



**City of South Pasadena
Planning and Community
Development Department**

Memo

Date: June 9, 2020

To: Chair and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Joanna Hankamer, Planning and Community Development Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager

Prepared By: Malinda Lim, Associate Planner

Re: June 9, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Item No. 1 – Request to Continue the Project and Public Comments for Moffat Street Extension (Project No. 2191-HDP/TRP)

The applicant for the Moffat Street Extension project is requesting to continue this project to the July 14, 2020 Planning Commission meeting to allow additional time for the public to provide comments. An e-mail from the applicant making this request is included as **Attachment 1**.

After posting of the staff report, eleven new public comments were received in opposition to the project. These new comments are included as **Attachment 2**.

Attachments:

1. Applicant's Request to Continue the Project
2. Public Comments Received After Posting of the Staff Report

ATTACHMENT 1
Applicant's Request to Continue the Project

From: [Michael Marini](#)
To: [Malinda Lim](#)
Cc: [David French](#); [Steve Scheck](#); [Joanna Hankamer](#); [Kanika Kith](#)
Subject: Moffatt Street Private Driveway / Project Number: 2191-HDP/TRP
Date: Monday, June 8, 2020 5:12:20 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Malinda,

Good afternoon. We understand that there are currently technical phone issues that are likely preventing some of the public comments from getting submitted and circulated. In light of this knowledge, we believe it is in the best interest of everyone to extend our Planning Commission hearing to the next available date. This will also allow everyone the time and opportunity to provide input and comment.

Thank you,

Michael Marini

CEO

signature_1337227930



1451 Quail Street, Suite #204 Newport Beach, CA 92660

D: 949.208.7248 x220 C: 949.903.0401 F: 877.279.6159

www.planethomeliving.com



Confidentiality Notice- The information in this email is intended only for the addressee(s) named above. Access to the email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient of this message any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken in reliance on it is prohibited and may be unlawful. The sender does not warrant that any attachments are free from viruses or other defects and accept no liability for any losses resulting from infected email transmissions. Please note that any views expressed in this email may be those of the originator and do not necessarily reflect those of this organization.

ATTACHMENT 2

Public Comments Received After Posting of the Staff Report

From: Brenda Contreras [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 11:21 AM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>
Cc: Marina Khubesrian <mkhubesrian@southpasadenaca.gov>; Diana Mahmud <dmahmud@southpasadenaca.gov>; Robert Joe <rjoe@southpasadenaca.gov>; Dr. Richard Schneider - Personal <Rdschneider0@yahoo.com>; Michael Cacciotti <mcacciotti@southpasadenaca.gov>
Subject: Public Comment Against Project Number: 2191-HDP/TRP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

South Pasadena Planning Commission,

My name is Brenda Contreras. I am a resident at [REDACTED] in Los Angeles. I am writing to urge you to vote against the proposed Moffat St Extension- Project Number: 2191-HDP/TRP.

Approval would be illegal as Planet Home Living's argument to a right to build based on the easement is not valid. The Right-of-Way Easement (Moffatt Street Vacation) document from 1962 states that "Said right of ingress and egress shall be used by Grantees individually and as a group in such a manner as not to interfere with the ingress and egress of any other Grantees..." PHL does not have consent from all parties that hold rights to the Right-of-Way Easement. PHL has not even had the courtesy to reach out to the other lot owners who have rights to the easement to discuss their access or concerns on the project. Planet Home Living has a right to ingress and egress but not a right to build without the consent of all parties involved. The parties we spoke to are against the excavation of the hill and would like for access to remain how it is, coming from Los Angeles on Lowell Ave.

This project is being piecemealed to avoid having to provide a CEQA analysis. PHL claims that they are "exempt from any California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303, Class 3 - New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures." They say that the "street improvement" is exempt from CEQA because it is being presented as a small project within South Pasadena but the plans that PHL provided to South Pasadena include curb cuts. These curb cuts directly induce growth. The CEQA Class 3 exemption only applies for construction of up to three single family residences. PHL is proposing to build seven single family residences and there are more than three curb cuts in the street plans. Unless South Pasadena is going to set a precedent and act as the lead agency on this project, they can no longer consider the "street improvement" a small project. The induced growth no longer keeps the project exempt from CEQA. This project becomes discretionary. Although the construction on the Los Angeles lots would be by-right or ministerial actions, state CEQA Guidelines, Section 15268 (d) states "Where a project involves an approval that contains elements of both a ministerial action and a discretionary action, the project will be deemed to be discretionary and will be subject to the requirements of CEQA."

Planet Home Living has harassed and threatened existing neighbors. They have not communicated information to parties who also share the Right-of-Way Easement. They have searched for illegal loopholes to get this project through. They have no regard for the endangered species and the wildlife they would be displacing. They do not

care about the destruction that they would cause to private property (our front deck) and the foundation of existing homes in this neighborhood. Los Angeles - 32 Land Use and Development Committee opposes this project on the LA side. Moffat St. should not be extended. I urge you to do the right thing, listen to the people that actually live here and have a stake in this community. Please vote against Project Number: 2191-HDP/TRP.

Kind Regards,
Brenda Contreras

From: Gregory Reynoso [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 1:40 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>
Subject: RE: Project No. 2191-HDP/TRP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Gregory Reynoso
[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90032
RE: Project No. 2191-HDP?TRP

My name is Gregory and I am writing to the members of the Planning Commission today in OPPOSITION to the project to extend and privatize Moffat St.

As a homeowner and resident of the City of Los Angeles, I am both perplexed and appalled that I must make this appeal to South Pasadena Planning Commission members. This proposed project clearly leads to immediate and long-lasting ramifications for the residents of South Pasadena and Los Angeles, alike. If South Pasadena Commission members have somehow been given final authority to determine the approval of this project, this Commission and the residents it serves should take full ownership of the ramifications of this project. If approved, all governance, utilities, and emergency services should be provided by the City of South Pasadena to any/all new construction that this project will serve. Although the lots to be developed exist in the City of LA, this project does not even allow these lots to be directly accessed by the very city in which they reside. It doesn't take a degree in Urban Planning to recognize that this is simply wrong.

