over 50 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $800</td>
<td>Disabled Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $640</td>
<td>Qualified Resident*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ $5,270</td>
<td>Move to Conv. Housing if unit cannot move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception B</td>
<td>Up to $25,555</td>
<td>Includes up to $15,970 for outstanding mortgage, plus basic benefit, plus any qualifying Supplemental Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Original purchase price $43,120 to $95,820 with outstanding mortgage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception C</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Includes any qualifying Supplemental Benefits and the greater of 1) $11,980 plus Basic Benefit plus up to $15,970 for outstanding mortgage, or 2) 60% of the difference between on-site and off-site value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Original purchase price over $95,820 with outstanding mortgage and cannot move within 50 miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>Recreational Vehicle (Motorhome, Camper, Fifth Wheel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>Renter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,075</td>
<td>Minimum payment if Benefits waived for a Mobilehome Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Minimum payment if Benefits waived for Tenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Qualified Resident may waive Option to Elect Move to Conventional Housing
- The increase from 1991 was calculated based on the US Department of Labor-Bureau of Labor Statistics Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers – All Items, Jan 1991 = 140.0, Dec 2009 = 223.643, CPI increase = 59.7%

* Qualified Resident
- (a) Very Low Income; or
- (b) Low Income Senior Citizen (62); or
- (c) Low Income and Disabled per Federal Regulations
# SUMMARY BENEFIT WORKSHEET

Name: 
Address: 
Space #: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic &amp; Supplemental Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Flat Fee</td>
<td>$9,580.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublewide move within 50 miles</td>
<td>$3,195.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplewide move within 50 miles</td>
<td>$6,390.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move over 50 miles</td>
<td>$3,995.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Resident</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Resident*</td>
<td>$960.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Resident* Move to Conv. Housing</td>
<td>$2,875.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exception A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unit &lt;320 s.f.)</td>
<td>$3,356.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 20 to 50 Miles</td>
<td>$1,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move over 50 miles</td>
<td>$2,395.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Resident</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Resident*</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to Conv. Housing if unit cannot move</td>
<td>$5,270.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exception B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Original purchase price $43,120 to $95,820 with outstanding mortgage and cannot move within 50 miles)</td>
<td>See Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exception C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Original purchase price over $95,820 with outstanding mortgage and cannot move within 50 miles)</td>
<td>See Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Vehicle</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits waived if mobilehome owner</td>
<td>$2,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits waived if tenant</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Summary Benefit</strong></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

*Qualified Resident
(a) Very Low Income; or
(b) Low Income Senior Citizen (62); or
(c) Low Income and Disabled per Federal Regs.

Agreed:

Approved:
Mayflower Ave. View

View A1  • Looking south and east from intersection of Mayflower Ave. and Birchcroft St. (250 -ft.)
 "Before"  • Red lines extending across Mayflower Ave illustrate north and south edge of project.
  • Residential back and side onto the project.
  • Power lines to remain.

View A2  • Existing landscaping and mobile homes on 4241 removed.
 "After"  • Existing trees within Mayflower Ave. right-of-way to be retained as determined by DPW.
Live Oak Ave. View

**View B1**  
*Before*  
- Looking north and west from intersection of Live Oak Ave. and 10th St. (350 ft.)  
- Red lines extending across Live Oak Ave. illustrate west and east edge of 4241  
- Existing outdoor truck rental not part of project.  
- Existing Billboard not part of project.  
- Live Oak Ave. improved with pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and SCE power lines.

**View B2**  
*After*  
- SCE to remove power lines as part of master plan.  
- Landscaping for illustrative purposes.
Renderings

Introduction
Prime Enterprises is providing the enclosed renderings as requested as part Impact Analysis 6/18/07 Request for Additional Information for the proposed Plan Amendment, Zone Change, CUP and Vesting Tract Map No. 68400.

Renderings
The View Vantage - Map 1, shows the location from which the rendering was prepared. The "Before" and "After" pictures are to assist County Staff with their visualization of the proposed project along Mayflower Ave. and Live Oak Ave.

Map 1 - View Vantage Map

4241 Live Oak Ave.
October 14, 2010

TO: Wayne Rew, Chair
    Pat Modugno, Vice Chair
    Esther L. Valadez, Commissioner
    Leslie G. Bellamy, Commissioner
    Harold V. Helsley, Commissioner

FROM: Mr. Jodie Sackett, Senior Regional Planning Assistant
      Land Divisions Section

SUBJECT: PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
          GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. 200700002
          ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 200700004
          MOBILEHOME PERMIT CASE NO. 201000003
          PARKING PERMIT CASE NO. 200800002
          HOUSING PERMIT CASE NO. 201000001
          CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 200700073
          VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 068400
          AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: OCTOBER 20, 2010

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant, Prime Enterprises LLC, proposes a residential subdivision to create six multi-family lots with 318 new residential condominium units in five phases (170 townhouse units in 23 three-story buildings and 148 multi-family units in two four-story towers), a community center, club house, pool, playground and village green on 12.1 gross acres. There is an existing mobilehome park on the project site proposed to be closed. The project site is located at 4241 E. Live Oak Avenue, in the unincorporated community of the South Monrovia Islands and the Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

PARKING PERMIT DESCRIPTION

Staff would like to clarify that the requested parking permit is for "shared and reciprocal parking among all lots", and not for "less than the required guest and handicapped parking on Lot Nos. 2, 3 and 4" as previously stated. When construction is completed, the project will have more than the required amount of onsite resident, guest and handicapped-accessible parking throughout the development.
ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Staff has attached the following additional materials:

a) Revised Conditions: Revised draft parking permit conditions of approval indicating that the request is for "shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots".

b) Draft Exhibits: Draft exhibits associated with the draft Plan Amendment and Zone Change resolution documents previously submitted in the original hearing package.

c) Updated Schedule: A revised construction progress schedule has been included as part of the requested CUP Development Program.

d) Applicant Responses (Landscaping): Applicant responses to staff biologist comments regarding the conceptual landscaping plan compliance with Drought-Tolerant Ordinance standards.

e) Additional Correspondence: All additional correspondence received since Thursday, October 7, 2010.

