



Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City

STEERING
COMMITTEE
& ADVISORS

May 12, 2020

RE: Agenda Item: 8-A (Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet)

mark armour
victor fresco
susan giesberg
diana gordon
dan jansenson
sherrill kushner
mary marlow
bea nemplaha
jacob samuel
lorraine sanchez
susan scarafia
jeff segal
carol sobel
maryanne solomon
doris sosin
linda sullivan
peter tigler
bill zimmerman

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As our Planning Commissioners, residents rely on you to reject knee-jerk responses for fast fixes and instead, to provide thoughtful, factual analysis, and demand the same from City staff. Unfortunately, this staff report gives you nothing you need to decide whether this is a good idea or a terrible one. In the many housing discussions that both you and the City Council have entertained, no one has studied eliminating Development Agreements for the largest housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet. Further, we believe that this proposal will have unintended consequences and erode public trust.

In response to what was basically a “shout-out” from a councilmember during a study session, you are now being asked to change the Development Agreement approval process for Tier 3 housing projects to a “streamlined” development review permit.

One line in the very short staff report says it all: “This change **would be intended** to encourage the development of larger housing projects as the current requirement of a Development Agreement for projects greater than 90,000 square feet **may be viewed as a disincentive for property owners to maximize housing developments.**” (Emphasis added).

Those are two speculative and subjective thoughts unconstrained by any factual analysis.

Maybe property owners (developers) will do what you hope, and maybe they won’t unless they can make more money. Maybe all this idea will accomplish is to create a wave of land speculation downtown as developers and REITs don’t build the housing you want, but instead wait for a new, more favorable post-pandemic, post-financial crisis world. In a couple of years, nothing in developer time, the speculators you will create tonight will press for new development standards (in order to have their projects “pencil out”) that – no surprise – will feature mostly market rate and luxury housing with barely a nod to affordable housing. There is nothing in this proposal that would prohibit that from happening. In fact, it’s inevitable. And when it does happen, you will have facilitated it along with the predictable and disastrous up-scaling and gentrification.

“Streamlining” the development process also provides a kind of “punch list” for both staff and the developers; it’s a cookie cutter approach instead of being responsive to the actual needs and impacts of specific project sites and their surroundings.

The current pandemic and financial crisis will inevitably result in a top down review of downtown land-use assumptions (the levels of retail, office, hotels and yes, housing) that our city planners have used to guide our future. Is this the best time to be considering a “quick fix”?

While the public – residents – are busy quarantining from this life-and-death pandemic, the city should not be deputizing staff to push through what would become the biggest housing developments in our city.

This proposal is misguided and cannot be justified. It should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Diana Gordon
Co-Chair, Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City (“SMCLC”)

Cc: City Council
City Manager Lane Dilg
Planning Director David Martin
Planning Division Manager Jing Yeo
Community Groups

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Melissa Zak](#)
Subject: FW: May 13 Board Meeting Agenda Item 8-A
Date: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 4:11:45 PM
Attachments: [Planning Commission Letter 5-12-20.pdf](#)

From: Rebecca Nunnelee <rebecca.nunnelee@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 3:59 PM
To: Leslie Lambert <Leslie.Lambert@SMGOV.NET>; Richard McKinnon <Richard.McKinnon@SMGOV.NET>; Elisa Paster <Elisa.Paster@SMGOV.NET>; Shawn Landres <Shawn.Landres@SMGOV.NET>
Cc: Planning <Planning@SMGOV.NET>; Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: May 13 Board Meeting Agenda Item 8-A

EXTERNAL

Planning Commission
City of Santa Monica

May 12, 2020

RE: May 13 Meeting Agenda, Item 8A

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I wish to echo the sentiments of the SMCLC in their comment letter to you dated May 12, 2020.

First, I would like to assure you that I understand the financial problems Santa Monica is facing in this time of the pandemic. I also understand the situation is only going to get worse as we all face the fallout over the coming few years.

However, as of today, I don't think any of us knows for sure what the fallout is going to be and how it will manifest in the Santa Monica community. Therefore, it is important to re-group and plan carefully, not act impulsively. As you all know, the decisions you make will stand for quite awhile. They can have a huge impact on the citizens, not just the bottom line of a budget.

Think about the ramifications of passing 8-A in view of the present situation, not the state of Santa Monica pre-pandemic. Why does the city need to "encourage the development of larger housing projects," especially now? Businesses are already closing (meaning fewer people will have jobs here), rents are extremely high (forcing people without jobs to move away from Santa Monica), and any prior demand for short-term housing is quickly dissipating. By fast-tracking large housing developments you are only encouraging the probable advent of speculative, rampant construction, and the result could very well be empty, high-priced living space.