It has been made clear to the Commission that members of the community from both cities obviously oppose this project. In fact, personal experience and engagement has revealed that many members of the "South Pas" community have not even been made aware of the proposed project. The most obvious question, to me, is: "How do the residents of the City of South Pasadena benefit from an approval of this project?" I can't help but wonder if there are factors in play affecting the consideration of this project that are not being shared with the members of our community.

Back in March, the members of the Planning Commission agreed to conduct a site visit as part of the follow-up to the Public Hearing. The fact that it takes a public hearing to arrive at this conclusion as part of the consideration of a project of this magnitude is beyond me. I sincerely hope that all members have had the opportunity to conduct this site visit before making a final decision.

I live in a diverse and historic community. You can call it "El Sereno", "Los Angeles", or

"South Pasadena". This neighborhood has value. The fact that an Orange County developer wants to build a series of modern luxury homes next door to me is proof of that. My modest, two-bedroom home built in 1927 is only one out of dozens directly affected by this project. I ask that the members of the Planning Commission consider the inherent value of this historic community as it currently exists. The extension and privatization of Moffat St. will permanently alter the soul of this humble, diverse, working-class community. Thank you for your serious consideration of this decision.

-----Original Message-----

From: Melissa Strype [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, June 7, 2020 8:45 AM

To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>

Subject: Oppose Project 2191-HDP/TRP for Tuesday 6/9/20 Public hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

My name is Melissa Strype and I oppose Project 2191-HDP/TRP. I oppose Planet Home Living building luxury homes on Moffat St in El Sereno and I oppose the construction of a private driveway through south Pasadena. The construction involved in both of these projects would contribute to the harm and extinction of endangered Southern California Black Walnut tree, kill various native plants and displace an arrive of native wildlife, create water run-off issues for those at all ends of the bottom of the hill. This is a very special and historic part of Los Angeles/South Pasadena, with residents who care deeply about the plant and animal ecosystems that this corner of the city holds. It is truly remarkable to see the variety of trees and wildlife in this segment of the city. The residents unanimously oppose this project. It does not serve our needs to protect the land and wildlife and our current homes. We are all for investment in our neighborhood but we ask that you find other ways to invest in our community like helping to protect the wildlife and trees, not bring in a developer from Orange County to build and destroy important history and nature of our neighborhood.

Please oppose this project moving forward. Thank you and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Melissa Strype

Resident el Serena/south Pasadena

Malinda Lim

From: Micah Haserjian [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 3:36 PM
To: PlanningComments; Planner1
Cc: Marina Khubesrian; Diana Mahmud; Robert Joe; Dr. Richard Schneider - Personal; Michael Cacciotti
Subject: Public Comment Opposed to Project Number: 2191-HDP/TRP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear South Pasadena Planning Commission and Planning Department,

My name is Micah Haserjian and I am a resident/property owner at [REDACTED] in Los Angeles. I am writing to urge you to vote against the proposed Moffat St Extension- Project Number: 2191-HDP/TRP.

The ingress/egress easement document from 1962 is situated on privately owned land (APN No's :5310-006-039, 5310-006-038, 5310-005-010, 5310-005-011, and 5310-005-004). The city of South Pasadena has no right to grant Planet Home Living (PHL) the right to excavate and heavily grade the hillside to construct a new street on this easement. South Pasadena gave up their role as the Grantor of the easement when the lots were sold to the private individuals. PHL has not secured permission from the Grantors (owners of the private lots) of the easement to make changes to the grade. Section (2) of the easement states *"...Grantees shall make no changes in the grades of said Moffatt Street (Vacated), without first obtaining the approval of the Grantor."*

Additionally, there are several other lots that are party to this easement besides PHL. PHL has not even contacted the owners of these lots to obtain approval to modify the current ingress/egress access that they have.

Next, as stated before, our 1932 home at 4519 Lowell Ave has the right to a prescriptive easement that falls on APN 5310-006-038 due to our deck and driveway being constructed on this parcel unopposed, decades ago. PHL has reached out to us regarding their proposed plans to demolish our property and only provide driveway access to our garage. Based on their plans, they are proposing to:

- Demolish our deck that is at the front entrance of our home.
- Deny us access to our two parking spaces next to the deck, and destroy the landscaping adjacent to this which includes a mature South California Black Walnut tree, for which they have not applied for permits to remove.
- Remove two mature avocado trees adjacent to the current driveway entrance off Lowell Ave that feed our community.
- Place a retaining wall alongside our house, 5 feet from our bedroom window.
- Only give us access to park next to our garage, which would be about 5 feet above the grade of their proposed street (an unreasonable grade to access the garage). We then would have to traverse another 10 vertical feet or so to get to our front door.

We are in disagreement with these plans, and there are no solutions they can provide that would not destroy our current property and give us the same access we currently have and need.

Easement approval issues aside, a full CEQA analysis would be required for a project of this type. The CEQA class 3 exemption that is being claimed is not valid, since section 1503 (A.) states the maximum allowed structures the street could serve is three: *“A. One single-family residence or a second dwelling unit in a zone which permits residential uses. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences may be constructed or converted under this exemption;”*. Another reason that validates the piecemeal argument being made would be under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15268 (d): *“Where a project involves an approval that contains elements of both a ministerial action and a discretionary action, the project will be deemed to be discretionary and will be subject to the requirements of CEQA.”* Though the construction of the seven homes may be a ministerial action, this private street is not – it is subject to discretionary review.