SMT:jds
10/14/10

Attachments: (a) Revised draft parking permit conditions of approval  
(b) Draft Plan Amendment and Zone Change exhibits  
(c) Updated CUP Development Program (DP) progress schedule  
(d) Applicant responses to comments on landscaping  
(e) Additional correspondence
PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
10/20/10
RPC PUBLIC HEARING
ATTACHMENT A
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
PARKING PERMIT CASE NO. 200800002

DRAFT CONDITIONS:

This grant authorizes shared and reciprocal parking among all proposed lots as shown on

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the
applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of
the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles
County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") their affidavit stating that
they are aware of and agree to accept all of the conditions of this grant, and that the
conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 7, and until all
required moneys have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 9, 20 and 22.
Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 2, and Condition Nos. 3, 4 and 20 shall
be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.

3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers,
and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents,
officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which
action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or
any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim,
action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.

4. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the
County, the permittee shall within ten (10) days of the filing pay Regional Planning an
initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the
purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the
defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to
permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following
supplemental deposits from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount
on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance
up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of
supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental
deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be
paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code ("County Code")
Section 2.170.010.

5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and
the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
6. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400. In the event that Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 068400 should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.

7. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.

8. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

9. If any inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of the grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment (currently $200 per inspection).

10. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

11. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.

12. The subject property shall be maintained in substantial conformance with the plans marked Exhibit 'A'. In the event that subsequent revised plans are required, the permittee shall submit four (4) copies of the proposed plans to the Director of Regional Planning for review and approval. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.

13. The subject property shall be developed, maintained, and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance, or to exercise reasonable
oversight of tenants or other so that development or activities not in full compliance are allowed to continue unabated, shall be a violation of these conditions.

14. All structures, walls and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings or signage that was not approved by Regional Planning. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the development on the premises or that do not provide pertinent information about said premises.

15. In the event of graffiti or other extraneous markings occurring, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

16. The permittee or successor in interest shall continuously maintain the property in a neat, clean, and healthful condition, free of litter and debris, to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.

17. A minimum of 746 automobile parking spaces, as depicted on the approved Exhibit “A” (dated January 7, 2009) or on an approved revised Exhibit “A”, shall be provided and continuously maintained on the subject property, developed to the specifications listed in Section 22.52.1060 of the County Code. The required parking spaces shall be continuously available for vehicular parking only and shall not be used for storage, automobile repair, or any other unauthorized use. No inoperable vehicles shall be parked or stored in any required parking spaces.

18. Within five days of the tentative map approval date, the subdivider or successor in interest shall remit processing fees (currently $2,085.25) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.

19. The mitigation measures set forth in the “Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation” section of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project are incorporated herein by this reference and made conditions of this grant. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program (“MMP”). After completion of the appeal period, record a covenant and agreement attaching the MMP, and submit a draft copy to Regional Planning for approval prior to recording of the covenant, agreeing to the mitigation measures imposed by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, the permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to Regional Planning for approval. The reports shall describe the status of the permittee’s compliance with the required mitigation measures.

20. The permittee shall deposit the sum of $3,000.00 with Regional Planning in order to defray the cost of reviewing the permittee’s reports and verifying compliance with the
information contained in the reports required by the MMP. The permittee shall retain the services of a qualified Environmental/Mitigation Monitoring Consultant, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, to ensure that all applicable mitigation measures are implemented and reported in the required Mitigations Monitoring Reports.
PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
10/20/10
RPC PUBLIC HEARING
ATTACHMENT B
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 1: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 144 AND 145, ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 18 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE E'LY LINE OF LOT 3 OF TRACT NO. 14525, AS SHOWN ON A MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 300, PAGE 29 AND 30 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY, SAID POINT BEING THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF SAID E'LY LINE WITH A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT N'LY 250', MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE N'LY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE, 100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15099, RECORDED IN BOOK 319, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY;

1. N.00' 14° 23' W. 630.34'
2. S.69° 45' 20" E. 734.04'
3. S.00° 09' 27" E. 515.10' TO THE INTERSECTION WITH A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT N'LY 250', MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE N'LY LINE OF SAID LIVE OAK AVENUE.
4. S.60° 40' 35" W. 438.62' TO A POINT DISTANT N.60° 40' 35" W. 20.25' FROM THE MOST W'LY CORNER OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO SUNES & FITZPATRICK, INC., A CORPORATION, AND DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED ON JUNE 8, 1948, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 132, IN BOOK 30268, PAGE 39, OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY.
5. S.00° 14° 23" E. 253.07' TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE N'LY LINE OF SAID LIVE OAK AVENUE.
6. S.80° 49' 38" W. 81' TO THE SE CORNER OF LOT 5, OF TRACT NO. 14718, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY.

