



# COASTAL SAN PEDRO NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

**Doug Epperhart**  
President  
**Dean Pentcheff**  
Vice President  
**Kathleen Martin**  
Secretary  
**Louis Dominguez**  
Treasurer

March 19, 2020

councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org  
alison.becker@lacity.org  
aksel.palacios@lacity.org  
cecilia.lamas@lacity.org  
connie.chauv@lacity.org

Re: **Support of the Appeal of the Proposed Project at 1309-1331 Pacific  
CPC-2019-4908-DB- SPR/ENV-2019-4909-CE**

Dear Representatives:

Please be advised that at a special virtual public meeting of the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council Board held May 18, 2020, the Board approved and adopted the following Resolution:

## **Resolution to support the appeal of proposed project at 1309–1331 Pacific**

**Whereas** the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council (CSPNC) Board recommended denial of and recommended significant changes to the proposed project at 2111-2139 Pacific, which is very similar to, and just seven blocks away from, the 1309-1331 Pacific project and has the same applicant and representative, and

**Whereas** both the 2111-2139 Pacific project and the 1309-1331 Pacific project are immediately adjacent to the Coastal Zone, the 2111-2139 Pacific project is in the CSPNC jurisdiction and the 1309-1331 Pacific project is immediately adjacent to the CSPNC jurisdiction, and

**Whereas** this is also the same applicant/developer as for the 1803 Mesa project, which is within the Coastal Zone and which CSPNC strongly opposed as it violated State Coastal Act and City law and was not compatible with the surrounding area, and

**Whereas** community members (Citizens Protecting San Pedro) have proven that the applicant and their representative, Jonathan Loner, submitted false information to City Planning in the project application and repeatedly misled the three San Pedro Neighborhood Councils' planning committees regarding this project, and

**Whereas** the plans and renderings for this project that were provided to the community, the City and the City Planning Commission (CPC) were materially in error and misleading, and

**Whereas** the applicant is requesting a 52% height bonus, a 77% FAR bonus, a 20% reduction in open space, and a 5 foot rear yard setback in lieu of the 16 feet otherwise required, but is only providing 12 very low income dwelling units out of the total 102 dwelling units, and

**Whereas** this project has been awarded a CEQA Categorical Exemption (CE) by the CPC, in error, which is due to falsified data provided by the developer and other deviations from the law, and

**Whereas** the CPC was obligated to provide a new public hearing when the project's entitlement request was materially changed AT the CPC hearing for the FAR bonus, from ministerial as per Density Bonus ordinance requirements (on menu) to discretionary (off menu), and

**Whereas** we believe this change was made because the community had provided evidence to prove that the FAR bonus entitlement did not qualify under the on-menu Density Bonus regulations, and

**Whereas** under the law if the FAR Density Bonus does not meet the specific limits of the Density Bonus regulations it cannot just be transferred to an "off menu" discretionary request instead, and

**Whereas** the project is approximately 1.8 times (almost double) the FAR/size of, and is significantly out of conformance with, what is allowed in the San Pedro Community Plan and the San Pedro Community Plan Implementation Overlay District (CPIO), and

**Whereas** the Pacific Corridor Development Plan requires that "development projects occupying more than 50% of a length of one side of a street block should provide public open space in the form of a plaza, out- door dining area or other similar space" and this project does not meet that requirement, and

**Whereas** the project does not provide for any infrastructure upgrades for water, sewer, streets, power or cable, and

**Whereas** the project is not compatible with the character of the surrounding area or in conformance with the applicable design guidelines, and

**Whereas** the cumulative impact of this project, together with the proposed "sister" project at 2111-2139 Pacific and the ten similar other large projects just completed, proposed or under construction in the general area, will destroy the existing community character of San Pedro, and

**Whereas** we are in favor of a project at this location but we insist that Councilman Buscaino and the City not allow a project to become a precedent for San Pedro that does not adhere to the law, that is requesting such outrageous bonuses compared to the affordable housing provided, that undermines our San Pedro Community Plan, and that contributes to a significant adverse cumulative impact on the area surrounding the project location as well as all of San Pedro, and

**Whereas** we specifically do not want this project to become a precedent for the proposed project at 2111-2139 Pacific.

**Resolved**, the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council supports an appeal to City Council of the City Planning Commission's decision to approve the project at 1309-1331 Pacific, requests Councilman Buscaino's support of the appeal, and requests that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) and City Council uphold the appeal and deny the project.

Sincerely,



Doug Epperhart, President  
On behalf of the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council Board

cc: Ray Regalado President NWSPNC; Carrie Scoville President CeSPNC; Diana Nave Land Use Chair NWSPNC; Javier Gonzalez-Camarillo Land Use Chair Central SPNC