It is clear that the members of the communities of South Pasadena and Los Angeles are both heavily opposed to the extension of Moffat St. This was voiced in the March 10th planning commission meeting for several reasons involving the project's detrimental impacts to the environment, damage to surrounding properties, gentrification and displacement of current residents, safety concerns with the increased traffic and construction, unreasonable interference with the use and enjoyment of the neighboring properties, incompatibility with the character of the neighborhood, and much more. I hope that you will be able to visit the site before a decision is made and see for yourself just how negatively this proposal would affect the current residents of this community. As of today, I believe only one member of the Planning Commission has made it out (thank you, Jane). Please deny the approval of this project and consider the best interests of your community, of the tax paying citizens, and of the surrounding neighbors who contribute to beautiful South Pasadena.

Best Regards,
Micah Haserjian

--
Micah Haserjian



From: Micah Haserjian [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 3:57 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>; Diana Mahmud <dmahmud@southpasadenaca.gov>; Marina Khubesrian <mkhubesrian@southpasadenaca.gov>; Robert Joe <rjoe@southpasadenaca.gov>; Michael Cacciotti <mcacciotti@southpasadenaca.gov>; Dr. Richard Schneider - Personal <Rdschneider0@yahoo.com>
Cc: Maria Ayala <mayala@southpasadenaca.gov>
Subject: URGENT: Public Notice for Planning Commission Meeting on Project 2191-HDP/TRP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear: Planning Department, Mayor Joe, Mayor Pro Tem Mahmud, Councilmember Khubesrian, Councilmember Cacciotti, and Councilmember Schneider,

I am writing to request that the agenda item for the Agenda Item No1 Project 2191-HDP/TRP (A Hillside Development Permit for the street extension of Moffat Street) in the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for June 9th, 2020 be rescheduled to the July Planning Commission meeting, at the earliest.

There are several concerns I have with this project and the agenda report which will be detailed in a separate email. However, the urgency of this specific request comes because of the below facts:

1. This remotely held meeting will not allow full public participation since no opportunity for comments will be allowed during this meeting via phone or other manners. Based on the public comment opposition from the previous meeting on this topic, this project is a very important concern to many South Pasadena and Los Angeles residents alike. This meeting should be held when members of the public can physically attend or provide live comments.
2. **The planning department phone number (626) 403-7720 has been disconnected.** This number was provided as a way to leave a public comment for the meeting, yet now only people can express comments through email. This is **discrimination** against those who are not well versed in communicating via email.
3. The public notice was only mailed out to those within 300 ft of the project site. The construction and future environmental concerns of this project will cause much more impact to the community than to only those within 300 ft of the project site. Given that the construction site and future impact of a street extension will most definitely extend beyond 300 ft of the actual project location, the city is hereby excluding direct notification of taxpaying citizens who will potentially incur damages due to this project.

4. The notice for consideration of this topic is much too short. The agenda packet for the topic is **397** pages, and we are given 2 business days to respond to the new (and old) information provided within this dense packet.

5. The agenda packet states that the agenda will be posted on the South Pasadena Review. As of 3:45pm June 5th 2020 this has not been posted on their website (search results at <http://southpasadenareview.com/?s=Planning+Commission> or <http://southpasadenareview.com/?s=2191-HDP%2FTRP>).

Thank you for your service to our community.

Sincerely,

Micah Haserjian

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, CA 90032

--

Micah Haserjian

[REDACTED]

Neilesh Mutyala
2050 La Fremontia St.
South Pasadena, CA 91030
neilesh_mutyala@yahoo.com

June 8th, 2020

Malinda Lim
City of South Pasadena
1414 Mission St
South Pasadena, CA 91030

PROJECT: Moffat St Extension | 2191-HDP/TRP

Dear Planning Commission,

As of February, my wife and I are the property owners of [REDACTED] one of the holders of the easement upon which the Moffat St. extension is being proposed. Planning for this project was well underway when we purchased the property, and the project's success or failure was not a factor in our decision. Out of neighborly interest, I did watch the March 10th Planning Commission meeting and like many, was struck by the intense local opposition to the new road. So I decided to look further into the issue myself, and it seems on initial review that proposed scope of the Moffat St. extension is in excessive use of the granted easement.

The previous owners of our home had a real estate lawyer review the easement rights, in preparation of disclosures for selling the home. Upon request, the lawyer shared his findings with me: that in the scope of the 50 foot easement granted for ingress and egress, building a private road is in excessive use of such easement.

Reviewing the easement rights granted, there are 2 points that suggest confirmation of this counsel's conclusion. First, that the easement is limited in scope to ingress and egress to the lots, from Moffat St. Second, that "Grantees shall make no changes in the grades of said Moffat Street (vacated) without first obtaining the approval of the Grantor."

I recognize that to comply with fire department, utility and other considerations, the road extension plan has grown to include thoughtful safety and community-oriented provisions. However, nowhere in the easement are the rights for significant "improvements" to the road granted; further, changing the grade of the road which is explicitly called out in the easement requires approval from all Grantors. I have not been asked to provide approval.

It seems logical that the easement grants the right to knock down the existing retaining wall at the end of Moffat St. to allow for ingress and egress to the lots. It is consistent with that logic that ingress and egress limited to this scope does not make the access road to those lots attractive or even feasible for development. I assume this is one main reason the lots have not been developed as private homes for ~100 years. There does seem to be significant precedence within California state law governing the scope of ingress and egress, and a clear case for how this project extends outside of this scope.

Respectfully to all stakeholders: our new neighbors, the developers and the planning commission, I am submitting this letter in opposition of this project. Should the above

points be mis-concluded by me or the previous' owners attorney, then I request the commission to address before proceeding with the vote to approve / disapprove.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'N M D', with a flourish extending from the end.