CONTINUE TO PAGE 2.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: VZ02ZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
AMENDMENT TO COUNTYWIDE GENERAL PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA COMMUNITY
PLAN AMENDMENT: 2007-00002
ON:
CATEGORY 1 TO CATEGORY 3
(PROPOSED: MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 12-22 DU/AC)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1
PARCEL 1:
⑦ N 00° 14' 23"W, 253.07' TO THE NE CORNER OF SAID LOT
⑧ S 80° 49' 38"W, 222.66' TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

LEGEND:
- PARCELS
- STREET / RIGHT OF WAY
- LOT LINE
- CUTOFF DEED LINE
- EASEMENT LINE
- ZONE CHANGE AREA
- NAP NOT A PART

MAP 1 (PAGE 2 OF 2) OF 4

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: WCOCZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR

COUNTY ZONING MAP
150H281
153H281
153H285
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 2: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, 4 AND 5 OF TRACT NO. 14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS A WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST N'LY NW'LY CORNER OF SAID LOT 2;
① S.00° 14' 23"E. 81.48'
② N.80° 49' 38"E. 20.25'
③ S.0° 14' 23"E. 19.75'
④ N.80° 49' 38"E. 108.85'
⑤ S.09° 10' 22"E. 150'
⑥ N.80° 49' 38"E. 70'
⑦ N.0° 14' 23"W. 253.07'
⑧ S.80° 49' 38"W. 222.68' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: IZCO2D_SOUTH_ARCadia
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
AMENDMENT TO COUNTYWIDE GENERAL PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA COMMUNITY
PLAN AMENDMENT: 2007-00002
ON:
CATEGORY 1 TO CATEGORY 3
(PROPOSED: MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 12-22 DU/AC)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 3: THAT PORTION OF LOT 145 OF ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 16 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE N'LY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE, 100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15099, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 318, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT IS S.80° 49' 38"W. 387.53' FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE W'LY LINE OF MAYFLOWER AVENUE, 90' WIDE AS SHOWN ON MAP OF SAID TRACT NO. 15099;
①N.00° 14' 23"W. 253.07'
②S.80° 49' 38"W. 50.63'
③S.00° 14' 23"E. 253.07'
④N.80° 49' 38"E. 50.63' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: VCOZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE Rew, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 4: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, AND 4 OF TRACT NO. 14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS A WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST WLY LINE OF SAID LOT 2, DISTANT THEREON S.09° 10' 22"E. 30.00' FROM THE S'LY LINE OF THE ALLEY SHOWN ON SAID MAP;

1. N.09° 10' 22"W. 30.00'
2. N.80° 49' 38"E. 36.00'
3. N.0° 14' 23"W. 20.25'
4. N.80° 49' 38"E. 108.85'
5. S.09° 10' 22"E. 50.00' TO A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID N'LY LINE AND E'LY PROLONGATION THEREOF THAT PASSES THROUGH THE POINT OF BEGINNING
6. S.80° 49' 38"W. 150.00' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF SAID ALLEY LYING E'LY OF A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH THE E'LY LINE OF SAID ALLEY AND WHICH PASSES THROUGH A POINT IN THE S'LY LINE DISTANT WLY THEREON 25' FROM THE SE'L CORNER OF SAID PORTION WAS VACATED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, A CERTIFIED COPY OF WHICH WAS RECORDED ON JUNE 28, 1956, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 4446, IN BOOK 51597, PAGE 68, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: VCO/ZD_SOUTH_ARCADIOA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNEREW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
CHANGE OF PRECISE PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT

ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE:
ON:

ZONING CASE: ZC 200700004

AMENDING SECTION: 22.16.230 OF THE COUNTY CODE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 1: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 144 AND 145, ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 18 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE E'LY LINE OF LOT 3 OF TRACT NO. 145246, AS SHOWN ON A MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 300, PAGE 29 AND 30 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY, SAID POINT BEING THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF SAID E'LY LINE WITH A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT N'LY 250', MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE N'LY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE, 100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15089, RECORDED IN BOOK 318, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY;

1. N. 00' 14" 23" W. 630.34'
2. N. 69' 45" 20" E. 734.04'
3. S. 09' 27" E. 515.10' TO THE INTERSECTION WITH A LINE WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT N'LY 250', MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE N'LY LINE OF SAID LIVE OAK AVENUE
4. S. 20' 40" 36" W. 436.62' TO A POINT DISTANT N. 80' 40" 36" E. 20.25' FROM THE MOST W'LY CORNER OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO SONES & FITZPATRICK, INC., A CORPORATION, AND DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED ON JUNE 8, 1949, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 132, IN BOOK 3026, PAGE 39, OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY
5. S. 00' 14" 23" E. 253.07' TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE N'LY LINE OF SAID LIVE OAK AVENUE
6. S. 80' 49" 39" W. 81' TO THE SE CORNER OF LOT 5, OF TRACT NO. 14718, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 282, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY

CONTINUE TO PAGE 2.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: VCOZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1
PARCEL 1:

7 N.00° 14' 23"W. 253.07' TO THE NE CORNER OF SAID LOT
8 S.80° 49' 38"W. 222.68' TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

LEGEND:

- PARCELS
- STREET / RIGHT OF WAY
- LOT LINE
- CUT/DEED LINE
- EASEMENT LINE
- ZONE CHANGE AREA
- NAP NOT A PART

COUNTY ZONING MAP
150H281
153H281
153H285

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: ZCOZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
CHANGE OF PRECISE PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT

ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE:

ON: ____________________________

ZONING CASE: ZC 200700004

AMENDING SECTION: 22.16.230 OF THE COUNTY CODE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 2: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, 4 AND 5 OF TRACT NO.
14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS
PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE
OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS A
WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST N'LY NWLY CORNER
OF SAID LOT 2;
1. S.00° 14' 23"E. 81.48'
2. N.80° 49' 38"E. 20.25'
3. S.0° 14' 23"E. 19.75'
4. N.80° 49' 38"E. 108.85'
5. S.09° 10' 22"E. 150'
6. N.80° 49' 38"E. 70'
7. N.0° 14' 23"W. 253.07'
8. S.80° 49' 38"W. 222.68' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: ZCOZ2D_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR

LEGEND:
- PARCELS
- STREET / RIGHT OF WAY
- LOT LINE
- CUTLINE
- EASEMENT LINE
- ZONE CHANGE AREA
- NAP NOT A PART

COUNTY ZONING MAP
150H281

MAP 2 OF 4

0 50 100 FEET
CHANGE OF PRECISE PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT

ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE: ____________________________
ON: ____________________________
ZONING CASE: ZC 200700004
AMENDING SECTION: 22.16.230 OF THE COUNTY CODE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 3: THAT PORTION OF LOT 145 OF ARCADIA ACREAGE TRACT,
IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP
RECORDED IN BOOK 10, PAGE 18 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE N'LY LINE OF LIVE OAK AVENUE,
100' IN WIDTH, AS THE SAME IS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 15099,
AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 319, PAGES 43 AND 44 OF MAPS,
IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT IS
S.80° 49' 38"W. 387.53' FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE W'LY LINE
OF MAYFLOWER AVENUE, 80' WIDE AS SHOWN ON MAP OF SAID TRACT
NO. 155099;
① N.00° 14' 23"W. 253.07'
② S.80° 49' 38"W. 50.83'
③ S.00° 14' 23"E. 253.07'
④ N.80° 49' 38"E. 50.83' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: ZC0ZD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR

COUNTY ZONING MAP
150H281
CHANGE OF PRECISE PLAN
SOUTH ARCADIA ZONED DISTRICT

ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE: ________________________
ON: ________________________

ZONING CASE: ZC 200700004

AMENDING SECTION: 22.16.230 OF THE COUNTY CODE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PARCEL 4: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 2, 3, AND 4 OF TRACT
NO. 14718, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
AS SHOWN ON MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 382, PAGE 3 OF MAPS, IN THE
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS
A WHOLE AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE MOST WLY LINE OF SAID
LOT 2, DISTANT THEREON S.09° 10' 22"W. 30.00' FROM THE S'LY
LINE OF THE ALLEY SHOWN ON SAID MAP;
1. N.09° 10' 22"W. 30.00'
2. N.80° 49' 38"E. 38.00'
3. N.0° 14' 23"W. 20.25'
4. N.80° 49' 38"E. 108.85'
5. S.09° 10' 22"E. 50.00' TO A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID N'LY LINE
AND E'LY PROLONGATION THEREOF THAT PASSES THROUGH THE
POINT OF BEGINNING
6. S.80° 49' 38"W. 150.00' TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF SAID ALLEY LYING E'LY OF A LINE
WHICH IS PARALLEL WITH THE E'LY LINE OF SAID ALLEY AND WHICH
PASSES THROUGH A POINT IN THE S'LY LINE DISTANT WLY THEREON
25' FROM THE S'LY CORNER OF SAID PORTION WAS VACATED BY
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, A CERTIFIED COPY OF WHICH WAS
RECORDED ON JUNE 28, 1968, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 4448, IN BOOK
51597, PAGE 68, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

DIGITAL DESCRIPTION: VZCOYD_SOUTH_ARCADIA
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WAYNE REW, CHAIR
RICHARD J. BRUCKNER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
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ATTACHMENT C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit Construction Drawings for Plan Check</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit and Site Utilities Permits Issued</td>
<td>2/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence Site Grading and Site Utilities</td>
<td>2/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Roadway Permits Issued</td>
<td>3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence Lighting and Roadway</td>
<td>3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence MFR &amp; Common Area Bldgs.</td>
<td>8/12, Phase by Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Out</td>
<td>9/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)

10/20/10

RPC PUBLIC HEARING

ATTACHMENT D
Date: October 5, 2010

From: Daniel Delle, ASLA, LEED GA – MJS Design Group

To: Wesley Colvin – Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

CC: Mark Schattinger – MJS Design Group
Jodie Sackett – Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
Dirk Thelen – Withee Malcolm Architects

Subject: Project: TR 068400
APN: 8511-028-017
Santa Anita Village
Responses to Comments

The following are responses to Wesley Colvin comments dated September 29, 2010 based on MJS’s Landscape Plans dated July 30, 2009:

1. Please depict or list on the landscape plan any drought-tolerant and non-drought tolerant landscaping that will be incorporated into the project. In addition, the site plan shall outline the areas of the project to be landscaped with drought-tolerant plants and/or turf, and calculations shall be provided on the site plan showing the percent of landscaped area devoted to each. (Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2240)

Please provide the calculations on the landscape plan that indicate the area devoted to drought-tolerant plants and turf.

- Please see revised L-1 Sheet, “Planting Scheme Area & Plant Recap”.
  - Areas of Drought-Tolerant vs. Non Drought-Tolerant listed with corresponding calculations shown
  - Planting List and Calculations revised.
2. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of the total landscaped area shall contain plants from the drought-tolerant plant list. (Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230)

- The total percentage of drought-tolerant planting will be 78%. Please see revised L-1 Sheet, “Planting Scheme Area & Plant Recap”.

a. The diversity of the plant pallet is impressive. Since the 75% rule applies to area and not number of species or number of individuals as depicted on the plans, the intent of this Landscape Plan with revision date of July 3, 2010, is to comply ‘Code plus’ with the Ordinance. Please make sure that the total landscaped area is a minimum of 75% and identified according to Comment 1 above.

- The total percentage of drought-tolerant planting will be 78%. Please see revised L-1 Sheet, “Planting Scheme Area & Plant Recap”.

b. This project occurs within the Los Angeles Basin & San Fernando Valley Planting Zone 3 of the County ordinance. The following species are not approved for use within this zone: (Olea europaea 'Swan Hill') Swan Hill Olive Tree, (Pinus eldarica) Afgan Pine, (Cycas revoluta) Sago Palm (Juniperus chinensis 'Kaizuka') Hollywood Juniper, (Photinia X Fraseri) Red-Top Photinia, (Salvia greggii) Autumn Sage, (Hemerocallis hybrids) Evergreen Daylilies, (Rosmarinus officinalis 'Prostratus') Prostrate Rosemary, and (Macfadyena unguis-cati) Cat Claw Vine. Since these plants are approved for use in other Ordinance zones and their water requirements are less than or equal to the plants approved for use in Zone 3, they may be used only in this plan.

