



## Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council

“Your Community Voice”

January 13, 2009

Los Angeles City Planning Commission  
c/o 200 N. Spring Street, Room 621  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

### **CPC 2006-8043-GPA-ZC-SP-DA**

Commissioners:

The proposed Ponte Vista development at 26900 South Western falls within the boundaries of the Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council. We have reviewed the Draft Report on the Ponte Vista Specific Plan and agree with the recommended actions and with the November 4, 2008 disapproval of the tentative tract map. We commend the staff for these recommendations.

We have some concerns with the staff report however.

[1] The report (p A-2) indicates that “the Open-Space designation appears to be a cartographic error that occurred when the site was annexed to the City of Los Angeles.” We question that conclusion since it is entirely appropriate for there to be a buffer between the Navy Fuel Depot and residential use on the remainder of the property. We suggest the City’s Emergency Preparedness staff review the matter with the Defense Department and include the analysis in the final environmental report.

[2] In discussing the Wilmington-Harbor City and San Pedro Community Plans, the report notes that “land-use impacts from the Ponte Vista site ... affect the San Pedro community.” In fact, while this property is technically in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan Area, it is physically located within the community of San Pedro, has a San Pedro address, is within the bounds of the Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council, and is located within a San Pedro census tract.

As the report points out (F-2) the General Plan Framework designates downtown San Pedro for higher-density residential land uses and denser residential development should be focused there, not at Ponte Vista. Focus of development in downtown San Pedro is consistent with the draft update to the San Pedro Community Plan and with the Community Redevelopment Agency’s efforts to revitalize San Pedro. Any proposed development at Ponte Vista should not undermine that effort. This is the reason that our Neighborhood Council recommended R-1 density for the site.

**Dan Dixon**  
President

**John Mavar**  
Vice President

**Craig Goldfarb**  
Treasurer

**Mary Hamlin**  
Secretary

[3] The staff report includes many strong reasons for the recommended denial. Those same reasons suggest that the density in section S [1200 units], is not justified and is not supportable.

[4] The staff report (S-1) states that the Low Medium I Residential designation allows for densities of 9-18 dwelling units per net acre and that the Ponte Vista site is approximately 61.5 gross acres. The report implies that the maximum number of dwelling units per acre (18) would be the appropriate number to use. Why was the minimum number of 9 not used to determine the range or at least the mid-point of 13.5 (the density of the Gardens)? Why was it applied to the entire 61.5 acres when a substantial portion of the property [the buffer area and the storm drain area in the baseball diamond area] is not available for development? We believe that the recommended density should be reexamined and lowered.

[5] Senate Bill 1818 has made it very difficult to do real planning. The report rightly points out that a density bonus would allow for up to 1,196 units. If you assume that 775 is the desired maximum number of units per acre, the plan should actually be for 574 units to allow for the 35% bonus. If you assume that 9 dwelling units per acre is the correct number, then it would be significantly fewer.

[6] The report (p A-2) references the drainage ditch on the southwestern portion of the project. This is the portion of the property that the developer proposed setting aside for a little league field. This “drainage ditch” renders a portion of the property “unbuildable”. This unbuildable portion should be deducted when determining the net buildable acreage. This does not appear to have been done.

[7] The report finds that the Specific Plan submitted is “not in conformity with the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice.” Because the recommendation is denial of the specific plan application, there is no discussion of the inadequacy of the specific plan, the inadequacy of the proposed Development Agreement, and the inadequacy of the Environmental Impact Report. Because all of these documents are significantly flawed, we believe that the existing application cannot simply be “tweaked.” Rather, a new application must be required in order to allow for sufficient public input and review.

In closing, we again request that the meeting of the Planning Commission at which this item is considered be held in San Pedro.

We appreciate your consideration of these matters, and look forward to your response.

Yours truly,

Dan Dixon, President  
Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council

CC: Gail Goldberg, Janice Hahn, James Washington, David Olivo