Neilesh Mutyala

██████████
South Pasadena, CA 91030

-----Original Message-----

From: Raul Anorve <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2020 1:48 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>
Subject: In opposition to 2191-HDP/TRP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Raul Anorve. I live on Berkshire Ave. in El Sereno. And I oppose the Extension of Moffat St. Such a project will be disastrous to our fragile environment. No trees should be cut. Thank you

Malinda Lim

From: Kanika Kith
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 5:04 PM
To: Malinda Lim
Cc: Joanna Hankamer
Subject: FW: Project No.2191-HDP/TRP- June 9 6:30pm agenda

From: Sharon Alcazar [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 4:21 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>; Paul Dominguez [REDACTED]
Subject: Project No.2191-HDP/TRP- June 9 6:30pm agenda

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

Our names are Sharon Dominguez and Paul Dominguez and we are the owners of [REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90032.

I am writing to state I oppose Project No.2191-HDP/TRP, agenda item #1.

We are the neighbors of 4519 Lowell and adjacent are the apartments 4520 Lowell Ave. We have attended numerous meetings and were one of 30 residents who opposed the last meeting in March (not 10 as stated).

We had a chance to review the 400 page document provided by the developer and feel that the document provided is one-sided and is in favor of the developer and not the residents on either side of property lines.

1. Even though it states that only 5 properties will be affected, this is only taking into consideration the homes on the South Pasadena property line. This document does not mention anything about the residents on the Los Angeles property line (our property).
2. In regards to utilities, sewer and electrical, it mentions the city of Los Angeles will be liable. The electricity and sewer system is located in front of our home and the developer would need to have a point of access to the homes that will be built blocking our backyard view. (how are we protected from trespassing) The statement in the pdf makes it seem that as homeowners we have no choice to comply with the developers demands even though it's been years since he has contacted us.
3. In the pdf, there is also a statement, that the land is vacant and sustainable and that the lack of the property being used to build homes can cause the increase of homeless camps. My husband has lived in our home for over 40 years and has yet to experience a homeless camp behind our residence (unlike Huntington Drive and Maycrest all the way down to Vanhorne).
4. Also in the last meeting, the council members discussed a site visit on the South Pasadena property line to view street access point. We are not sure if this was ever done. Can you clarify?

5. We also oppose the permit for numerous tree removal. Trees should not be removed. They provide oxygen and are organic food resources.

6. The developer provided plans and clarifications to the new street development, our biggest concern is the speed limit of cars entering and exiting the private street. Also, in the pdf it does not discuss trash collection.

7. The developer also discusses dwelling, landscaping, water drainage, for new homes that are intended to be built in our backyard but he does not go into detail as to where the exit point will be..through our property line? And how water drainage will affect our property line. Currently when it rains we have puddles of water that form in our backyard due to the hillside.

8. If the private street is granted, we lose the peacefulness of our cul de sac.

Lastly, we feel that the residents of South Pasadena, enjoy the peacefulness of the dead-end street and would not appreciate the increased traffic due to construction of a private street that would restrict residents of 4519 and 4520 to have access to their parking garages and their home. The hillside behind us has been abandoned for many years and even though the developer states that they won't displace wildlife and the land is sustainable, our biggest fear as residents of 4511 Lowell is that the foundation of our remodeled and surrounding homes will be affected due to the dwelling and constant digging.

We oppose this project all together and do not see the need to build 7 \$1M dollar homes and create a private street in order to access homes. Council members you voted against the project in 1961 and we ask that you do so again in 2020. Our beautiful City of Los Angeles does not need 7 additional homes. The residents of South Pasadena will lose their privacy and safety due to the new proposed road. Given the current state of our economy, we feel that his project is not necessary and is not in need of another developer to make millions of dollars based on a decision by the city of South Pasadena that would profit the city of Los Angeles. Thank you for your time.

Best,

Sharon Alcazar Dominguez & Paul Dominguez

[REDACTED]

From: Tom Foster [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 6:36 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>
Subject: Project No. 32+1-HDP/TRP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Committee,

With respect to the above subject agenda item I would like to register my rejection to project 2191-HDP/TRP due to the fact that it has no beneficial interest to the residents of South Pasadena.

If the South Pasadena Planning Commission approves the project there will be no benefit to the residents of South Pasadena. On the contrary, there will be a number of changes that directly and adversely impact residents. These include:

- A significant and substantial increase in traffic on South Pasadena streets increasing danger to residents and children
- The steep gradient of the driveway will cause stormwater runoff and associated debris to flow into South Pasadena streets
- The project foresees the destruction of a number of protected trees and species

If the Planning Commission decides to approve a project which has no beneficial impact to South Pasadena residents then we must question in whose best interests the Commission is acting.

Thank you,
Tom Foster
[REDACTED]

From: Tom Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 12:58 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: Tuesday Meeting for 2191-HDP/TRP Public Notice. and PRA Request

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Tuesday Meeting for 2191-HDP/TRP Public Notice. and PRA Request

Please provide links/webpage with public notice for June hearing for 2191-HDP/TRP.

Webpage and Google Search does not provide any links to public notice.
"Your search - "**South Pasadena**" "**Planning Commission**" "**Notice of Public Hearing**" "**2191-HDP/TRP**" - did not match any documents."

I have attempted to contact the telephone number 626-403-7720 given in a notice for June 9, 2020 meeting but was told number is "No longer in Service"

I will be available on Monday for phone communications, if not today. [REDACTED]

Based on the current status and lack of public info and apparent lack of telephone call in to the meeting on 060920, I recommend that the issue/item be postponed til July, otherwise, judicial review may be required.

Please provide requirements for appeal to City Council of South Pasadena.

Given these issues I wish to make this Public Records Act Request:

Please provide all communications and records pertaining to the Moffatt Str. extension and 2191-HDP/TRP during May and June 2020

City of South Pasadena has assumed lead agency position without concurrence with the City of Los Angeles, Dept. City Planning.
No documents have been circulated such to OPR/SCH.

Dr. Tom Williams LA-32 NC Director for North El Sereno, [REDACTED] LA,
90032-1712
[REDACTED]

From: Tom Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 1:34 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Tuesday Meeting for 2191-HDP/TRP Public Notice. and PRA Request

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I just repeated search and found
<https://www.southpasadenaca.gov/home/showdocument?id=21130>

On Friday, June 5, 2020, 12:58:13 PM PDT, Tom Williams [REDACTED] > wrote:

Subject: Tuesday Meeting for 2191-HDP/TRP Public Notice. and PRA Request
Please provide links/webpage with public notice for June hearing for 2191-HDP/TRP.
Webpage and Google Search does not provide any links to public notice.

