



Los Angeles County  
Department of Regional Planning

*Planning for the Challenges Ahead*



Jon Sanabria  
Acting Director of Planning

April 2, 2009

TO: Leslie G. Bellamy, Chair  
Wayne Rew, Vice Chair  
Esther Valadez, Commissioner  
Harold V. Helsley, Commissioner  
Pat Modugno, Commissioner

FROM: Ramon Cordova, Senior Regional Planning Assistant *REC*  
Land Divisions Section

SUBJECT: **VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 51153-(4)**  
**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 92-027-(4)**  
**OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 92-027-(4)**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CASE NO. 92-027-(4)**  
**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9 a, b, c, d; April 8, 2009**

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Staff submitted a hearing package to your Commission for this project on March 26, 2009 which contained an error in the staff report. Staff described the proposed RL 2 (Rural Land 2 – One Dwelling Unit per Two Gross Acres) Land Use Category of the proposed updated Land Use Policy Map of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan (“Plan”), which depicted a maximum density of 38 dwelling units based on the applicant’s submitted slope density analysis. As work is currently pending on the updated draft Land Use Policy Map, we are not at a point where the updated land use policy map can be used for this project analysis at this time. This information should therefore not be considered with respect to project consistency with the Plan. Staff apologizes for any inconvenience this may have created.

The subject property is currently depicted within the Non-Urban 2 (N2 – 0.3 to 1.0 Dwelling Units per Net Acre) land use category of the current adopted Hacienda Heights Community Plan (“Plan”). Based on the applicant’s submitted slope density analysis, which provides different densities for the zero to 25 percent (20.8 acres), 25 to 50 percent (52.3 acres), and over 50 percent (41.2 acres) slope categories, the subject property yields a maximum of 74 dwelling units. The project proposes 47 dwelling units which is consistent with the density calculations. The project will require a CUP since the proposed 47 dwelling units exceeds the low density threshold of nine dwelling units.

Based on applicable Plan goals and policies cited in the full staff report, due to the direct impacts on biotic resources and from associated grading and infrastructure required for the project, the proposed development is believed to be **inconsistent** with Plan policies and **incompatible** with the SEA designation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The following recommendation is subject to change based on oral testimony or documentary evidence submitted during the public hearing process.

If the Regional Planning Commission agrees with staff's evaluation, staff recommends that the Commission take the matter off-calendar to allow the applicant time to redesign the project to more comprehensively address the concerns raised by the Commission and staff, mainly with respect to a redesign that reduces significantly dwelling units and grading impacts, circulate the revised project through the Subdivision Committee, update the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Document as needed and to be recirculated if required, and return before your Commission for a fully noticed public hearing on the revised project.

**Suggested Motion:** "I move that the Regional Planning Commission take the matter off-calendar, and direct the applicant to more comprehensively address the concerns raised by staff, mainly with respect to a redesign that reduces significantly dwelling units and grading impacts, for the conditional use permit and oak tree permit to be revised to reflect the new revised project, to circulate the revised tentative and Exhibit "A" map through the Subdivision Committee, and for the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report to be updated as needed and to be recirculated for public review, before returning to our Commission.

OR

If the applicant does not wish to redesign the project to reduce significantly the dwelling units and grading impacts staff recommends the Commission deny Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 51153, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 92-027-(5) and Oak Tree Permit Case No. 92-027-(5).

**Suggested Motion:**  
"I move that the Regional Planning Commission indicate its intent to deny Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 51153, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 92-027-(5) and Oak Tree Permit Case No. 92-027-(5) and continue the matter for Staff to return with findings for denial."

SMT: REC  
3/31/09