

EPC Questions – December 2, 2020

Item 5.1 – Minor General Plan, Zoning and Precise Plan Amendments

1. For the 3 that are more dense than the currently permitted zoning (250 East Dana Street, 300 Moorpark Way, 709 Vaquero Drive), were these approved properly through the City's permitting and review process?

Staff has not determined whether all structures and uses on these sites are fully permitted. However, the existing uses at these sites are allowed, either conditionally or by-right, under their existing zoning districts.

2. For my understanding, there appears to be more than one street address for some of the locations but only one parcel being discussed (ie. 300 Moorpark on map also includes 320 on the street). When making these changes we don't need to take into account street addresses and don't have to mention them. Is that correct?

The maps attached to the resolutions are adequate to identify the affected locations.

3. Some Precise Plans intentionally have areas zoned for a different use than the current use. This was true for example of the residential area near in the recently reviewed Google Landing office project. Was there any specific discussion about 615 South Rengstorff during the ECRPP to make this area residential only zoning rather than Mixed Use? If so, what was the reasoning for that?

The current question is not whether the existing use is consistent with uses allowed by Precise Plans or Zoning, but rather to identify where the City's land use policies are internally inconsistent. In the case of 615 South Rengstorff Avenue, there was no discussion about the General Plan designation or uses at the site. The internal inconsistency was an administrative oversight.

4. Were the property owners and/or owners in the vicinity of the properties subject to the amendments given notice of this hearing and the proposed changes?

Yes. Formal letters were mailed to the affected property owners. Postcard notices were mailed to residents and property owners within 750' of all affected properties.

5. On the 841 San Veron property, if the zoning is R3-3, allowing up to 37 units, why is the proposed general plan amendment allowing only up to 25 DU/acre? Does this mean that an inconsistency will remain?

The proposed density would allow up to 25 units per acre, equal to about 66 dwelling units. While this is not the same as 37, the only General Plan Land Use

Designations that are associated with the R3 (Multifamily) Zoning District and allow multifamily housing are Medium, Medium-High and High Density Residential. The density inconsistencies will be addressed during the R3 Update process.

6. I went over to the site and noticed that the private religious school and church had the address 320 Moorpark Way, while the 300 Moorpark Way was a single family home. Which property is the amendment intended to apply to?

These are the same property.