"Your search - "South Pasadena" "Planning Commission" "Notice of Public Hearing" "2191-HDP/TRP" - did not match any documents."

Not available til 1pm

Please incorporate the following into file for 2191-HDP/TRP

I have attempted to contact the telephone number 626-403-7720 given in a notice for June 9, 2020 meeting but was told number is "No longer in Service"

I will be available on Monday for phone communications, if not today. [REDACTED]

Based on the current status and lack of public info and apparent lack of telephone call in to the meeting on 060920, I recommend that the issue/item be postponed til July, otherwise, judicial review may be required.

Please provide requirements for appeal to City Council of South Pasadena.

Given these issues I wish to make this Public Records Act Request:

Please provide all communications and records pertaining to the Moffatt Str. extension and 2191-HDP/TRP during May and June 2020

City of South Pasadena has assumed lead agency position without concurrence with the City of Los Angeles, Dept. City Planning.

No documents have been circulated such to OPR/SCH.

DATE: June 9, 2020...SUBJECT: Project No. 2191-HDP/TRP(Continued)—A Hillside Development Permit for the **street extension of Moffat Street**, which will be a **private street** extending westward from the terminus of the existing Moffat Street to allow access to seven lots in the City of Los Angeles and a Tree Removal Permit (APN No's: 5310-006-039, 5310-006-038, 5310-005-010, 5310-005-011, and 5310-005-004)

Recommendation It is recommended that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution approving Project No. 2191-HDP/TRP, Hillside Development Permit for the **street design of an extension of Moffat Street** approximately 580 feet westward and Tree Removal Permit of five trees, subject to conditions of approval.

The driveway will provide improved access to up to a total of ten lots in LA and four lots in SP, and promote some expansion that could be made through future subdivision of existing large lots to 5000+ sf single family dwellings (R1) lots.

Confusion seems to remain as to whether the project is a "Driveway" serving all parcels (LA & SP) or an extension of a public street, Moffatt Str., as the parcels would remain addressed as on Moffatt Str. with multiple numbers rather than a single number. Similarly there would be expected differences for designating a Fire Lane for truck access if it is a private driveway.

As parcels are in City of LA and reference is made to annexation of the Driveway/Street-Extension to the City of LA some form of agreement between the Cities of LA and SP should be provided.

Only two-and-one-half days of public notice has been provided.

***Agenda #1 States - private road on an easement in South Pasadena
Drawings show roadway extends into the City of LA
Request - continue item 1, 2191-HDP/TRP til July PC Meeting***

Dr. Tom Williams LA-32 NC Director for North El Sereno, [REDACTED]. LA, 90032-1712
[REDACTED]



**City of South Pasadena
Planning and Community
Development Department**

Memo

Date: June 9, 2020

To: Chair and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Joanna Hankamer, Planning and Community Development Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager

Prepared By: Malinda Lim, Associate Planner

Re: June 9, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Item No. 1 – Additional Public
Comments for Moffat Street Extension Received After Deadline (Project No.
2191-HDP/TRP)

The deadline for the public to submit comments for the Planning Commission to consider at tonight's meeting was 6:00 PM on Monday, June 8, 2020. This deadline was extended to 4:30 PM tonight for those who emailed PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov wishing to leave a voicemail. After the original deadline to submit comments passed, staff received three emailed comments today. These new comments are attached.

Malinda Lim

From: Kanika Kith
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 10:03 AM
To: Malinda Lim
Cc: Joanna Hankamer
Subject: FW: Opposed to Monday street extension

Kanika Kith | Planning Manager
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA | Planning & Building Dept.
1414 Mission Street | South Pasadena, CA 91030 kkith@southpasadenaca.gov | T: 626.403.7227

COVID-19 PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT UPDATES • For general Planning-related information and questions, please email AskPlanning@southpasadenaca.gov or call (626) 403-7220.

- For Planning project-related information or questions, please continue to contact the project planner directly via email.
- For Building-related information and questions, please email PermitTech@southpasadenaca.gov or call (626) 403-7224.
- For Code Enforcement filing, please complete the form on our website and email the completed form to CodeEnforcement@southpasadenaca.gov.
- We appreciate your business and your patience during this time.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kathy Hoang [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 11:31 PM
To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>
Subject: Opposed to Monday street extension

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear planning commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Moffat St extension (2191-HDP/TRP). I live 5 houses from the LA-South Pasadena border on the LA side, and am concerned about the negative environmental impacts of this project. There is very little natural habitat left in our urban area and it's critical that we preserve what is left. There are several trees including the endangered Southern California Walnut tree that would be destroyed by this project. I hope you will consider the resounding opposition you are hearing from the community and halt this project.

Thank you,
Kathy Hoang
[REDACTED]

Malinda Lim

From: Tom Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 1:42 PM
To: PlanningComments; Malinda Lim
Subject: Fw: Public Comments for Planning Commission Agenda Item 1 060920

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

DATE: 060920
TO: City of South Pasadena Planning Commission
CC: Malinda Lim

FROM: Dr. Tom Williams, Snr. Techn. Adviser, Citizens Coalition for A Safe Community

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #1 Planning Commission Meeting June *09*, 2020 6pm Moffat Extension [*sorry for date error 08 > 09*]

RE: Public Comments #2 pg.3 only

Thank You for the opportunity to review this project as it relates to the North boundary of the North District of LA-32 Neighborhood Council area, for which I am an elected Director to LA-32 NC. I oppose this project as currently defined and will appeal and undertake further actions if approved as currently presented.

General Comments:

The City of South Pasadena (CSP) has not approved lead agency designation for consideration of a project which includes substantial earthworks and construction within and by the City of Los Angeles (CLA).