Do you really believe this is what Santa Monica needs? My personal opinion is, if anything, Santa Monica might benefit more from affordable housing, less focus on high-end platinum, gold, or silver LEED certification projects, and the use of current housing rather than tearing down existing buildings just to please the desires of greedy developers.

I recommend we all stop, take a deep breath, and consider what future realities may look like. Then you can create planning models that make sense in a post-pandemic society. Right now, there is not sufficient data to do that. You may find future models are more practical, cost-effective, and citizen-friendly. Neither the Planning Commission nor the City Council can afford to move forward if they are stuck in pre-pandemic patterns of thinking and behavior.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Nunnelee

Cc: City Council
Planning Director David Martin
Planning Division Manager Jing Yeo

From: [Santa Monica Forward](#)
To: [Leslie Lambert](#); [Richard McKinnon](#); [Elisa Paster](#); [Shawn Landres](#); [Mario Fonda-Bonardi](#); [Jim Ries](#); [Nina Fresco](#)
Cc: [Melissa Zak](#); [David Martin](#); [Jing Yeo](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 8A - Tier 3 DRPs - Santa Monica Forward Letter
Date: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 4:40:30 PM
Attachments: [05.12.20 PC Item 8A - Tier 3 Housing - SM Forward Letter.pdf](#)

EXTERNAL

Dear Chair Lambert and Planning Commissioners,

Please find attached a letter from Santa Monica Forward addressing Item - 8A on your agenda.

Best,

**Abby Arnold and Carl Hansen
Co-chairs, Santa Monica Forward**

--

We are working for a diverse, progressive, sustainable and equitable Santa Monica.

SantaMonicaForward.org



May 12, 2020

Re: Planning Commission Agenda Item 8A - Downtown Tier-3 Housing DRPs

Dear Chair Lambert and Planning Commissioners,

Santa Monica Forward strongly supports staff's recommendation for the Planning Commission to adopt an ROI to consider recommending amending the DCP to allow Tier-3 housing projects greater than 90,000 square feet to be reviewed through a DRP. The proposed process would not change existing allowable heights or densities, and would only simplify the process of approval for desperately needed new housing.

The coronavirus has only exacerbated the housing shortage crisis. The unpredictable and expensive DA process leads developers to build less housing on sites that could be significant sources of new market rate and affordable housing. Ensuring that incentives allow for maximizing housing production is key to addressing the housing shortage crisis, supporting the production of new affordable housing, and addressing our RHNA obligations.

Sincerely,

Abby Arnold and Carl Hansen
Co-chairs, Santa Monica Forward

From: [Matthew Stevens](#)
To: [Leslie Lambert](#); [Richard McKinnon](#); [Elisa Paster](#); [Shawn Landres](#); [Mario Fonda-Bonardj](#); [Jim Ries](#); [Nina Fresco](#)
Cc: [Jing Yeo](#); [David Martin](#); [Planning Commission Comments](#); [Planning](#); mstevens901@gmail.com
Subject: May 13, 2020 Agenda Items
Date: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 9:16:47 PM
Attachments: [Planning Commision Letter - May 13 2020.pdf](#)

EXTERNAL

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Attached please find a letter in regards to items 8-A and 9-A on your agenda for tomorrow.

Staff, please include this letter in the public record for the meeting.

Thank you,

Matthew Stevens



May 13, 2020

Santa Monica Planning Commission
City Hall
1685 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401

RE: May 13, 2020 Agenda Items

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My name is Matthew Stevens. I am a Wilmont area resident and the Santa Monica Lead for Abundant Housing LA (AHLA). AHLA is a pro-housing education and advocacy organization working to help solve Southern California's housing shortage. I write to you in both my personal capacity as a Santa Monica resident and on behalf of AHLA.

On Wednesday, you will be considering several proposals related to housing production. AHLA respectfully asks that you consider the following feedback on these proposals:

Tier 3 Streamlining (Item 8-A)

We strongly support this proposal. The DCP was intended to be a pro-housing plan but it has so far failed to produce the housing that Santa Monica hoped for. As [stated by Staff](#) in December last year, "since [DCP] Plan adoption, very few, if any, new housing projects have been submitted despite process incentives that expedite entitlements for housing projects."

The failure of the DCP to produce new housing is not without consequence. Since its adoption in 2017, Santa Monica home values have [increased by nearly 30%](#). This means higher rents, higher rates of homelessness, and more traffic on our roads as our workforce, increasingly unable to afford housing locally, is forced to move farther away.

This proposal is not a "knee-jerk" response as some others have stated nor will it lead to any immediate changes. Rather, it is simply an opportunity for this Commission to study process streamlining further. We appreciate this willingness to reflect on the efficacy of Santa Monica's policies.