- Noted.

c. (Limonium perezii) Sea lavender is not on the County approved list, but it is ranked by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Met) as a very low water use plant. Therefore, it is approved for use in this plan.

- Noted.

d. Of the Grevillea species, only the following are approved for use in the Ordinance; (Grevillea alpina) Mountain Grevillea, (Grevillea asplenifolia) Fern-leaf Grevillea, (Grevillea australis) Alpine Grevillea, (Grevillea banksii) Banks' Grevillea, (Grevillea curviflora) Narrow Curved-leaved Grevillea, (Grevillea lanigera) Woolly Grevillea, (Grevillea lavadulacea) Lavender Grevillea, (Grevillea robusta) Silky-oak. Limit your selection to these species.
• “Grevillea Species” revised to “Grevillea lavadulacea”. Please see revised sheet L-1, “Preliminary Shrub, Vine, Groundcover List”.

3. A maximum of twenty-five (25) percent of the total landscaped area may consist of turf (lawn). Please depict amount of landscaping dedicated to turf as a percentage of total landscaped area. Be advised that turf shall not be planted in strips less than five (5) feet wide, and in no event shall the total landscaped area contain more than five thousand (5,000) square feet of turf. (Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230)

Please provide the calculations on the landscape plan that indicate the area devoted to turf.

• Turf area calculations have been shown. The turf area as been limited to 4,750 s.f. (5%) which is less than the maximum 5,000 S.F. or 25%. Please see revised sheet L-1 “Preliminary Shrub, Vine, Groundcover List” column “Ground Cover and Turf” and “Landscape Plan Notes – Notes 1 and 2”.

4. Be advised that all turf in the total landscaped area shall be water efficient. Please indicate on the plan the type of turf proposed for this project. Please refer to the list shown below for appropriate turf types. (Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230)


a) The Water Efficient Turf List is under revision, since the California Invasive Plant Council lists the following five species as invasive: (Cynodon dactylon) Bermuda grass, (Festuca arundinacea) Tall fescue, (Lolium multiflorum) Annual ryegrass, (Pennisetum clandestinum) Kikuyu grass, and (Poa pratensis) Kentucky Bluegrass. Please make another grass selection from the approved list or choose a turf alternative, such as a (Carex) species.

b) If a sedge (Carex) species is planned for use, it must have a hydrozone rating between 1 to 3 within the California Friendly system of Met. (http://www.bewaterwise.com/Gardensoft/index.aspx).

* Note that sedges are not grasses, and the area calculations for turf and drought-tolerant plants must be in accord with comment 1. Therefore, it’s possible to plan a 100% drought-tolerant plant area under the Ordinance using a turf alternative, such as sedge, that can handle foot traffic.

• Turf species has been revised to (Sesuvium portulacastrum ‘SoLow’) Dwarf St. Augustine Grass. Please see revised sheet L-1 “Preliminary Shrub, Vine, Groundcover List” column “Ground Cover and Turf”.
5. All plants in the total landscaped area shall be grouped in hydrozones in accordance with their respective water, cultural (soil, climate, sun, and light), and maintenance requirements. Please show these hydrozones on the proposed plan. [Title 22, Part 21, Section 22.52.2230]

While the majority of the plants are identified as drought-tolerant according to the Ordinance, the symbol used to call one out on the plan is not clear, especially when grouped under a common symbol. Develop a planting plan that is in accord with either the Met hydrozones or WUCOLS water use requirements in the accompanying table.

- Planting legend has been revised to include the WUCOLS rating, additional a note has been added stating “All trees and shrubs are grouped with similar water needs (hydrozones) per WUCOLS – See Planting List”. Please see revised sheet L-1 “Preliminary Tree List” for WUCOLS and “Planting Scheme Area & Plant Recap” for above mentioned note.

6. Be advised that a covenant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk indicating that the owner of the subject property is aware of the drought-tolerant landscaping requirements and is also aware of how said requirements apply to the owner’s project. See the Green Building Program for a copy of the “Drought-tolerant Landscaping Covenant” at http://planning.lacounty.gov/green.

- Note has been added regarding the covenant agreement. Please see revised sheet L-1 “Landscape Plan Notes – Note 8”.

7. The plan shows plants that are considered invasive or flammable by the County of Los Angeles.

Please consider using different plants in place of: (Ligustrum japonicum 'Texanum') Texas privet, (Phoenix dactylifera) Date palm, and (Pittosporum tobira) Mock orange.

- Species have been removed or replaced. Please see revised sheet L-1 “Preliminary Tree List” and “Preliminary Shrub, Vine, Groundcover List”.

8. The landscape plan is also subject to the Department of Public Works’ Low Impact Development Standards. See the Green Building Program for a copy of all related ordinances and other Green Building Program Information at http://planning.lacounty.gov/green.
• Note has been added regarding the Public Works' Low Impact Development Standards. Please see revised sheet L-1 "Construction Notes – Note 5".

If you should have any questions or comments, please let me know.

Best Regards,

Daniel Delle
PROJECT NO. TR068400-(5)
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ATTACHMENT E
October 9, 2010

Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project: TRO068400
Location: 4241 E. Live Oak Ave. S. Monrovia Island

Dear Mr. Jodie Sackett,

All documents were scanned to a PDF Format (Adobe Reader). All page numbers below are the PDF page numbers.

We have reviewed the documents on line at your web-site and also at the Live Oak Library.
We have also noted the project was not posted on-line until Sept. 20, 2010, unlike most other projects. Most projects are posted as they occur.
Example: Staff Report
  Factual
  Draft Conditions
  Conditions
  Findings
  Library Package
  Hearing Notice

It would appear that, after several years, this project has been put on the fast track. We had meetings with all project developers some 2 years ago and some of the same problems still exist.

