

First I would wish all of you a Merry Christmas and a Healthy New Year.

History - in 2008, Councilman DeLong commissioned a study with input from all of the homeowner groups in southeast Long Beach. I have previously presented a copy of the study to Council but you can go to LBDS – SEADIP on the City website. The study indicated that the majority of residents in the area preferred restoration of the wetlands and indicated “redevelopment at higher levels of density is ... not desired.”

SEADIP is not outdated in just the last three years – but we should redo the study as a starting point before trying to spot zone this area. If the local residents would then approve (even a modest density increase) – then have 2nd & PCH present a conforming development. You could then “honestly” say you are approving a project in compliance with the Local Coastal Plan.

The Project - After a cursory look at this major project with so very little of the actual plans available for review and even less financial analysis. The best anyone can say is that the “drawings” presented tonight portray 2nd & PCH as an attractive high density project. It looks like it would be right at home in Marina Del Rey. I imagine - if approved – this project will be the start of the conversion of the PCH corridor into Marina Del **La Playa Largas** as many other nearby landowners follow with their own high rise developments.

I say this for a reason - **why** would you and **how** could you deny the same development rights to all the other nearby landowners who have maintained their properties well, after “you – the leaders of Long Beach” richly reward a property owner who has literally trashed what was once an Edgewater Hyatt.

The Process - EIR’s and CEQA - I just read that Long Beach does not like the new EIR for the Port of Los Angeles railroad plans. I relate having found fault in the corrected EIR for 2nd & PCH. The item should have been obvious as it was so recent, but it is another one of many faults that have been or will be set forth by counsel for the wetlands.

In Summary

Negatives of the Project - Spot zoning – Precedents - F rated traffic impact with insufficient consideration of new projects – Insufficient consideration of pedestrian traffic - Insufficient parking – 12 Stories (on top of above ground parking?) – Impact on bird fly-way to and from Wetlands - No financial analysis – Currently - not financial feasibility.

Positives for the Project - Green?

Conclusion – Please remember - 3 Planning Commissioners wisely voted against the project and with good reason.

Thank you for your time. - - David C. Robertson, MAI