ADU Zoning Changes (Item 9-A)

Consistent with the previously stated views of this Commission and City Council, AHLA supports incentives to encourage ADU construction. However, we are concerned about the following two proposals within Item 9-A:

Parcel Coverage Exemptions

ADUs are exempt from parcel coverage limitations in our R1 neighborhoods. This policy encourages ADU construction by giving homeowners flexibility to build the ADU that best fits their needs.

Item 9-A asks you to treat our multifamily and commercial neighborhoods differently by applying parcel coverage limitations in these neighborhoods. We disagree with this approach: there is no clear reason why different neighborhoods should be subject to different treatment, and we believe this policy will discourage ADU production by limiting flexibility on our multifamily and commercial parcels.

Moreover, most buildings in our multifamily neighborhoods already exceed their parcel coverage limitations due to downzonings which have occurred since original construction. We are concerned that this could effectively cap most ADUs in our multifamily neighborhoods at 800 square feet even though state law allows construction of two-bedroom ADUs that are up to 1,000 square feet in size.

To encourage ADU construction, and to ensure fair treatment across Santa Monica, we ask you to treat all ADUs equally and exempt all ADUs from parcel coverage limitations.

Owner Occupancy Requirements

The State law governing owner occupancy requirements sunsets on January 1, 2025. The proposal before you would implement owner occupancy requirements immediately thereafter. We disagree: owner occupancy requirements limit options for our residents, cause financing issues for homeowners, and depress ADU production.

Perhaps the largest issue with owner occupancy requirements is that they limit the number of parcels that ADUs can be constructed on. By requiring a homeowner to live in one of the two units, we would eliminate the ability to build an ADU on any property that is currently occupied by renters. We believe this restriction would apply to many properties in our city considering that almost 75% of Santa Monica residents are renters.

Moreover, owner occupancy requirements would limit the ability of homeowners to build an ADU for renters and later move away if personal circumstances dictate. In this scenario, perhaps the homeowner would want to rent their house instead of sell but they would be unable to do so unless they evict their ADU tenant. The other option would be to sell the house, which they may not want to do, and the new owner could then choose to evict the ADU tenant anyways. These are undesirable options which can easily be avoided if we do away with owner occupancy requirements.

Owner occupancy requirements can also cause financing issues, because banks do not occupy properties they foreclose on. This was one of the key justifications [given by Assemblymember Richard Bloom](#) in his bill, AB 881, which eliminated owner occupancy requirements on ADUs.

Pursuant to financing issues, owner occupancy requirements may also increase evictions by forcing banks to evict any tenant living in an ADU on a foreclosed property.

For the above reasons, homeowners may also become more reluctant to build ADUs. This would short-circuit Santa Monica's goal of increasing ADU production at a time when more homes are needed than ever before. Considering Santa Monica's daunting RHNA obligation of almost 10,000 new homes, and the possibility for ADUs to address part of this requirement, we believe it would be short-sighted to forestall ADU production.

We understand there may be concerns related to short-term rentals. To avoid the risk of affecting production of all ADUs, we respectfully suggest you address those concerns in policy specifically targeted for short-term rentals.

We ask you to permanently eliminate ADU owner occupancy requirements. We do not believe they will serve Santa Monica's goals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Matthew Stevens

Wilmington resident, and Santa Monica Lead for Abundant Housing LA

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Melissa Zak](#)
Subject: FW: Planning Commission 5/13/20 agenda item 8-A -- Oppose
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 7:45:57 AM

From: zinajosephs@aol.com <zinajosephs@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 1:04 AM
To: Planning <Planning@SMGOV.NET>; Leslie Lambert <Leslie.Lambert@SMGOV.NET>; Richard McKinnon <Richard.McKinnon@SMGOV.NET>; Elisa Paster <Elisa.Paster@SMGOV.NET>; Shawn Landres <Shawn.Landres@SMGOV.NET>; Mario Fonda-Bonardi <Mario.Fonda-Bonardi@SMGOV.NET>; Jim Ries <Jim.Ries@SMGOV.NET>; Nina Fresco <Nina.Fresco@SMGOV.NET>; Clerk Mailbox <Clerk.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Lane Dilg <Lane.Dilg@SMGOV.NET>; David Martin <David.Martin@SMGOV.NET>; Jing Yeo <Jing.Yeo@SMGOV.NET>
Cc: Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Mayor Kevin McKeown <Kevin.McKeown@SMGOV.NET>; Terry O'Day <Terry.Oday@smgov.net>; Gleam Davis <Gleam.Davis@SMGOV.NET>; Ana Maria Jara <AnaMaria.Jara@SMGOV.NET>; Sue Himmelrich <Sue.Himmelrich@SMGOV.NET>; Greg Morena <Greg.Morena@SMGOV.NET>; Ted Winterer <Ted.Winterer@SMGOV.NET>; zinajosephs@aol.com
Subject: Planning Commission 5/13/20 agenda item 8-A -- Oppose

EXTERNAL

May 12, 2020

To: Planning Commission
From: Board of Directors, Friends of Sunset Park
RE: 5/13/20 item 8-A - Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 sf

A majority of the FOSP Board members support the SMCLC letter below, opposing any recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council to process Tier 3 housing projects under a Development Review permit instead of a Development Agreement.