The proposed Extension is only one part of a larger area development and, thereby approval of one, may lead to the “approval” of all, later; this is piecemealing.

The Project if implemented would lead to substantial growth inducements for large northside/hillside lots within and adjacent to the Extension as has already occurred in similar areas of CSP, along Alpha, Cam Lindo, and even 2051 La Fremontia.

Although more than 10 adjacent parcels could be served by the Extension, not all adjacent lots will be provided access to the Extension and leaving some lots as “Land-Locked”. The Extension starts as a “public street” and then become a “private driveway” without service to all adjacent lots.

Based on these and other comments please continue this Project consideration and require a more thorough presentation, along with a letter assigning Lead Agency Status to the City of South Pasadena for all elements within the CLA and CSP.

No attachment #2

pg. 3 / parag.2 There is no LACity Building Department, Dept. of Building and Safety [as mentioned in parag.3]
parag. 3 There is no "Planning Department" it is Department of City Planning.

Define "Zoning Clearance" by the LAC-DCP.

parag. 4-5 LAFCo involvements.

Provide current status of Extension site and relationship/easement contracts between current property holders in CSP and the Applicant. Have the parcels in CSP been subdivided or new easements designated?

This document needs a professional editing start to finish.

Dr. Tom Williams

Approval Process in City of Los Angeles for the Homes The seven (7) homes proposed for development in the City of Los Angeles for which the private street will serve are subject to the City of Los Angeles' Northeast Hillside Ordinance ("NEHO"). The homes are by-right and do not require discretionary review if the homes follow the standards set forth in the NEHO. The developer has provided a letter of intent (see Attachment 7) to follow all standards set forth in the stated ordinance in order to not require discretionary review. The plans of the seven (7) homes are currently undergoing plan review with the Los Angeles Building Department. The street design, classification and approval of the private street is required in order for the City of Los Angeles Building Department to determine each lot's required frontage setbacks and height requirements. Due to a designed width of the street (see Attachment 5) of only 20-feet, the street would be considered a "substandard hillside limited street" by the City of Los Angeles. After the City of Los Angeles Building & Safety Department has reviewed and approved the house plans, the applications will proceed to the Los Angeles City Planning Development Service Center Metro location for the Planning Department's zoning clearance prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.

DATE: 060920
TO: City of South Pasadena Planning Commission
FROM: Dr. Tom Williams, Snr. Techn. Adviser, Citizens Coalition for A Safe Community
SUBJECT: Agenda Item #1 Planning Commission Meeting June 08, 2020 6pm Moffat Extension
RE: Public Comments

Thank You for the opportunity to review this project as it relates to the North boundary of the North District of LA-32 Neighborhood Council area, for which I am an elected Director to LA-32 NC. I oppose this project as currently defined and will appeal and undertake further actions if approved as currently presented.

General Comments:

The City of South Pasadena (CSP) has not approved lead agency designation for consideration of a project which includes substantial earthworks and construction within and by the City of Los Angeles (CLA). The proposed Extension is only one part of a larger area development and, thereby approval of one, may lead to the "approval" of all, later; this is piecemealing. The Project if implemented would lead to substantial growth inducements for large northside/hillside lots within and adjacent to the Extension as has already occurred in similar areas of CSP, along Alpha, Cam Lindo, and even 2051 La Fremontia. Although more than 10 adjacent parcels could be served by the Extension, not all adjacent lots will be provided access to the Extension and leaving some lots as "Land-Locked". The Extension starts as a "public street" and then become a "private driveway" without service to all adjacent lots. Based on these and other comments please continue this Project consideration and require a more thorough presentation, along with a letter assigning Lead Agency Status to the City of South Pasadena for all elements within the CLA and CSP.

More Specific Comments:

2/1 Project Analysis

Street Design

The City has purview over the design and construction of the **private street**.

The proposed 30-foot wide **private street** has been revised since the March 10th Planning Commission meeting to include the following additions:

- A set of stairs with guard rails This occurs in the area where Moffat Street becomes a private street and will make it easier for pedestrians going up and down the **street** in a location that is **too steep** for a ramp.
- Street lights** Three (3) **street lights** will be installed along the **sidewalk** to provide for better visibility and safety. ***As the CSP designates the Extension as a street and include the initial portion within the public ROW, does the entire project require compliance with the "American Disability Act", including the stairway and sidewalks for the entire project. Provide a wheelchair accessible ramp for the stairway and assure all sidewalks are 42in or wider.***

2/5 The City of Los Angeles would not issue building permits to the landlocked properties without an **improved street**. The **street vacation and Right-of-Way Easement** granted by the City of South Pasadena in 1961 executes ingress and egress rights to the landlocked properties.

Earlier versions and consideration of the land-locked parcels in the CLA provided a service easement and opportunities for access through Lowell and the CLA which have not been used. The Extension will add more development in the CLA by allowing at least one lot on Lowell to be developed.

6/2 Public Notification of Agenda Item The **public** was made aware that this item was to be considered this evening by virtue of its inclusion on the legally publicly noticed agenda, posting of the same agenda and reports on the City's website, in the South Pasadena Review newspaper, and individual property mailings to those within 300 feet of the project site.

9/ WHEREAS, on May 28, 2020, the public hearing notice indicating the date, time, and location of the public hearing was published **outside City Hall** and said public hearing notice was mailed to each property owner within a **300-foot radius of the project site** in accordance with the requirements of South Pasadena....

WHEREAS, on May 29, 2020, the City of South Pasadena Planning Division, published a legal notice in the South Pasadena Review, a **local newspaper** of general circulation, indicating the date, time, and...

WHEREAS, the South Pasadena Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on June 9, 2020, at which time it considered the staff report, oral report, the testimony, and the written evidence submitted by and on behalf of the applicant and by members of the public...and approved the proposed Hillside Development Permit and Tree Removal Permit for the extension of Moffat Street which will be a **private street**.

