

## Results of the Agua Dulce CSD Revision Community Meeting Ballots.

The Agua Dulce Community Meeting to discuss revisions to the Agua Dulce CSD was held on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2011. The Department of Regional Planning sent 1,909 notices to the addresses of all the property owners in the areas under discussion. Somewhere between 70 to 80 people attended the meeting, and 67 completed ballots were handed in to staff at the end of the meeting.

This document contains all the votes on each subject. Additionally all of the handwritten comments on every ballot were typed up and included with each ballot item in italics. Where staff has a note it is indicated in **[bold brackets]**. If a word was unclear it is indicated as **[?]**.

A sample ballot is included at the end of this document for reference.

### Final Vote

Vote Options	Tally	Percentage
Abstain	8	12%
No	24	36%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>52%</b>

### Comments (Final Vote Box)

1. **Voted Yes.** *"25% only"*
2. **Voted No.** **[Under Contact information]** *"Why- So you can send the storm troopers"*
3. **Voted No.** *"count vote as disagree."*
4. **Voted Yes.** *"with reservations on some issues."*
5. **Voted Yes.** *"but we need more info!"*

### 1. Boundary

Yes to boundary additions	Tally	Percent (out of all votes)
Lives in Proposed Area	9	13%
Does not live in Proposed Area	12	18%
Did not say which area	2	3%
<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>34%</b>

No to boundary additions	Tally	Percent (out of all votes)
Lives in Proposed Area	6	9%

Does Not live in Proposed Area	17	25%
Did Not say which area	2	3%
<b>Total No</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>37%</b>

<b>Abstain on boundary additions</b>	<b>Tally</b>	<b>Percent (out of all votes)</b>
Lives in Proposed Area	7	10%
Does Not live in Proposed Area	7	10%
Did Not say which area	5	7%
<b>Total abstain</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>28%</b>

### Boundary Comments:

**1.1. Voted Yes/Yes.** *“Please include all OVOV area to boundary. I own 2 properties Parcel # [APN REDACTED] [APN REDACTED] [ADDRESS REDACTED] and I am not sure if I am in the pink or blue, I can vote in AD and we are on the OVOV area plan. Please include our area and change to AD Boundary.”*

**1.2. Voted Abstain/Yes.** *“can’t comment-no changes posted”*

**1.3. Voted No/Yes.** *“ must keep it rural”*

**1.4. Voted Abstain/No** *“next area over in the current plan”*

**1.5. Voted Yes/No** *“except the portion along Sierra Hwy into Acton CSD”*

**1.6. Voted Abstain/No** *“we do not see a need to add Soledad Canyon. Are they not part of Acton's CSD?”*

**1.7. Voted Abstain/Yes.** *“Sleepy Valley”*

**1.8. Voted Abstain/Abstain.** *“need to study”*

## 2. Highways and Local Streets

<b>Highways and Local Streets</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Abstain	2	3%
No	13	19%
Yes	52	78%

### Highway and Local Street Comments:

**2.1. Voted Yes.** *“This rural nature is what makes Agua Dulce. I would never want that to change. There should be no restrictions to what rural should be.”*

**2.2. Voted Yes.** *“\*Only if there is a vote to which & where [?] are to be placed. Do we vote on the areas that would be considered "safety" light improvement. \*No red lights\*”*

**2.3. Voted Yes.** *“BUT standards should adopt max width on major and secondary highways specific to Agua Dulce.”*

**2.4. Voted No.** *“should be voluntary”*

**2.5. Voted Yes.** *“please keep it the way it is currently”*

### **3. Signs**

<b>Signs</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Abstain	3	4%
No	19	28%
Yes	45	67%

#### **Signs Comments**

**3.1. Voted Yes.** *“only ranch property get to have sign”*

**3.2. Voted No.** *“present rules have NEVER! been enforced”*

**3.3. Voted Abstain.** *“unclear on [?] limitations”*

**3.4. Voted No.** *“temporary signage..“lost dog’ has been removed “the same day” not good for the lost dog or the family.”*