We strongly urge the Planning Commission to reject this staff recommendation, which would eliminate all public hearings for these large projects.

There are still residents in this city who would like to have some say as to what gets built in our downtown, and we object to this streamlining scenario, i.e., "Developers Gone Wild."

Thank you for your consideration.

May 12, 2020

RE: Agenda Item: 8-A (Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As our Planning Commissioners, residents rely on you to reject knee-jerk responses for fast fixes and instead, to provide thoughtful, factual analysis, and demand the same from City staff. Unfortunately, this staff report gives you nothing you need to decide whether this is a good idea or a terrible one. In the many housing discussions that both you and the City Council have entertained, no one has studied eliminating Development Agreements for the largest housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet. Further, we believe that this proposal will have unintended consequences and erode public trust.

In response to what was basically a “shout-out” from a councilmember during a study session, you are now being asked to change the Development Agreement approval process for Tier 3 housing projects to a “streamlined” development review permit.

One line in the very short staff report says it all: “This change would be intended to encourage the development of larger housing projects as the current requirement of a Development Agreement for projects greater than 90,000 square feet may be viewed as a disincentive for property owners to maximize housing developments.” (Emphasis added).

Those are two speculative and subjective thoughts unconstrained by any factual analysis.

Maybe property owners (developers) will do what you hope, and maybe they won’t unless they can make more money. Maybe all this idea will accomplish is to create a wave of land speculation downtown as developers and REITs don’t build the housing you want, but instead wait for a new, more favorable post-pandemic, post-financial crisis world. In a couple of years, nothing in developer time, the speculators you will create tonight will press for new development standards (in order to have their projects “pencil out”) that – no surprise – will feature mostly market rate and luxury housing with barely a nod to affordable housing. There is nothing in this proposal that would prohibit that from happening. In fact, it’s inevitable. And when it does happen, you will have facilitated it along with the predictable and disastrous upscaling and gentrification.

“Streamlining” the development process also provides a kind of “punch list” for both staff and the developers; it’s a cookie cutter approach instead of being responsive to the actual needs and impacts of specific project sites and their surroundings.

The current pandemic and financial crisis will inevitably result in a top down review of downtown land-use assumptions (the levels of retail, office, hotels and yes, housing) that our city planners have used to guide our future. Is this the best time to be considering a “quick fix”?

While the public – residents – are busy quarantining from this life-and-death pandemic, the city should not be deputizing staff to push through what would become the biggest housing developments in our city.

This proposal is misguided and cannot be justified. It should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Diana Gordon Co-Chair, Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City (“SMCLC”)

Cc: City Council City Manager Lane Dilg, Planning Director David Martin, Planning Division Manager Jing Yeo, Community Groups

From: [Daniel Galamba](#)
To: [Planning Commission Comments](#); [Leslie Lambert](#); [Richard McKinnon](#); [Elisa Paster](#); [Shawn Landres](#); [Mario Fonda-Bonardi](#); [Jim Ries](#); [Nina Fresco](#); [Clerk Mailbox](#); [Mayor Kevin McKeown](#); [Terry O'Day](#); [Gleam Davis](#); [Ana Maria Jara](#); [Sue Himmelrich](#); [Greg Morena](#); [Ted Winterer](#); [Lane Dilg](#)
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting May 13, 2020 item 8.A.
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 9:15:03 AM

EXTERNAL

Dear Planning Commission,

I must request that you reject this proposal to make all Tier III (i.e. skyscraper) projects in the downtown area no longer subject to Planning Commission review with no public comment. This robs your constituents of their right to comment on Tier III projects that directly affect them. This is tyranny in action and should not be tolerated anywhere and especially in our City of Santa Monica. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Dr Daniel Galamba

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Melissa Zak](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Item 8 - A
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 9:25:17 AM

From: Noma Boardmember <nomaboard@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 9:13 AM
To: Planning <Planning@SMGOV.NET>; Leslie Lambert <Leslie.Lambert@SMGOV.NET>; Shawn Landres <Shawn.Landres@SMGOV.NET>; Richard McKinnon <Richard.McKinnon@SMGOV.NET>; Elisa Paster <Elisa.Paster@SMGOV.NET>; Jim Ries <Jim.Ries@SMGOV.NET>; Nina Fresco <Nina.Fresco@SMGOV.NET>; Jing Yeo <Jing.Yeo@SMGOV.NET>; David Martin <David.Martin@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Opposition to Item 8 - A

EXTERNAL



May 13, 2020

To: Planning Commission

From: NOMA Board

RE: 5/13/20 item 8-A - Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 sf

A majority of the NOMA Board members support the SMCLC letter below, opposing any recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council to process Tier 3 housing projects under a Development Review permit instead of a Development Agreement.