Nowhere in the documents or in the drawings could we find any reason given or an order stipulating that the existing Live Oak Ave entrance be moved to the Mayflower Ave side of this project. The Mayflower Ave. side is a residential neighborhood and this main entrance/exits is only a couple hundred feet from Live Oak Ave. The project site, as is mentioned numerous times, is at 4241 Live Oak Ave. Not Mayflower Ave. This driveway on Live Oak has worked quite well for the 228 mobile homes since 1950. Sixty years without a problem of undue added traffic on this thoroughfare. There is no reason to have a very small "exit only" on Live Oak Ave. and have the "only entrance" and the "main exit" on Mayflower Ave. Access per page 9 indicates the access via Lovejoy st. and the private alleyway (west side of project) are to be walled off. No access.

On page 2 & 7 states that they want a parking permit for less than what is required for Guests & H/C parking for lots 2-4 or as noted on page 4, lots 2, 3 & 5. (depends on which page you look at).
On page 6 states 746 parking spaces for a total of 30 more than required. If they are providing more, than why do they want less?
Page 13 States: "Parking Permit"
A. "There is no need for the number of parking spaces required by Part II of Chapter 22:52."
B. "That there will be no conflicts arising from special parking allowing shared facilities, tandem spaces or compact spaces."
C: "That off-site facilities, leases of less that 20 years, rear lot transitional parking lots will provide the required parking for use."
D: "That the requested parking permit will not result in traffic congestion, excessive off-site parking or unauthorized use of parking facilities developed to serve surrounding property."
Just where is this off-site parking going to be placed? This is not shown in the documents or the drawings! There is no surrounding vacant property that we are aware of except the street.
Pages 4 & 7 Amendment to the General Plan from category I (low density) to a category 3 (Medium density residential). That's 228 mobile homes (low density) to 318 new residential condos (medium density) with 3 & 4 story buildings. Page 10 states..."Land use: subject site is contained within category I as per land use category of the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan. Category I only allows 72 dwelling units on the subject property." They wish to increase to a total of 318 units, which is category 3. This is not comparable with the surrounding area. This page also states "The need for the proposed plan amendment does exist. That the particular amendment proposal is appropriate & proper. That approval of the proposed plan amendment will be in the interest of the public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good planning practices." This proposed plan is not comparable with the surrounding area, near or far. The only 4 story buildings or above anywhere in the San Gabriel valley are a couple of Hotels on Huntington Drive in Arcadia or In downtown Pasadena. Both of which are many miles from this project site and not within a residential neighborhood. What is appropriate & proper with this project? How is the project in the interest of public health, safety and the general welfare of this area. You are dumping an overbearing monster in the area. Every building in this area is single story with the exception of a few 2 story homes and very few business's.

Page 5 ..."Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by staff is less than significant or no impact on traffic."
"Traffic: Community Outreach and Los Angeles County Public Works Traffic & Lighting conclude that the project will not have significant traffic impact on the main entrance to the project and that Mayflower Ave. will have a northbound left turn lane."
This is quite a statement considering the letter that was sent from the Dept. of Public Works to Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, dated Sept. 13, 2007.
States: ... "The project will generate approximately 2,422 net new vehicle trips daily with 158 & 214 net new vehicle trips during the A.M. & P.M. peak hours" This is assuming only 25% of the residents will go to work in the morning.
This will have no impact?? This will have a huge impact.

Two Years ago we tried to get the developers to come to our home and just survey the conditions. Adding 214 more vehicles onto Mayflower southbound will have a big impact. You have to remember, all traffic coming out of this complex is going approximately 200 feet to Live Oak Ave.
Just envision all these vehicles lining up on Mayflower Ave. This has no impact?
We live at the Corner of Ashmont Ave. and Mayflower Ave. This is right in front of the proposed main entrance. All traffic exiting the complex will shine their headlights into our home while being forced to turn right onto Mayflower Ave. Also we shall hear each vehicle & smell their exhaust while they are lined up waiting for the signal light at Live Oak Ave. to change.
This in itself creates another serious problem. BLOCKED DRIVEWAYS.
The driveway to 2955 Mayflower Apartments (38 units) will be totally blocked at times. This is their only driveway.
All cars that are parked on the west side of Mayflower Ave from Live Oak Ave to the Main entrance/exit will be blocked in.
The one driveway on Mayflower Ave., for Complete Auto Repair, (located at the corner of Live Oak Ave & Mayflower Ave) will also be blocked.
The east side of Mayflower Ave. will also be impacted. Parked cars who want to go north, should have little if any impact. However, 4 driveways will be impacted for anyone turning south from the west side of Mayflower Ave.
These are: Otto's Liquor Store (corner of Live Oak Ave & Mayflower Ave.)
Marco Industries
Live Oak Mobile Home Park
The Smith Residence (Our driveway is on Mayflower Ave.)
This also holds true for all traffic turning left (southbound) from Ashmont Ave. onto Mayflower Ave. Now this is going to create a situation where vehicles are going to start to block northbound traffic. Not only will this have an impact on traffic but will create one big traffic hazard.

In addition, during the construction phase we will have not only the construction personnel going back and forth with their own vehicles but also Graders, Tractors, Big Rigs and other big machinery being brought in & out. All of this heavy equipment will tear up Mayflower Ave as this street does have a weight limit. AFTER ALL, THIS IS A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

Please reconsider the above items before any final decision is acted upon.

Thank you,

Richard & Karlyne Smith
2952 Ashmont Ave
Arcadia, Ca. 91006
626-446-1380
richkar@charter.net

cc

Gerard Hernandez
Moss & Associates

John Chin
Department of Public Works

Michael D. Antonovich
Supervisor 5th District
Dear Mr. Sackett,

I am a home owner at 2845 Ashmont Avenue, 91006-5517.

I have three questions regarding the proposed, multi-family housing development (Project Number TR068400-(5)) at the old mobile home park between Mayflower Ave. and 10th Street in Arcadia Adjacent, Los Angeles County.