**3.5. Voted No.** *“people should be allowed to use their own common sense, consistent with the law on commercial speech and 1st Amendment Rights.”*

### **4. Trails**

<b>Trails</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Abstain	5	7%
No	35	52%
Yes	27	40%

#### **Trails Comments**

**4.1. Voted No.** *“only on subdivision new developments”*

**4.2. Voted Yes.** *“with subdivisions only, not individual [no/new?] projects”*

**4.3. Voted No.** *“with the proposed increase of the Santa Monica Mt conservancy into this area. Connecting to the area should be reduced- also keeping motor vehicles- off the trails will be impossible w/o increase of sheriff patrols-“*

**4.4. Voted No.** *“Parks & Rec have no REAL awareness for trail requirements”*

**4.5. Voted No.** *“why do easements/trails have regulations on width and grade, etc. Leave it natural who pays for maintenance grading placement etc.”*

**4.6. Voted Yes.** *“unaware of proposed trail locations”*

**4.7. Voted Yes.** *“I need more specific Information. But if it makes sense, yes.”*

**4. 8. Voted Yes.** *“Should only apply to sub-divisions”*

**4. 9. Voted Yes.** *“Should only apply to sub-divisions”*

**4.10. Voted No.** *“trail standards means easements”*

**4.11. Voted Yes.** *“all trails should remain open. Trails have been closed off by land owners at their discretion. Without a formal vote..”*

**4.12. Voted No.** *“standards should be tied to major land dev NOT CUP”*

**4.13. Voted No.** *“make sure they know, what a trail is and to look like”*

**4.14. Voted Abstain.** *“what?”*

**4.15. Voted No.** *“grants should not be conditional. They should be voluntary and negotiated.”*

## **5. Significant Ridgelines**

50x50	Total	Percent
Abstain	9	13%
No	13	19%
Yes	45	67%

Ridge	Total	Percent
Map		
Abstain	14	21%
No	18	27%
Yes	35	52%

**Significant Ridgelines Comments:**

- 5. 1. Voted Yes/Yes. *"50x50 ft"*
- 5. 2. Voted Yes/Yes. *"50ft not enough if excluding chimneys, etc. consider 100 ft"*
- 5. 3. Voted Abstain/Abstain. *"??"*
- 5. 4. Voted Yes/Yes. *"No build on ridgelines. "No CUP for ridgelines". If the standard is to build on ridgeline. "No build on ridgeline""*
- 5. 5. Voted Abstain/Abstain. *"??, ??"*
- 5. 6. Voted Yes/Yes. *"w/exception. Eliminate ridgeline by Coussoulis development approved but not built."*
- 5. 7. Voted No/No. *"ridiclus"*

**Drainage**

Drainage	Total	Percent
Abstain	8	12%
No	29	43%
Yes	30	45%

**Drainage comments.**

- 5. 1. Voted No. *"42% too high [?] in residential 1.25 acre"*
- 5. 2. Voted Abstain. *"??"*
- 5. 3. Voted No. *"Need more information"*
- 5. 4. Voted Abstain. *"?"*
- 5. 5. Voted Abstain. *"Is driveway ok? Is new barn ok?"*
- 5. 6. Voted No. *"could be a conflict with Calif. Green Building code- also presently effective."*

**7.Residential and Ag Land**

**a. Minimum Width and Depth.**

Min W &D	Total	Percent
Abstain	9	13%
No	23	34%
Yes	35	52%

**Minimum Width and Depth comments:**

**7a.1. Voted Yes.** *if at least 165x165 ft*

**7a.2.Voted No.** *"Small lots create clustering"*

**7a.3.Voted Abstain.** *"?"*

**7a.4.Voted Abstain.** *"?"*

**7a.5. Voted Abstain.** *"Not sure"*

**b. Required Yards**

Req Yards	Total	Percent
Abstain	7	10%
No	27	40%
Yes	33	49%

**Required Yards comments:**

**7b.1.Voted No.** *"yards and property are dependent on topography & easements & a size regulation is untenable"*

**7b.2. Abstained.** *"already subdivided?"*

**7b.3. Voted Abstain.** *"?"*

**7b.4. Voted Abstain.** *"Probably should not allow [arrow pointed at one acre]"*

**c. Home Based Occupations**

HBO	Total	Percent
Abstain	11	16%
No	17	25%
Yes	39	58%

**Home Based Occupations comments:**

**7c.1. Voted No.** *"Why change?"*

**7c 2. Voted No.** *"Specific rules for home based occupations too restrictive. I agree to home based business and accessory buildings."*