We strongly urge the Planning Commission to reject this staff recommendation, which would eliminate all public hearings for these large projects.

There are still residents in this city who would like to have some say as to what gets built in our downtown, and we object to this streamlining scenario, i.e., “Developers Gone Wild.”

Thank you for your consideration.

NOMABoard@gmail.com

May 12, 2020

RE: Agenda Item: 8-A (Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As our Planning Commissioners, residents rely on you to reject knee-jerk responses for fast fixes and instead, to provide thoughtful, factual analysis, and demand the same from City staff. Unfortunately, this staff report gives you nothing you need to decide whether this is a good idea or a terrible one. In the many housing discussions that both you and the City Council have entertained, no one has studied eliminating Development Agreements for the largest housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet. Further, we believe that this proposal will have unintended consequences and erode public trust.

In response to what was basically a “shout-out” from a councilmember during a study session, you are now being asked to change the Development Agreement approval process for Tier 3 housing projects to a “streamlined” development review permit.

One line in the very short staff report says it all: “This change would be intended to encourage the development of larger housing projects as the current requirement of a Development Agreement for projects greater than 90,000 square feet may be viewed as a disincentive for property owners to maximize housing developments.” (Emphasis added).

Those are two speculative and subjective thoughts unconstrained by any factual analysis.

Maybe property owners (developers) will do what you hope, and maybe they won't unless they can make more money. Maybe all this idea will accomplish is to create a wave of land speculation downtown as developers and REITs don't build the housing you want, but instead wait for a new, more favorable post-pandemic, post-financial crisis world. In a couple of years, nothing in developer time, the speculators you will create tonight will press for new development standards (in order to have their projects “pencil out”) that – no surprise – will feature mostly market rate and luxury housing with barely a nod to affordable housing. There is nothing in this proposal that would prohibit that from happening. In fact, it's inevitable. And when it does happen, you will have facilitated it along with the predictable and disastrous upscaling and gentrification.

“Streamlining” the development process also provides a kind of “punch list” for both staff and the developers; it's a cookie cutter approach instead of being responsive to the actual needs and impacts of specific project sites and their surroundings.

The current pandemic and financial crisis will inevitably result in a top down review of downtown land-use assumptions (the levels of retail, office, hotels and yes, housing) that our city planners have used to guide our future. Is this the best time to be considering a “quick fix”?

While the public – residents – are busy quarantining from this life-and-death pandemic, the city should not be deputizing staff to push through what would become the biggest housing developments in our city.

This proposal is misguided and cannot be justified. It should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Diana Gordon Co-Chair, Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City (“SMCLC”)

Cc: City Council City Manager Lane Dilg, Planning Director David Martin, Planning Division Manager Jing Yeo, Community Groups

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Melissa Zak](#)
Subject: FW: Vote NO on Agenda Item 8-A, Planning Commission meeting of May 13, 2020
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 10:08:44 AM

From: Tricia Crane <1triciacrane@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 10:04 AM
To: Planning <Planning@SMGOV.NET>; Leslie Lambert <Leslie.Lambert@SMGOV.NET>; Richard McKinnon <Richard.McKinnon@SMGOV.NET>; Elisa Paster <Elisa.Paster@SMGOV.NET>; Shawn Landres <Shawn.Landres@SMGOV.NET>; Mario Fonda-Bonardi <Mario.Fonda-Bonardi@SMGOV.NET>; Jim Ries <Jim.Ries@SMGOV.NET>; Nina Fresco <Nina.Fresco@SMGOV.NET>; Clerk Mailbox <Clerk.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Lane Dilg <Lane.Dilg@SMGOV.NET>; David Martin <David.Martin@SMGOV.NET>; Jing Yeo <Jing.Yeo@SMGOV.NET>
Cc: Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Mayor Kevin McKeown <Kevin.McKeown@SMGOV.NET>; Terry O'Day <Terry.Oday@smgov.net>; Gleam Davis <Gleam.Davis@SMGOV.NET>; Ana Maria Jara <AnaMaria.Jara@SMGOV.NET>; Sue Himmelrich <Sue.Himmelrich@SMGOV.NET>; Greg Morena <Greg.Morena@SMGOV.NET>; Ted Winterer <Ted.Winterer@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Vote NO on Agenda Item 8-A, Planning Commission meeting of May 13, 2020

EXTERNAL

May 13, 2020

RE: Agenda Item: 8-A (Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet)

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We oppose the removal of a required Development Agreement process and the assurance of public input that a DA allows for Tier 3 housing projects in downtown. The Planning Commission should REJECT the staff proposal to allow these projects to be approved with only a Development Review permit.