1: The current plans available for download on the County's website refer to Driveway A on Mayflower Avenue as the development's main entrance and exit. The plans say that exiting the development is limited to making a right turn onto Mayflower.

My question: Will cars *entering* through Driveway A be able to drive straight from Ashmont, through Mayflower, into development? I am concerned about "cut-through" traffic on our street.

2: What is the *maximum* number of residents this new development can support? What is the "expected" number of residents? What is the minimum number of residents expected?

3: The PDF file I downloaded does not contain any maps or illustrations of what the proposed development is to look like upon its completion. Can you please provide me with a link to such images if they exist (and if it's not a hassle on your end)?

Thank you for your time,

Alex Muniz
Dear Mr. Sackett,

I am a home owner at 2845 Ashmont Avenue, 91006-5517.

I have three questions regarding the proposed, multi-family housing development (Project Number TR068400-(5) at the old mobile home park between Mayflower Ave. and 10th Street in Arcadia Adjacent, Los Angeles County.

1: The current plans available for download on the County’s website refer to Driveway A on Mayflower Avenue as the development’s main entrance and exit. The plans say that exiting the development is limited to making a right turn onto Mayflower.

My question: Will cars *entering* through Driveway A be able to drive straight from Ashmont, through Mayflower, into development? I am concerned about "cut-through" traffic on our street.

2: What is the *maximum* number of residents this new development can support? What is the "expected" number of residents? What is the minimum number of residents expected?

3: The PDF file I downloaded does not contain any maps or illustrations of what the proposed development is to look like upon its completion. Can you please provide me with a link to such images if they exist (and if it's not a hassle on your end)?

Thank you for your time,

Alex Muniz
October 14, 2010

VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Chair, Wayne Rew
Vice Chair, Pat Modugno
Mr. Leslie G. Bellamy
Mr. Harold V. Helsley
Ms. Esther L. Valadez
Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission
303 W. Temple St.
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Project No. TR068400-(5)

Dear Honorable Commissioners:

This letter serves as a formal objection to the project proposed to be located at 4241 E. Live Oak Avenue in Arcadia, Project No. TR068400-(5) ("Project"). As it is currently proposed, the Project will create aesthetic and visual blight, is inconsistent with the character and zoning of the neighborhood, and will unduly impact the surrounding residential community with increased traffic, air and noise pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and infrastructure demands.

In addition, the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this Project is legally insufficient to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). First, the Mitigated Negative Declaration does not address at all the Project’s greenhouse gas emission impacts, as required by the California Code of Regulations. This alone necessitates a denial of the current Project and a new environmental investigation. Second, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is inappropriate for the size and scale of this Project, which proposes to build 318 units of residential housing with a subterranean garage, over 740 parking spaces, a clubhouse, a pool and spa, and a village green. The "fair argument" standard requires that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") be prepared.

As a resident and home-owner on Mayflower Avenue since 1992, two blocks from the proposed Project, I will be acutely affected by the Project’s many negative impacts. I respectfully request that the Project be denied. In the least, further
environmental review is necessary, and the Project should be substantially altered to more appropriately fit within the community.

1. **The Mitigated Negative Declaration is Fatally Flawed**

Pursuant to CEQA and Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations, lead agencies are required to determine the significance of impacts of greenhouse gas emissions posed by a project. *See* 14 C.C.R. § 15064.4 (“(a) The determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions calls for a careful judgment by the lead agency consistent with the provisions in section 15064. A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project...(b)...(3)...If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with the adopted regulations or requirements, an EIR must be prepared for the project.”) The Mitigated Negative Declaration for this Project makes no mention whatsoever of greenhouse gas emissions. This alone requires denial of the proposed Project and a new environmental review of the Project.

The likely reason for this failure additionally supports the need for a new environmental review. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared in July 2009, more than fourteen months ago. It is, therefore, stale and cannot adequately address the current state of the environment. The Project should be denied and a new environmental review completed.

2. **An EIR is Required**

CEQA supplies a strong presumption in favor of requiring preparation of an EIR. Pursuant to the “fair argument” standard, an agency must prepare an EIR whenever substantial evidence in the record supports a fair argument that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.*, 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1123 (1993); *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 13 Cal.3d 68, 75 (1974).

The CEQA Guidelines echo this presumption and require an EIR where a project may cause a significant effect on the environment. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21100, 21151. A project may have a significant effect on the environment if there is a “reasonable probability” that it will result in a significant impact. *No Oil Inc., supra*, 13 Cal.3d at 83, n. 16. If any aspect of the project may result in a significant
impact on the environment, an EIR must be prepared even if the overall effect of the project is beneficial. 14 C.C.R. §15063(b)(1).

The fair argument test is a “low threshold” for requiring the preparation of an EIR. No Oil Inc., supra, 13 Cal.3d at 84. This standard reflects a preference for requiring an EIR to be prepared and for resolving doubts in favor of environmental review. Mejia v. City of Los Angeles, 130 Cal.App.4th 322, 332 (2005). As one court has stated:

“The EIR has been aptly described as the heart of CEQA. Its purpose is to inform the public and its responsible officials of the environmental consequences of their decisions before they are made. Thus, the EIR protects not only the environment but also informed self-government. (T)he ultimate decision of whether to approve a project, be that decision right or wrong, is a nullity if based upon an EIR that does not provide the decision-makers, and the public, with the information about the project that is required by CEQA. The error is prejudicial if the failure to include relevant information precludes informed decision making and informed public participation, thereby thwarting the statutory goals of the EIR process.”