**7c 3. Voted Abstain.** *"?"*

**7c 4. Voted Abstain.** *"?"*

**d. Dogs**

Dogs	Total	Percent
Abstain	4	6%
No	27	40%
Yes	36	54%

**Dogs comments:**

**7d.1. Voted No.** *"Way too many! Low ambient noise level means too much noise nuisance (constant barking)"*

**7d.2. Voted No.** *"5 dogs."*

**7d.3. Voted No.** *"Less than 7 is better. Seven dogs is a lot"*

**7d.4. Voted No.** *"Too much barking as is. Uncontrolled."*

**7d.5. Voted No.** *"Keep current 3 dogs max unless in A2 zone"*

**7d.6. Voted Yes.** *"They're already here!"*

**e. Cargo Containers**

Cargo*	Total	Percent
Abstain	5	8%
No	25	38%
Yes	36	55%

\*out of 66

**Cargo Containers comments:**

**7e.1. Voted No.** *“Cargo containers anchorage to prevent floating off property with flooding or earthquake shearing.”*

**7e 2. Voted Yes.** *“accurate to CSD”*

**7e 3. Voted No.** *“only until construction is finished.”*

**7e 4. Voted No.** *“Ugly! Unhealthy-unsafe-NONE should be allowed! But at least a C.U.P required.”*

**7e 5. Voted both Yes and No (this vote not counted in tally.)** *“Limit the size of containers the larger 10' tall ones should not be allowed-“*

**7e 6. Voted No.** *“no more than 2 per 10 acres or more, etc- or none at all”*

**7e 7. Voted No.** *“Change to 1 container per parcel unless “hide” others behind shrubbery, existing structures, etc.”*

**7e 8. Voted Yes.** *“but disagree on quantity, allow less!”*

**7e 9. Voted Abstain.** *“Include residential zoned areas & vacant land. Change 2 containers for 2.5 ac not 3 ac all other numbers acceptable.”*

**7e 10. Voted No.** *“No cargo containers”*

**7e 11. Voted No.** *“More than detailed”*

**7e 12. Voted No.** *“Disagree with limits Qty too high”*

**7e 13. Voted No.** *“Don’t agree with amounts of containers-should be allowed more on smaller lots. Many of us bought out here so we could put containers on property and trucks on property.”*

**7e 14. Voted No.** *“This is pushed by a select few. Most residents here hate. Containers reduce adjacent properties' value. People place them next to other property owners' entrance & ruin the western atmosphere. Some people place them too close to their neighbors fence and having a 10' allowance, they cannot be hidden with a 6' fence. They promote an unkempt environment around them. Already the county has little enforcement in this area, this will make it worse. \*no more than 1 container per 5 acres and it should be neat and 8' tall not 10'. Better to have no containers at all and enforce current rule.”*

#### **f. Trucks**

Trucks	Total	Percent
Abstain	10	15%
No	28	42%
Yes	29	43%

**Trucks comments:**

**7f.1. Voted Abstain.** *"as long as owner operator none if not owned by property owner."*

**7f.2. Voted Yes.** *"Yes! Only if an enumeration of ONE is used."*

**7f.3. Voted No.** *"No commercial vehicle parking at all within the CSD area"*

**7f.4. Voted No.** *"NO WAY!"*

**7f.5. Voted Abstain.** *"Park away from sightlines of neighboring residences."*

**7f.6. Voted Abstain.** *"No Commercial truck parking 1. Dump type truck"*

**7f. 7. Voted No.** *"Null comm driveway entrance [?]"*

**7f.8. Voted No.** *"No commercial trucks."*

**7f.9. Voted No.** *"If this is their living where else would they park their truck?"*

**7f.10. Voted No.** *"Ugly"*

**7f.11. Voted No.** *"No truck parking in Agua Dulce."*

**General Comments (Agriculture and Residential):**

**7. 1.** *"There should be minor restrictions to somehow still make the property appealing. In other words as long as the property does not look like a junk yard."*