This proposed change would wreak havoc with our city.

We are offended by the use of the euphemism "streamlining" for the silencing of the community about the future of downtown Santa Monica.

We ask you to vote NO on 8-A.

We agree with the assessment of Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City (below).

Do not hand our city over to developers to do as they wish. Retain the process that we have in place to protect the community.

Sincerely,

The Board of Northeast Neighbors

Please include this comment in the Public Record for Agenda Item 8-A, Planning Commission meeting of April 13, 2020

May 12, 2020

RE: Agenda Item: 8-A (Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As our Planning Commissioners, residents rely on you to reject knee-jerk responses for fast fixes and instead, to provide thoughtful, factual analysis, and demand the same from City staff. Unfortunately, this staff report gives you nothing you need to decide whether this is a good idea or a terrible one. In the many housing discussions that both you and the City Council have entertained, no one has studied eliminating Development Agreements for the largest housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet. Further, we believe that this proposal will have unintended consequences and erode public trust.

In response to what was basically a “shout-out” from a council member during a study session, you are now being asked to change the Development Agreement approval process for Tier 3 housing projects to a “streamlined” development review permit.

One line in the very short staff report says it all: “This change would be intended to encourage the development of larger housing projects as the current requirement of a Development Agreement for projects greater than 90,000 square feet may be viewed as a disincentive for property owners to maximize housing developments.” (Emphasis added).

Those are two speculative and subjective thoughts unconstrained by any factual analysis.

Maybe property owners (developers) will do what you hope, and maybe they won't unless they can make more money. Maybe all this idea will accomplish is to create a

wave of land speculation downtown as developers and REITs don't build the housing you want, but instead wait for a new, more favorable post-pandemic, post-financial crisis world. In a couple of years, nothing in developer time, the speculators you will create tonight will press for new development standards (in order to have their projects "pencil out") that – no surprise – will feature mostly market rate and luxury housing with barely a nod to affordable housing. There is nothing in this proposal that would prohibit that from happening. In fact, it's inevitable. And when it does happen, you will have facilitated it along with the predictable and disastrous upscaling and gentrification.

"Streamlining" the development process also provides a kind of "punch list" for both staff and the developers; it's a cookie cutter approach instead of being responsive to the actual needs and impacts of specific project sites and their surroundings.

The current pandemic and financial crisis will inevitably result in a top down review of downtown land-use assumptions (the levels of retail, office, hotels and yes, housing) that our city planners have used to guide our future. Is this the best time to be considering a "quick fix"?

While the public – residents – are busy quarantining from this life-and-death pandemic, the city should not be deputizing staff to push through what would become the biggest housing developments in our city.

This proposal is misguided and cannot be justified. It should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Diana Gordon Co-Chair, Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City ("SMCLC")

Cc: City Council City Manager Lane Dilg, Planning Director David Martin, Planning Division Manager Jing Yeo, Community Groups

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Melissa Zak](#)
Subject: FW: Planning Commission
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:06:40 AM

From: Lynette Kozdron <lynette624k@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:04 AM
To: Planning <Planning@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: Planning Commission

EXTERNAL

I ask you to vote no on 8 A.

Thank you,
Lynette Kozdron

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Melissa Zak](#)
Subject: FW: vote NO on 8-A - Do not hand our city over to developers
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:14:31 AM

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

From: Rachel Harms <rharms@ix.netcom.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:12 AM

To: Planning <Planning@SMGOV.NET>; Leslie Lambert <Leslie.Lambert@SMGOV.NET>; Richard McKinnon <Richard.McKinnon@SMGOV.NET>; Elisa Paster <Elisa.Paster@SMGOV.NET>; Shawn Landres <Shawn.Landres@SMGOV.NET>; Mario Fonda-Bonardi <Mario.Fonda-Bonardi@SMGOV.NET>; Jim Ries <Jim.Ries@SMGOV.NET>; Nina Fresco <Nina.Fresco@SMGOV.NET>; Clerk Mailbox <Clerk.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Lane Dilg <Lane.Dilg@SMGOV.NET>; David Martin <David.Martin@SMGOV.NET>; Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Mayor Kevin McKeown <Kevin.McKeown@SMGOV.NET>; Terry O'Day <Terry.Oday@smgov.net>; Gleam Davis <Gleam.Davis@SMGOV.NET>; Ana Maria Jara <AnaMaria.Jara@SMGOV.NET>; Sue Himmelrich <Sue.Himmelrich@SMGOV.NET>; Greg Morena <Greg.Morena@SMGOV.NET>; Ted Winterer <Ted.Winterer@SMGOV.NET>

Subject: vote NO on 8-A - Do not hand our city over to developers

EXTERNAL

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am a 25 year resident, voter, taxpayer and homeowner in Santa Monica.

