



MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

County Counsel
Director of Planning

At its meeting held October 25, 2005, the Board took the following action:

4

At the time and place regularly set, notice having been duly given, the following item was called up:

Combined hearing on the following zoning matters and on the certification of the Draft Environmental Impact Report relating to property located at the terminus of Hasting St., south of Pathfinder Rd., and southwesterly of Brea Canyon. Cut-Off Road, Puente Zoned District, petitioned by LB/L EPAC Rowland Heights, as further described in the attached letter dated August 25, 2005 from the Director of Planning:

Local Plan Amendment Case No. 90-184-(4), an amendment to the Rowland Heights Community General Plan from Open Space (OS) to Urban 1 (U1)

Conditional Use Permit Case No. 90-184-(4), to ensure compliance with Hillside Management Design Review Criteria

Oak Tree Permit Case No. 90-184-(4), to authorize the removal of 288 oak trees, including 5 heritage oak trees

Vesting Tentative Tract Map Case No. 49411-(4), to allow the creation of 55 single-family lots, 2 open space lots and 1 street lot

(Continued on Page 2)

4 (Continued)

All persons wishing to testify were sworn in by the Executive Officer of the Board. Frank Meneses, representing the Department of Regional Planning testified. Opportunity was given for interested persons to address the Board. Gordon Youde, James Hall, Lisa Deushane, Charles Wu, Sabrina Lee, Paul Cheug and others addressed the Board. Written correspondence was presented.

Supervisor Knabe made the following statement:

“In June of this year I asked this Board to support me in referring Project No. 90-184 (4) back to the Planning Commission for consideration of a down-scaled residential project on approximately 27 acres, along with horse stables and publicly dedicated open space on over 143 acres which are now privately owned and which provide no open space opportunities for the public. Under the applicant's revised proposal over 50 percent of property that was part of the original development would still be preserved as open space and public serving equestrian facilities. However, I could not get support at that time merely to allow the revised proposal to be considered on its merits by the Planning Commission.

“I did not then, and I do not now, ask that this Board vote to approve the project on its merits. The applicant's current proposal and the potential project benefits have not even been considered in any detail by the Planning Commission or the community, yet. Also, I am fully aware of the concern expressed by some of my colleagues that this proposal may create a bad precedent for the conversion of open space to other uses. However, I believe that each proposal needs to be considered on the basis of its own facts, and I further believe that a blanket position that prohibits the Planning Commission or Board's consideration of the conversion of open space to other uses no matter what the circumstances or potential benefits is not legally required or responsible.

(Continued on Page 3)

4 (Continued)

“The facts of this case indicate that, except for an undeveloped trail easement, the 170 acres of open space that are in consideration here are neither dedicated to the public nor required to be available for the public's use under the approvals previously given by this Board. In light of this, I believe that the Planning Commission, the applicant and the community should have a full opportunity to consider whether in this case, there are sufficient benefits - such as the conversion of private open space to fully dedicated open space, the construction and improvement of equestrian and hiking trails, the potential purchase of additional open space, the creation of publicly available equestrian facilities, and contributions to schools and the community - justify the conversion of approximately 27 out of 170 acres of private open space for additional needed housing in the Rowland Heights area. Of course, the Board will still retain its right to vote on the merits of the project once it has been considered by the Planning Commission.

“As the advisory agency to this Board, the Planning Commission working with planning staff is well equipped to reconsider this project and any alternatives and review the technical details before returning the case to this Board with a recommendation:”

Therefore, Supervisor Knabe made a motion that the Board:

1. Refer Local Plan Amendment, Conditional Use Permit, and Oak Tree Permit Case Nos. 90-184 - (4) and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 49411-(4), back to the Regional Planning Commission for further proceedings in accordance with the following instructions:
 - a. Take the steps necessary to initiate a revised amendment to the Rowland Heights Community General Plan and appropriate revisions to the other proposed entitlements for consideration of an alternative proposal which includes no more than 43 residential lots, removal of necessary oak trees, and legitimized horse stables while retaining approximately 144 acres as dedicated open space and equestrian facilities;
 - b. Obtain community input by holding at least one noticed public meeting in the local community as well as a noticed Planning Commission hearing;

(Continued on Page 4)

4 (Continued)

- c. Consider potential community benefits with the understanding a recommended project must include one for one replacement of the 27 acres in the Puente Hills Community Plan area, dedication to a public/non-profit agency of the open space, establishment of a maintenance fund to enhance and maintain open space and biological resources, funds provided for ranger trailer, wildlife guzzler and possible restrooms, endowment to a music program for local school district, contributions to the Giving Tree program of the Rowland Heights School District, a grant of \$250,000 to the adjacent Ridgemoor subdivision and funding for traffic improvements and beautification projects.
2. Instruct the Regional Planning Commission to return its recommendation and decisions on the project entitlements and environmental documentation to the Board upon the completion of its hearing process.

Said motion failed for lack of a second.

After discussion, on motion of Supervisor Molina, seconded by Supervisor Yaroslavsky, duly carried by the following vote: Ayes: Supervisors Yaroslavsky, Antonovich and Molina; Noes: Supervisor Knabe (Supervisor Burke being absent), that Board took the following actions:

1. Closed the public hearing;
2. Indicated its intent to deny the appeals and to sustain Regional Planning Commission's decision denying Local Plan Amendment, Conditional Use Permit and Oak Tree Permit Case Nos. 90-184-(4), and Vesting Tentative Tract Map Case No. 49411-(4); and

(Continued on Page 5)

4 (Continued)

3. Instructed County Counsel to prepare the necessary documentation for final denial.

04102505_4

Attachment

Copies distributed:

- Each Supervisor
- Director of Public Works
- LB/L EPAC Rowland Heights
- Gordon Youde
- James Hall
- Lisa Deushane
- Charles Wu
- Sabrina Lee
- Paul Cheug