As an undesignated Lead Agency, the CSP has used only CSP requirements of 300ft radius notice area, rather than the CLA's 500ft notices. Publicly distributed notices were only circulated through CSP media, and no records of notices for the affected communities of CLA and the LA-32 Neighborhood Council.

Provide notices of all future CSP meetings affecting CLA properties and negotiate a Lead Agency agreement with CLA.

10 SECTION 1: The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed project is Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), under Article 19 Section 15303, Class 3 – New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures of the California Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA. Class 3 exemption includes water main, sewage, electrical, gas, and other utility extensions, including **street improvements**, of **reasonable length** to serve such construction. Specifically, the project involves **street improvements** of an access easement to landlocked properties in Los Angeles.

The CSP and the Planning Commission has no jurisdiction to approve projects within the City of Los Angeles, nor the Neighborhood Council area of LA-32.

Provide the Initial Study for the Project and CEQA considerations to arrive at the Categorical Exemption which is required to submit to the County and State SCH/OPR.

Provide clear and consistent usage of street and driveway throughout all documents.

Provide an agreement with the CLA to assign CSP as Lead Agency for this Extension and all later construction related thereto.

11/ 4. The impact on surrounding properties The **proposed private street** will have a **positive impact on the surrounding properties [both cities]**. The proposed project would provide a paved access road to the **seven landlocked properties within the City of Los Angeles**, 4519 Lowell Avenue, and 2051 La Fremontia Street. The proposed project will create an easier access for the **nine properties** it serves for emergency services to reach the properties.

More than 9 properties will have access adjacent to the Extension, but as a private project, the Extension can/has limited access of some properties although the properties are immediately adjacent.

Provide all properties (within 10ft of the Project boundaries) with access to this public/private street.

The "Positive Impact" is commonly called growth inducement, the proposed Extension will cause growth inducements for "small-lot-subdivisions", "Accessory Dwelling Units", and large R-1 parcel subdivisions as has and is occurring within CLA and CSP.

Provide conditional limits on all adjacent parcels to prohibit accessory dwelling units (bungalows), small lot subdivisions, and large lot subdivisions.

11/ 5. The obstruction of sunlight to the existing adjoining residences. The proposed retaining walls help to retain the existing hillside and will be a lower elevation....The **existing homes** on Atlas Street within the City of Los Angeles are **at the top [bottoms] of the slope [Parcels drop 30-40ft]**; the **proposed development** of the single-family homes on the vacant lots **would be the cause of sunlight obstruction**.

The submittals have numerous errors and clearly shows the incomplete and inadequate knowledge and considerations of the Extension and its setting by the applicant.

No "proposed development" has been submitted for all of the "land-locked" home parcels and no sunlight obstruction would exist as they are all southerly sloped parcels.

Withdraw the entire submittal, review and revise with CSP and CLA residents and organizations, get Lead Agency designation, and recirculate all considerations along with publicly accessible documents and records.

12/ The **establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use** would not,..., be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use;

The proposed project would provide a **paved access road** to the **seven** landlocked properties..., **4519 Lowell Avenue**, and 2051 La Fremontia Street. The proposed project will create an **easier access for the nine properties**...for emergency services to reach the properties. The project is conditioned to **install stop signs, stop pavement legends, and limit lines for the north and south approaches on Maycrest Avenue** to improve traffic safety.

As a private project, provide the Homeowners Maintenance Association which will accept, conduct, and provide bonding for the Project and all related facilities thereto.

Provide specific drawings/locations for such signages, marking, and lines and for Overhead Lighting for the Extension, Moffat, Maycrest, and Lowell.

13/ 5. The design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed use would be compatible with the existing and **future land uses** in the vicinity, in terms of aesthetics, character, scale, and view protection. The proposed project would provide a **paved access road** to the **seven** landlocked properties within the City of Los Angeles, 4519 Lowell Avenue, and 2051 La Fremontia Street.

An abundance of landscaping is proposed to help screen **the wall**.

A condition was added for the properties utilizing the private street to maintain the street to be aesthetically appealing.

No viewshed analyses for CLA residents and travellers have been provided.

Landscaping would be provided to One Wall.

4519 and 2051 are not currently landlocked and have driveway access to La Fremontia and Lowell, although the two 2051 units on this property would benefit from having a second, shorter driveway, which is assumed to be part of their easement negotiated with the applicant.

13/ SECTION 6. DETERMINATION Based upon the findings outlined...and provided during the public hearing, the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena hereby approves the application for a Hillside Development Permit for the **extension of Moffat Street**, which will be a **private street** extending westward from the terminus of the existing Moffat Street to allow access to **seven lots in Los Angeles** and a Tree Removal Permit for the removal of five tree...

As shown, the eastern 180ft portion of the Project is part of the CSP's ROW and thereby part of the Public Street which would serve the driveway and parking of the apartment building at SE corner of Lowell/Moffat ROWs and streets.

Do not approve this Project/Application based on the currently inadequate and incomplete documents under consideration. If so approved, appeals and further actions will be undertaken. Continue the considerations and request further revised documents and additional public considerations.

16/ P-9. The hours of construction shall be limited to 8:00 am through 7:00 pm Monday through Friday; **9:00 am through 7:00 pm on Saturday; and 10:00 am through 6:00 pm on Sunday.**

Provide the construction work hours and special permit hours as used by CLA Dept. Building and Safety. Prohibit Sunday construction hours totally.

17/ P-12. The developer shall **provide a letter from the City of Los Angeles** confirming that the applicant has sufficiently addressed all other outstanding plan check comments and that the City of Los Angeles is ready to issue grading or building permits subject to the City of South Pasadena issuing grading permits for the **road extension**, for the combinations of properties referenced above (Condition P-11).

Provide consistent use of driveway, road, and public street as these have different definitions and standard usage by CSP and CLA.