I strongly oppose the removal of a required Development Agreement process and the assurance of public input that a DA allows for Tier 3 housing projects in downtown.

The Planning Commission should REJECT the staff proposal to allow these projects to be approved with only a Development Review permit.

I ask you to vote NO on 8-A.

I agree with the assessment of Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City which you have been sent previously.

Do not hand our city over to developers to do as they wish. Retain the process that we have in place to protect the community.

Sincerely,

Rachel Harms

From: [Nancy Morse](#)
To: [Planning Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Agenda item 8-A of 5/13/20 meeting
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:30:19 AM

EXTERNAL

To: Planning Commission
Re: Agenda item 8-A of 5/13/20 meeting
From: Nancy M. Morse

Please vote no on agenda item 8-A.

If this item is passed, once again the residents will be omitted from communications as to changes in the community. The development projects this measure is designed to benefit will last many years, and residents will have to live with the changes for a good many years. What is it that staff plans to sneak in without public observation?

This measure is a slap in the face to all residents who worked to craft the Downtown plan.

I am not opposed to development. I am opposed to irresponsible development, and that done behind the backs of residents. This measure is all the more insulting at a time when we are to stay away from city hall.

I agree with the assessment of Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City

Sincerely,
Nancy M. Morse

From: [Dee Cappelli](#)
To: [Planning Commission Comments](#); [Leslie Lambert](#); [Richard McKinnon](#); [Elisa Paster](#); [Shawn Landres](#); [Mario Fonda-Bonardi](#); [Jim Ries](#); [Nina Fresco](#); [Lane Dilg](#)
Cc: [Clerk Mailbox](#); [Mid City Neighbors](#)
Subject: <https://www.smgov.net/departments/pcd/agendas/Planning-Commission/2020/20200513/a20200513.htm>
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:44:20 AM

EXTERNAL

I ask that the City Clerk include this email as part of the public record.

Regarding Agenda Item 8, 8-A and 8-B under consideration: Resolution Number 20-010 (PCS) and 20-011 (PCS)

As a citizen of Santa Monica for more than 30 years, I am against this resolution.

The changes from this rushed resolution would benefit developers, not Santa Monica residents. In addition, how many times will this planning commission repeat the number "90,000?" It's been over a year now since it was first publicized as an required number of units that have to be jammed into the city's boundaries. With all the massive amount of construction all over the city, certainly that number must be less by now. Could we have an update? The housing crisis is a such a red herring anyway. There will never be enough housing in Santa Monica. By the time the 90,000 units are completed, the governing agency will tell Santa Monica to build 100,000 more units. Why not change zoning for the area north of Montana. start building massive high rises in that area? Make it easier for developers to erect more ugly high rise boxes there? Santa Monica is not Miami. Stop passing ordinances that will further enable developers to destroy the community, character and beauty of this city by building more, higher, ultimately more expensive housing units stacked on top of each other.

Vote NO on this ordinance. It does to benefit Santa Monica.

Full disclosure, I am a commissioner on the Disability Commission but am writing as a private citizen of Santa Monica.

Thank you,

Dee Cappelli
1438 11th St.
B
Santa Monica, CA 90401

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Melissa Zak](#)
Subject: FW: SAVE SANTA MONICA - VOTE NO on 8 A
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:52:42 AM

From: Linda Shayne <lindashayne@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:43 AM
To: Planning <Planning@SMGOV.NET>; Leslie Lambert <Leslie.Lambert@SMGOV.NET>; Richard McKinnon <Richard.McKinnon@SMGOV.NET>; Elisa Paster <Elisa.Paster@SMGOV.NET>; Shawn Landres <Shawn.Landres@SMGOV.NET>; Mario Fonda-Bonardi <Mario.Fonda-Bonardi@SMGOV.NET>; Jim Ries <Jim.Ries@SMGOV.NET>; Nina Fresco <Nina.Fresco@SMGOV.NET>; Clerk Mailbox <Clerk.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Lane Dilg <Lane.Dilg@SMGOV.NET>; David Martin <David.Martin@SMGOV.NET>; Jing Yeo <Jing.Yeo@SMGOV.NET>; Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Mayor Kevin McKeown <Kevin.McKeown@SMGOV.NET>; Terry O'Day <Terry.Oday@smgov.net>; Glean Davis <Glean.Davis@SMGOV.NET>; Ana Maria Jara <AnaMaria.Jara@SMGOV.NET>; Sue Himmelrich <Sue.Himmelrich@SMGOV.NET>; Greg Morena <Greg.Morena@SMGOV.NET>; Ted Winterer <Ted.Winterer@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: SAVE SANTA MONICA - VOTE NO on 8 A

EXTERNAL

May 13, 2020

RE: Agenda Item: 8-A (Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet)

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We oppose the removal of a required Development Agreement process and the assurance of public input that a DA allows for Tier 3 housing projects in downtown. The Planning Commission should REJECT the staff proposal to allow these projects to be approved with only a Development Review permit.

