

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception Listing

Comparison with City Council
Approved Provisions

June 15, 2010

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception Listing - OVERVIEW

- THE GREATEST LIE, MISINFORMATION AND FALSE CLAIM BY THE COLLEGE IS THAT THE PROCESS OF REVIEW IS FLAWED, BROKEN AND NEEDS TO BE “CORRECTED” BY VOTER APPROVAL OF THE INITIATIVE: DON’T BE FOOLED BY THEIR PROPAGANDA:
- OF THE TOTAL 10 YEARS THIS “PROCESS” HAS REQUIRED, THE COLLEGE HAS CAUSED 87 MONTHS OF DOCUMENTED OBSTRUCTION AND DELAY!
- THE COLLEGE FAILED TO CONDUCT GEOLOGIC “DUE DILIGENCE” THAT CAUSED THE “PROCESS” TO BE SUSPENDED AFTER 37 MONTHS OF WASTED EFFORT AND ANOTHER 25 MONTHS TO PRODUCE NEW PLANS! THAT IS OVER 5 YEARS OF WASTED TIME!
- THEN THEY DISRUPTED WORK FOR AN ADDITIONAL 15 MONTHS BY FAILING TO PROVIDE REQUIRED CEQA DATA AND INFORMATION! ETC.

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception Listing - Summary

- The most significant differences between the two plans are that the Initiative would allow:
 - (1) the construction of two residence halls (2 buildings that will house 255 occupants) that may be connected by a gallery; (14-7)
 - (2) the placement of the athletic field immediately adjacent to the Palos Verdes Drive East roadway curvature* with the tennis courts located immediately to the east of the athletic field; (14 – 9)
 - (3) increased grading quantities; (14 – 14)
 - (4) no limit on the maximum duration of construction activities** (14 – 9), and
 - (5) no periodic review of the conditions of approval that would allow conditions to be revised by the City Council to lessen impacts upon the surrounding residential neighborhoods.” (14-3.)
- **Page References in Parenthesis are from the Staff Report of June 15, 2010)**

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception Listing - Detail

- * The City Council approved the **athletic field** in that same general **location** at the curvature of Palos Verdes Drive East, but moved it away from the road a small distance based on perceived safety issues created by Marymount's proposed location. (14 – 9)
- ** Marymount's campaign literature characterized its **construction** as **involving 36 months**. However, Marymount strenuously objected to the City Council limiting it to one 36 month construction period. Instead, it sought, and was granted a construction period of 36 months spread **over up to 8 years**. And its **Initiative does not have that time limitation**] (14 – 9 & 14 - 13)
- Their Campus Specific Plan **deletes key safeguards** of athletic field and tennis court use, allowing all sports and night time (lighted) activities **without specific safety restrictions** included in the Approved Plans. (14 – 23, 14 – 28, 14 – 29, 14 – 36, 14 – 37, 14 – 38, 14 -39, 14 – 42, 14 – 44, 14 – 45, 14 – 47, 14 - 48)

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception Listing – Detail Page Two

- The Campus Specific (Initiative) Plan **VOIDS Key protections and limitations** provided in the City Council Approved Plan, including;
- **Deletes** Compliance with Mitigation Measures: (14 – 8)
- **Deletes** Compliance with Council adopted conditions of approval and grounds for revocation of such approvals based on non-performance: (14 - 8)
- **Removes** 6 month review of the project performance compliance: (14 – 8)
- **Deletes required Compliance** of all Construction activity consistent with Certified EIR : (14 – 9)
- **Deletes** Indemnification of the City against third party suits: (14 – 11)
- **Deletes** compliance with Athletic Building Maximum Height Limitation: (14 – 12)
- Balanced on-site grading: **Not required!** (14 – 15)

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception Listing – Detail Page Three

- **Removes restriction** of on-site stone cutting: (14 – 18)
- **Introduces** Unrestricted outdoor amplified sound events: (14 -23)
- **Allows sub-leasing of the campus for commercial purposes:** (14 – 25)
- **Deletes** promised (Dr. Brophy) driver training for incoming new students regarding local roadway conditions: (14 – 26)
- **Removes** enrollment limitation on BA students: (14 – 26)
- **Deletes** Enrollment reporting on a timely basis: (14 – 27)
- **Removes** Noise Level restrictions and Compliance : (14 – 27, 14 – 28, 14 - 44)
- **Deletes** Lighting Plan restrictions and Reviews: (14 -28, 14 – 29, 14 – 38, 14 - 39)
- **Removes** Parking Management Strategy Program: (14 – 31, 14 - 32)
- **Adds** 125 new parked on-campus vehicles for Residence Hall residents: (14 – 32)

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception Listing – Detail Page Four

- **Removes Key Landscape Plan Reviews and Requirements:** (14 – 32, 14 - 33, 14 – 34, 14 – 35)
- **Deletes requirement for minimally reflective glass** for Athletic Building – would also apply to new Residence Halls also: (14 – 39)
- **Removes all Enrollment restrictions** and limitations: (14 – 40, 14 - 41)
- **Deletes required Parking Management Strategy Review Requirements:** (14 – 41)
- **Removes Air Quality Construction Requirements:** (14 – 43)
- **Removes Marymount Student Code of Conduct Review and Approvals** at noticed Public Hearing: (14 – 44)
- **Deletes Drainage Reviews** for Athletic Field and Tennis Courts: (14 – 47)
- **Deletes Oversight of Private Security Program:** (14 – 47)
- **Deletes requirement for recycling and waste containers** during events: (14 – 48)

Marymount Campus Specific Plan Exception

Listing – Detail – Page Five

- **The Initiative does not include a *Non-Binding offer*** for the College to pay a \$200,000 “donation” to the City for Construction of a Collision Barrier costing upwards \$500,000. Nor does the Initiative “pay” the City for Costs to be incurred for the special Ballot Measure, approximating \$80,000.
- **There are many, many more details to master.** The project is complex, and RPV City Planning Staff, the RPV Planning Commission, and the RPV City Council all reviewed thousands of pages of material to balance the merits of each aspect of this multifaceted project.
- They all conducted detailed hearings, with input from all interested parties – Marymount, neighboring residents, professional planners, geologists, etc – in order to reach the “right” decision that best meets the needs of Marymount and the community.
- The City hearing process gave all interested parties the ability to make their voices, points of view, and information heard and understood by those charged with making the “right” decision. It involved decision makers who devoted many hours to master the details.
- **NOTE: Portions of this Presentation have been excerpted from Council Member Doug Stern’s e-mail of June 14, 2010**