

CEO Summary: TR 067784
BOS Hearing: October 28, 2008
Page 1 of 3

Board of Supervisors Hearing Date: October 28, 2008

Case Summary: Project No. TR067784-(2) – General Plan Amendment Case No. 2006-00015-(2), Zone Change Case No. 2006-00012-(2), Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2006-00321-(2); Housing Permit Case No. 2006-00003-(2); and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 067784

Project Applicant: Shea Presidio Red Oak Investments

RPC Hearing Date: August 13, 2008
RPC Approval Date: August 13, 2008

Synopsis

The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission (“Commission”) held a public hearing on August 13, 2008 and took its final action on August 13, 2008, **approving the project, by a vote of 5-0.** The proposal includes General Plan Amendment Case No. 2006-00015-(2), Zone Change Case No. 2006-00012-(2), Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 067784, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2006-00321-(2) and Housing Permit Case No. 2006-00003-(2). The project proposes to create a multi-family development of 246 attached condominium units in one building, varying from two to four stories in height, with a courtyard, pool area and an attached five-level parking structure on 4.74 gross acres. The administrative housing permit is for a 20 percent density bonus (40 units) with 10 percent affordable housing (22 units) set aside for lower-income households. This project will also be constructed to meet green-building certification standards. A Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared for the project with project mitigation for traffic, noise, air quality and emergency services reducing impacts to less than significant/no impact.

The project is located at 22425-22433 S. Vermont Avenue, approximately 900 feet west of Interstate 110 (“I-110”) in the Carson Zoned District and unincorporated community of West Carson, within the Second Supervisorial District.

Project Support/Opposition

Staff’s presentation was followed by a presentation by the applicant’s representative and testimony from the applicant. Additionally, testimony was heard from six persons, including four residents, one local business owner and one property owner in the nearby area. Two persons supported the project, stating that the development would benefit the community, while the other four persons expressed some concerns while not formally opposing the proposed development. Testifier’s concerns included the following:

- Adjacent non-residential uses: One testifier, a local business owner who owns a bakery located directly to the north of the subject property, stated that he does not want the bakery operations to negatively impact the future tenants of the subject project. He also stated that the bakery's driveway is located adjacent to the proposed driveway of the subject project, and wanted to be reassured that there would be no access conflicts.
- Local employment, housing costs: Another testifier requested that the developer use local construction workers and "train apprentices". This testifier also voiced concerns that the proposed multi-family units would be too costly for the community to afford.
- Increased pedestrian traffic and privacy: Lastly, two testifiers, both nearby residents, expressed concerns about maintaining the privacy of adjacent single-family residences as existing public walkways adjacent to the development become more frequently utilized.

Commission Decision

On August 13, 2008, the Commission closed the public hearing and approved the project. The Commission discussed the following issues, adding conditions to the project's approval:

- Fair distribution of affordable housing units within the development: The Commission stated that the 22 affordable units should be evenly distributed throughout the building, and also be evenly distributed among one, two and three bedroom unit types. The Commission stated that fair distribution of the affordable units is to be ensured through the required covenant and agreement for the administrative affordable housing permit, and through the project's Conditions Covenants and Restrictions ("CC&Rs").
- Limiting the number of units that can be leased ("sublet") by future condominium unit owners: The Commission was concerned that the proposed condominium development would gradually become a poorly-maintained apartment complex over time. To help avoid this outcome, the Commission decided that a limit to the number of condominium units to be sold and then owner-leased (or "sublet") should be imposed. The Commission stated that no more than 25 percent of the total number of "ownership" units (or those units purchased and individually owned) may subsequently be leased or "sublet" by the owner.
- Visual impact of the project's front yard fencing: The Commission stated that the proposed front yard fence should be set-back from the public sidewalk, should be screened with vegetation, and should be designed in a "broken" or "offset"

configuration integrated with the front yard landscaping to help avoid a negative visual impact caused by a monotonous straight line of fencing.

- Sufficient disclosure of adjacent non-residential uses: The Commission was concerned that future residents/tenants of the condominium development would not be properly notified of the surrounding non-residential land uses, to include the bakery existing directly to the north of the subject property. To ensure notification, the Commission stated that adjacent non-residential uses shall be disclosed in a recorded covenant, in the project's CC&Rs and in the tenant's lease agreement.
- Adequate screening of the five-story parking structure: To adequately screen views of the five-story parking structure located on the northerly side of the project site, the Commission stated that "multiple screening techniques" should be used, to include architectural design features, landscaping/vegetation and any other reasonable methods necessary to reduce the long-term visual impacts of the parking structure.
- Additional recreational facilities within the development: Finally, the Commission asked if additional outdoor recreational facilities (a "basketball hoop") could be provided within the development, as feasible, so long as such facilities do not diminish the safety and security of the residents and guests.

Contact Person: Mr. Jodie Sackett (213) 974-6433

10/23/08