This proposed change would wreak havoc with our city.

We are offended by the use of the euphemism “streamlining” for the silencing of the community about the future of downtown Santa Monica.

We ask you to vote NO on 8-A.

We agree with the assessment of Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City (below).

Do not hand our city over to developers to do as they wish. Retain the process that we have in place to protect the community.

Sincerely,

The Board of Northeast Neighbors

*Please include this comment in the Public Record for Agenda Item 8-A,
Planning Commission meeting of April 13, 2020*

Letter submitted by Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City:

May 12, 2020

RE: Agenda Item: 8-A (Eliminating DA review for Tier 3 housing projects
exceeding 90,000 square feet)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As our Planning Commissioners, residents rely on you to reject knee-jerk responses for fast fixes and instead, to provide thoughtful, factual analysis, and demand the same from City staff. Unfortunately, this staff report gives you nothing you need to decide whether this is a good idea or a terrible one. In the many housing discussions that both you and the City Council have entertained, no one has studied eliminating Development Agreements for the largest housing projects exceeding 90,000 square feet. Further, we believe that this proposal will have unintended consequences and erode public trust.

In response to what was basically a “shout-out” from a council member during a study session, you are now being asked to change the Development Agreement approval process for Tier 3 housing projects to a “streamlined” development review permit.

One line in the very short staff report says it all: “This change would be intended to encourage the development of larger housing projects as the current requirement of a Development Agreement for projects greater than 90,000 square feet may be viewed as a disincentive for property owners to maximize housing developments.” (Emphasis added).

Those are two speculative and subjective thoughts unconstrained by any factual analysis.

Maybe property owners (developers) will do what you hope, and maybe they won't unless they can make more money. Maybe all this idea will accomplish is to create a wave of land speculation downtown as developers and REITs don't build the housing you want, but instead wait for a new, more favorable post-pandemic, post-financial crisis world. In a couple of years, nothing in developer time, the speculators you will create tonight will press for new development standards (in order to have their projects "pencil out") that – no surprise – will feature mostly market rate and luxury housing with barely a nod to affordable housing. There is nothing in this proposal that would prohibit that from happening. In fact, it's inevitable. And when it does happen, you will have facilitated it along with the predictable and disastrous upscaling and gentrification.

"Streamlining" the development process also provides a kind of "punch list" for both staff and the developers; it's a cookie cutter approach instead of being responsive to the actual needs and impacts of specific project sites and their surroundings.

The current pandemic and financial crisis will inevitably result in a top down review of downtown land-use assumptions (the levels of retail, office, hotels and yes, housing) that our city planners have used to guide our future. Is this the best time to be considering a "quick fix"?

While the public – residents – are busy quarantining from this life-and-death pandemic, the city should not be deputizing staff to push through what would become the biggest housing developments in our city.

This proposal is misguided and cannot be justified. It should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Diana Gordon Co-Chair, Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City ("SMCLC")

**Cc: City Council City Manager Lane Dilg, Planning Director David Martin,
Planning Division Manager Jing Yeo, Community Groups**

From: [Jennifer M Regan](#)
To: [Planning Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Ana Maria Jara](#); [Ted Winterer](#); [Lane Dilg](#); [Nina Fresco](#); [Leslie Lambert](#); [Richard McKinnon](#); [Elisa Paster](#); [Shawn Landres](#); [Mario Fonda-Bonardi](#); [Jim Ries](#); [Clerk Mailbox](#); [Andrew Hoyer](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Planning Agenda Item 8-A
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:55:57 AM

EXTERNAL

Thank you in advance for your time to consider and review this comment in your discussion of Agenda Item.8-A. My comments are below the restatement of the agenda item.

Agenda Item 8-A description:

Resolutions of Intention to consider recommending to the City Council that the Council amend the text of the Downtown Community Plan to authorize Tier 3 housing projects greater than 90,000 square feet to be reviewed through a Development Review Permit and amend Section 9.10.070 of the Zoning Ordinance to establish project requirements for Tier 3 Downtown housing projects greater than 90,000 square feet."

PUBLIC COMMENT:

I believe Tier 3 housing projects greater than 90,000 square feet are the exact types of projects that need community input and public comment. I am concerned that the "Development Review Permit" process as currently defined by the city does not have adequate public review or input. If there is to be an amendment adopted it must account for the need for public input on projects of that magnitude.

Thanks,
Jennifer Regan
Vice President, Mid-City Neighbors
Born in Santa Monica 1985
1428 14th street Santa Monica, CA 90404
(310) 614-5756