

Title in Resp.
pg 3 Pursuant

Tewasart, Samantha

From: McAvoy, Mark
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 4:13 PM
To: Real Sebastian, Teresa
Cc: Tewasart, Samantha; Bow, Ron
Subject: RE: Item 2-A

6. include tax info as well; water bill
7. Remove "Urban Design" language

Hi Teresa,

Sam mentioned that you called and spoke to her a little while ago, these are the responses we received from Laura Stetson earlier today that Sam was referring to:

"1. When we calculated the housing yield in the Corporate Center district associated with the overlay introduced during the hearing process, we assumed that the housing would be in lieu of some office development, not additive to it. We substituted office trips for residential trips. Thus, those trips cannot "moved" to the Sybil Brand site and vacant parcel; they would be new trips not analyzed in the EIR.

2. With regard to potential housing sites for the 6th cycle Housing Element: changes in HE law in 2017 have made the sites inventory analysis much more difficult. Simply having zoning on a site is not sufficient. You have to present a detailed analysis and justification as to how housing can be built on a site. The vacant parcel would be problematic due to terrain. The Sybil Brand site may be a challenge as well since it is in County ownership, would require extensive demolition, could require routing traffic through the adjacent neighborhood for sufficient access, and may be constrained in building height due to Sheriff helicopter operations. Also, I think that the County would first have to offer the site to another public entity if it were looking to sell the property. All of these factors would make it difficult to justify this site as suitable for housing during the 6th cycle.

3. With regard to the EIR traffic analysis, it did not account for new trips associated properties west of I-710. If the trips from Corporate Center were reassigned to the Sybil Brand site (which they can't, per item 1), we would be concerned that the traffic study did not account for the traffic patterns and impacts that would occur west of I-710."

Laura will be there tonight to answer more questions or clarify these responses she gave us.

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

From: Real Sebastian, Teresa
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2019 1:18 AM
To: Bow, Ron; McAvoy, Mark; Tewasart, Samantha
Cc: Ing, Mitchell; Wong, Diana
Subject: Item 2-A

Tues, Jan 21st 7-11
Homeless Court LAHSA

Another option would be to adopt Option 2 (Sybil brand and vacant lot) with 57 units/acre instead of Option 1 (corporate center). It would yield 9,801.48 trips which is within the FEIR assumption of 9,971 net new trips.

Analysis: (fingers crossed my madness makes sense)

Current FEIR caps trips at 9,971

10,321 Sybil trips / proposed 1410 Sybil units = 7.32 trips per Sybil unit under option 2.

9,971 cap FEIR trips / 7.32 trips per Sybil unit under option 2 = 1,362.16 units cap for Sybil

1,362.16 units caps for Sybil / 23.5 Sybil acres = 57.96 max units per acre

Round down to 57 units per acre x 23.5 acres = 1,339.50 units at Sybil

1,339 units at Sybil x 7.32 trips per unit = 9,801.48 trips which is within current FEiR cap trips of 9,971

Pursue option 2 with modification to 57 units per acre will generate 5,175 units (3,836 +1,339). Close to SCAG proposed RHNA allocation of 5,221 (-46 units) which still needs to be approved by HCD and may be subject to appeal by municipalities)

Sent from my iPad