Provide letter of agreement from CLA that the CSP is lead agency for all landlocked parcels along the CSP boundary.

17/ P-14 Street improvement plans for the **private street** shall show the sidewalk, curb, and **gutter** connecting with the existing sidewalk, curb, and **gutter** located in front of the apartment building at 4520 Lowell Avenue.

Initial 180ft of Extension is within the CSP ROW and thereby Public Street.

Provide consistent use of driveway, road, and street as these have different definitions and standard usage by CSP and CLA.

Provide letter of agreement from CLA that the CSP is lead agency for all landlocked parcels along the CSP boundary.

Provide Low Impact Development improvements and agreement of CLA to accept huge amount of street/driveway/building storm runoff. Provide conditions on Extension and all sites adjacent to and served by the Extension to collect/detain and reuse onsite of any rainfall of >3/4 inch/24 hours.

- 17/ P-16 The applicant shall submit a construction management plan for approval by the Building, Planning, and Public Works Departments. The construction management plan shall include, but not be limited to:
- a. A **proposed haul route** and location of a **proposed off-site construction staging area** where project construction workers and/or subcontractors will park and equipment will be stored. Equipment and construction staging area shall be located away from adjacent residential uses. Any construction activity that may require closing public roadways shall be identified and mitigation identified as part of the staging plan. The applicant shall obtain input from Public Works to identify haul route and staging area.

Provide the same to all CLA departments related thereto, as portions of the Extension impact on the CLA.

Based on review of available documents no haul route(s) or quantitative grading volumes have been provided for the project construction. Provide a quantitative and numerical review, including bulking factors (e.g., 25-50% bulking for exported and similar for imported – with onsite compaction), for monthly grading, imported, and removed soil/dirt and concrete/aggregate materials for the site. Based on 10 cuyd loaded volumes provide daily/weekly truck traffic along haul route(s).

Prohibit weekend hauling of bulk materials. Require approval of CLA Board of Building and Safety Commissioners consideration and approval for project.

Based on review of available documents no staging area or parking for the project construction is indicated anywhere and based on available information, no feasible construction staging, parking, and stockpiling areas are available other than the streets of CLA and CSP.

Provide specific Staging, Parking, and Stockpiling areas for the project.

- 21/ PW-10. **Water and sewer utilities** shall be provided by the City of Los Angeles. Show the location and area of trench sections for the proposed sewer and water lines connection within the private street including trench restoration detail and all utility points of connections (POC). The City of South Pasadena will not provide water and sewer utilities.

No reference is made to Storm Drainage and LID, nor where surface drainage of the Extension will reach a storm water inlet and who will be responsible for capacity and maintenance of such drainage facilities. Who will clean the gutters, inlet screens, and drains.

- PW-12. Provide clearance letter from **utility companies** for any proposed relocation of utility lines that encroach on the **properties** prior to obtaining permits for the project.

Provide clearance letter from CLA Dept. of Water and Power for power and sanitation and for water and sewerage.

- PW-13. Improvement plans for underground utilities (i.e. water, sewer, gas, electrical, telecommunications, etc.) to be placed in the **private street or easement** that will be owned and maintained by other entities shall be reviewed by the City prior to Utility Agency approval.

Provide definition of “etc.” and assure inclusion of fire hydrants, street lighting, and storm drainage receiving storm water directly/indirectly within 500ft of project boundaries,

- PW-14. The Developer shall execute and provide to the City, a written statement from the water, sewer, electrical, and gas purveyor indicating that each system will be owned, operated, and maintained by the purveyor and that under normal condition, the system(s) will meet the requirements for the **development and that each service will be provided to each building.**

Provide table of maximum planned capacities for all utilities and services within the project and all properties adjacent to the Extension development boundaries.

- 29/ Project Description The applicant, Planet Home Living (Developer), is requesting approval of a Hillside Development Permit for the **street design of the private street portion** that extends from Moffat Street **westward approximately 580 feet...** The term, “**private street**” will refer to the portion of the **street extension** and the **proposed project.**

The Project includes retaining walls, driveways, and “street-related facilities” and includes CSP ROWs and privately acquired easements.

**Provide copies of all easement agreements and use agreement/franchises for the CSP ROW.
Revise and provide consistent usage of street and driveways.**

30/ The **portion of Moffat Street** directly west of Lowell Avenue **will be a private street** to access the seven lots in Los Angeles. In addition, the Developer will also **provide driveway access** to 2051 La Fremontia Street (City of South Pasadena) on the northern portion of the private street and to 4519 Lowell Avenue (City of Los Angeles) on the southeast portion the private street.

Currently, the owners of 4519 Lowell Avenue use Lowell Avenue to arrive to their property and encroach onto the access easement to reach their garage without **proper authority**. The Developers will provide an appropriate driveway approach for 4519 Lowell Avenue but with the development of the private street, Lowell Avenue will be closed off and the owners of 4519 Lowell Avenue will need to access their garage from Moffat Street.

Define private street vs private driveway and use consistently throughout.

Private driveways, including curb cuts and ramps and the double-driveway at the west end

Define "Proper Authority" and historic use of this driveway for 4519 Lowell, use historic aerial photos.

Geology p.182 – Preliminary Geologic and Geotechnical Report

p.184 Letter 10/14/17 Geoconcepts Inc. **No signatures on stamps**

p. 185-187 maps **No stamps and use Tp, rather than Tt.**

p. 204 Stratigraphy and p.314 refer the geology to the Puente Formation (Tpss and Tpsh), **the map shows the site formation as Tertiary Topanga (Ttsl) north of Newtonia St., 800ft south of the site.**

p.227 022719 Geologic Map (text p.30). **No specific Reference citation for USGS Map. No legend of geologic units, Tp and Tt.**

Entire report is in error and requires withdrawal and revision before further considerations.

Examples of So Pasadena Lot Splits and Accessory Dwelling Units – yellow line with red dots



580ft Project Site Moffat Extension along Yellow line – supposedly 780ft.

