



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
1.		Favor	Kimberly Curran	
		Oppose	Shahram hedayati	
		Item Total	2	
Grand Total			2	

February 20, 2026

t 310.229.9689
f 310.229.9901
EMThompson@Venable.com

Hon. Kathryn Barger
Chairperson
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
500 West Temple Street, Room 383
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Response to Appeal by United Homeowners' Association II of Regional Planning Commission approval of Project No. 2015-01232-(2) at 5101 Overhill Drive

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

We write in response to United Homeowners' Association II's ("UHA") December 1, 2025 appeal of the Regional Planning Commission's ("RPC") approval of the abovementioned Project, which, once again, mischaracterizes the Superior Court's final ruling (which included a judgment prepared by UHA's attorney) and final order, as well as the applicable legal standards.

First, in its appeal, UHA again attempts to broaden the scope of the Superior Court's final ruling. To be clear, the Court issued THREE final decisions in this matter—the Order, Judgment, and Final Writ—and all three made the same points.

- On October 10, 2019, the Court issued its Order, largely agreeing with the County and Project proponent's objections to UHA's proposed language that was so broad it would limit or even eliminate the ability for the Project proponent to move forward with, or the County to approve, the Project. The Court specifically "found the County's actions and determinations were justified as to Air Quality, Land Use and Aesthetics but not as to Traffic and Circulation...the EIR to be prepared need not include those issues for which the record justifies the County's actions and determinations." The Court then directed the parties to try again to reach an agreement on a final judgment.
- UHA's attorney drafted a proposed judgment and the parties worked together to craft a final judgment ("Judgment") that complied with the Court's explicit directions. In this judgment, all parties agreed on the following language:

3. Respondents are ordered *to set aside the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration only as to traffic and circulation;*

Hon. Kathryn Barger
February 20, 2026
Page 2

4. *Should Respondents again consider approval of the Project or a substantially similar project, and consistent with the Court’s finding that the County’s actions and determinations were justified as to Air Quality, Land Use and Aesthetics, but not as to Traffic and Circulation. Respondents shall prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addressing the significance of environmental impacts regarding Traffic and Circulation which need not include those issues for which the record justifies the County’s actions and determinations; and*

5. *Respondents shall refrain from taking any action to approve or otherwise permit **the construction** of the Project or a substantially similar project until after fully complying with this Writ of Mandate.*

On November 26, 2019, the Court signed this Judgment.

- Around this same time, UHA’s attorney drafted a proposed writ of mandate (“Writ”) and the parties worked together to craft a final writ of mandate as ordered by the Court. This language called out the conditional use permit and vesting tentative tract map would be “set aside” and to also “set aside the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration only as to traffic and circulation.” This Writ also contained the Judgment’s same language regarding the County’s requirements should it consider, again, approval of the Project or a substantially similar project. There is a further step that requires the County to file a return to the Writ if the County approves the Project after it completes and certifies an Environmental Impact Report for traffic and circulation.

On December 5, 2019, the Court signed this Writ of Mandate.

Despite the fact that UHA’s attorney drafted the documents later signed by the Court, UHA now wants to dispute the very requirements it proposed, and to which it consented. As a practical matter, the Court crafted a limited remedy, putting all other project approvals “on hold” pending further CEQA review. Indeed, County Counsel has confirmed that the Project’s deemed complete status dates to August 2016, when the Project application was complete, and that the entitlements referenced in the Order were properly set aside to comply with the Court’s instructions. To be clear, this Project has not changed in any way but for certain additional requirements imposed by the County regarding traffic circulation on the site. Moreover, no approvals to permit the construction of the Project have been issued by the County—the matter has been stayed, and the County has adhered to the writ’s terms, for the past six years.

Hon. Kathryn Barger
February 20, 2026
Page 3

Now, based on the necessary CEQA analyses prepared by the County and testimony received at its public hearings, the RPC properly considered this information and determined the Project not only complies with the Order, but also granted the requisite land use entitlements.

Second, UHA's appeal recycles its unsupported claim that the Project lacks adequate water supply for fire safety. The Los Angeles County Fire Department confirmed that the required upgrades to the existing water system to meet the fire flow requirements would be reviewed and approved prior to final map recordation. At the request of the RPC, Cal American Water, the local water purveyor, provided an updated will-serve letter (dated November 18, 2025) to reflect additional conditions based on County Fire's memo dated September 25, 2025, and the Project site's recently downgraded designation from a Very High Fire Severity Zone to a High and Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone. At the November 19, 2025, RPC hearing, County staff confirmed Cal American Water's position that the required water system upgrades would be project specific, and not impact the community's existing water supply; in fact, it is likely the replaced water line will improve service (e.g., water flow) for other, local system users. Moreover, the Project will be required to install two new fire hydrants and replace and upgrade an existing hydrant to meet LA County Fire Code fire flow requirements, and make any necessary water system upgrades to the satisfaction of the County's Fire and Public Works departments to meet required fire flow. These conditions ensure compliance with the current County fire protection standards and Division 1 of Title 20, as Section 22.258.040 requires.

Third, UHA's contention that CEQA required consideration of a reduced-density alternative is meritless. CEQA mandates analysis of alternatives only where they would avoid or lessen *significant* impacts. The focused Environmental Impact Report concluded that traffic impacts were less than significant—as such, it is not possible to identify an alternative that would avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts since none exist. Nevertheless, a reduced-density alternative would fail to meet the Project's fundamental objectives of maximizing unit production and housing diversity, and critically, would be legal infeasible under the Housing Accountability Act, which prohibits downzoning a code-compliant housing project. Courts have consistently upheld the exclusion of alternatives that do not meet a project's basic objectives or are barred by law.

Since 2016, the Project has been extensively analyzed, challenged by opponents in public hearings, litigated, and ultimately approved (a second time) by the RPC. This has significantly delayed the provision of much-needed housing for the Baldwin Hills community. In addition to meeting all of the County's code requirements, the Project, as offered voluntarily by the proponent, now contains double the number of units set aside for income-restricted residents, from five to 10 units.

Hon. Kathryn Barger
February 20, 2026
Page 4

For these reasons, UHA's objections lack merit, and serve only to sow confusion and fear. The County and the Project proponent are entitled to rely on the findings already upheld by the Court, as well as the findings in its very thorough traffic and circulation environmental review, which support the conclusion that the Project has no significant impacts. Accordingly, we urge the Board of Supervisors to deny UHA's appeal and uphold the RPC's correct and well-founded decision.

Sincerely,



Elizabeth ("Ellia") M. Thompson

cc: Los Angeles County Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Los Angeles County Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Los Angeles County Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Los Angeles County Supervisor Janice Hahn
Joshua Huntington, AICP, Supervising Planner, Department of Regional Planning
Erica G. Aguirre, AICP, Principal Planner, Department of Regional Planning
Andriy Pazuniak, Deputy County Counsel