Here, a fair argument exists to require an EIR. The Mitigated Negative Declaration admits that the Project could substantially increase ambient noise levels due to its parking lots and parking structure. Yet the only mitigation measures included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program relate to noise during construction. There has been no mitigation measures implemented to address the noise that will result from the Project once it is completed, including the noise related to increased traffic. Noise pollution must be adequately addressed through an EIR.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration also admits that the Project may create dust during grading and that it “has the potential to contribute to a cumulative net
increase in air quality impacts.” Under “Mitigation Measures,” however, the declaration states only that “AQMD had no comments on project” and that the mitigation monitoring program should be implemented. The air quality mitigation program includes certain steps to minimize gasoline-powered generators during construction and the use of certain energy-efficient materials or landscape to minimize HVAC use. There is no mention whatsoever of the impacts of increased traffic on air quality, nor is there any mention of mitigation measures designed to minimize dust during construction. A reasonable probability exits that the Project will significantly impact air quality, yet the mitigation measures included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are woefully deficient.

Moreover, the Mitigated Negative Declaration is wholly insufficient to address the effects of increased traffic on the environment. When listing traffic mitigation measures to be implemented by the applicant, the Declaration states only “Provide and implement studies and analysis -- ...Traffic Study...” This is an abdication of the responsibility of a lead agency under CERCLA to determine and evaluate the environmental impacts of a project. Yet the Department is aware that the Project will, in fact, result in a dramatic increase in traffic in the area, producing approximately 2,422 net new vehicle trips per day. The environmental impact of this many additional cars in the area unquestionably presents a fair argument that an EIR is required.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration also essentially admits that the Project will create visual blight, to the detriment of the surrounding area’s environment. In assessing “visual qualities,” the Declaration states that the two proposed four-story buildings, up to 66 feet in height, will be out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses, but absolutely no mitigation measures are suggested to address this visual impact. When combining this fact with the traffic, air quality, and noise impacts of the Project, the cumulative effect necessitates an EIR here. The Mitigated Negative Declaration admits as much, stating that “Traffic, water quality, visual, [and] utilities” impacts have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.

The issues raised and admitted in the Mitigation Negative Declaration alone present a reasonable probability that the Project will significantly impact the environment. Therefore, the fair argument standard requires an EIR for this Project.
3. The Proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change Are Inappropriate

The County’s Zoning Ordinance requires that an applicant requesting a zone change prove:

"A. That modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning plan as it pertains to the area or district under consideration; and
B. That a need for the proposed zone classification exists within such area or district; and
C. That the particular property under consideration is a proper location for said zone classification within such area or district: and
D. That placement of the proposed zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, and in conformity with good zoning practice."

Los Angeles County Code, § 22.16.110.

The applicant cannot do so here. There are no modified conditions in the community and there is no need for the proposed zone classification to support a zone change beyond the particular "needs" or "conditions" of this applicant alone. The surrounding community is a single-family neighborhood, as it has been for generations. There has been no shift toward R-3-22U-DP compatible uses in the parcels immediately adjacent to the Project, which are zoned for single-family residences. The difference between the proposed zoning designation and the current R-A zoning applicable to a majority of the Project's property is substantial and has no similar counterpart in the area. The Project will stand alone in this neighborhood as a monolith of high-density residential use, towering above the homes around it. Approving the requested zone change will constitute impermissible "spot zoning" and should be denied.

The same is true of the requested General Plan amendment, which seeks to change the Countywide General Plan Land Use Policy Map applicable to the entirety of the Project's 12.1 acre property from Category 1 to Category 3. This alteration more than doubles the number of units allowed per acre without any regard to the low-density residential parcels surrounding the Project.
The General Plan does not support such a huge increase in density. The Land Use Element states:

"The residential use classifications of the Land Use Policy Map are intended to describe dominant housing characteristics within the areas covered and are representative of permitted density ranges established by various city and community plans throughout Los Angeles County."

General Plan, p. III-30. The Land Use Element states that only "Minor density variations may be permitted…" Id. The proposed density variation here is not minor.

Moreover, dramatically changing the zoning density of one property simply to accommodate the pleasures of one developer to the substantial detriment of the surrounding community is not good planning practice. The proposed change in zoning and General Plan Category will open the door to future high-density development in the immediate area. Those persons who have purchased single-family homes in the neighborhood should be able to rely upon the current zoning restrictions in place without the fear that they will be increased more than twofold in order to make way for one monstrous development.

Even with the proposed amendment to the General Plan, the Project is not consistent with the General Plan and should be denied. The Project does not maintain or enhance the qualities of the existing residential neighborhood, as required by the General Plan. To the contrary, the single-family residential neighborhood surrounding the Project will suffer greatly by the visual blight created by the four-story structures and their large footprints, as well as the increased traffic and negative environmental impacts. There are no similarly tall structures in the area, which will not be adequately camouflaged with landscaping and which residents for several blocks around will have to contend with every time they look toward that area. If approved, the Project will be the largest structure or development of its kind from Temple City, South Arcadia, North El Monte, and South Monrovia to Irwindale. The Project simply does not fit in the neighborhood, as the numerous proposed amendments and entitlements sought by the applicant demonstrate. It could not be built without these onerous concessions, nor should it be.
In addition, the Project eliminates a crucial segment of the County’s low-income housing by replacing a mobilehome park. In these economic times, mobilehome parks provide much-needed housing to those with limited means. Yet, rather than accommodate these needs, the applicant explicitly declined to include any low-income units because of concerns for its own bottom line. This is inconsistent with the County’s Housing Element of the General Plan.

The County Zoning Ordinance and General Plan were put in place to reflect the current state of the community and to protect it. The Project promises to irreversibly obliterate these protections for the surrounding residential community if it is approved through permanent modifications to these essential County provisions.

Please deny this Project. The proper environmental review has not been conducted, including an analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, and the Project proposes a high-density use that is wholly incompatible with the surrounding community, the General Plan, and the zoning designation. It will also place an undue burden on its neighbors through increased traffic, air quality impacts, and visual blight.

Thank for your time and consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

Craig V. Manning

cc: Mr. Jodie Sackett