**7.2.** *"too limited should be less restriction"*

**7.3.** *"Larger lots for new development to prevent clustering of homes. Keeping Agua Dulce rural. A parcel limit for businesses on multiple acres."*

**7.4.** *"My comment is that similar to your "notice" sent out to Agua Dulce members to alert of this meeting on 5/25/11, so should you make the same concerted effort to mail a ballot form to Agua Dulce residents."*

**7.5.** *"conditional"*

**7.6.** *"not in /Spanish"*

**7.7.** *"Same comments as #3, #4, and #6" [Not clear on paper what they are referring to]*

**7.8.** *"see #3,4 & #6 for comment" [Not clear on paper what they are referring to]*

**8. Commercial and Manufacturing**

Architecture	Total	Percent
Abstain	4	6%
No	15	22%
Yes	48	72%

Hitching Post	Total	Percent
Abstain	4	6%
No	21	31%
Yes	42	63%

### **Commercial and Manufacturing Comments:**

**8.1. Voted Yes/Yes.** *“As long as it [matches?] the rural communities and not made to look industrialized, ex adding pavement for pedestrians.”*

**8.2. Voted No.** *“no to the hitching post”*

**8.3. Voted Abstain/No.** *“Finally! An appropriate area to be covered in CSDs.”*

**8.4. Voted Yes/Yes.** *“LA County needs to change out/eliminate sidewalks in "downtown" Agua Dulce. Make shoulders dirt allowing for equestrian use.”*

**8.5. Voted Yes/Yes.** *“Definitely. This translates to "rural" Agua Dulce.”*

**8.6. Voted Yes/Yes.** *“screen dumpsters and utilities could be problem.”*

**8.7. Voted No/No.** *“conflicts with Calif. Green Building code??”*

**8.8. Voted No/No.** *“40-50 people should not decide rules for a community of 4,000 to 6,000 people.”*

### **Additional Comments.**

**AC 1.** *“I would like to commend the professionalism and patience of the presenters and presentation with this [word unclear]”*

**AC 2.** *“Boundaries, please include our area to AD, we are in the OVOV and can run for the AD town council, vote on any items in AD. Everyone in the small strip is confused as to why we cannot be added (boundaries) map. Is not clear if we are included (pink or blue) (I run of out room on Item #1) sorry is a mess. Acton town council told us county screwed up let County fix it up, let County change the Boundary. [NAME, ADDRESS, PARCEL NUMBERS & PHONE NUMBER REDACTED]”*

**AC 3.** *“Put native vegetation protection standards back in”*

**AC 4.** *“Address the proposed change in the LA Plans to rural land zoning and the minimum acreage requirements which affect smaller parcels.”*

**AC 5.** *“What kind of consensus is this? We have 1,600 voters, only 85 seats, 32 people present. There are real problems with small advisory town council and their committees forming CSD and rules that are meant to be adopted by our own elected officials. Elected officials alone have the power to put together, discuss and pass LEGISLATION which affects us all. This why we elect Supervisors. We elected town council member just to have an advisory role. It seems to be a federated state. Constitutional problem. Liable to counteractions to stop or prevent. TURN IT DOWN!”*

**AC 6.** *“Earlier this year Agua Dulce Cyn Road was resurfaced- asphalt was widened to narrow dirt should impeding equestrian use.”*

**AC 7.** *“?? Designates more questions need to be answered in DETAIL. Where NO TIME WAS ALLOWED for this most important element to create a truly acceptable CSD!”*

**AC 8.** *“1. Before holding a meeting of this type where residents are asked to vote- approve/disapprove these "changes" an educational pre meeting should be held so residents know what they are voting for/against and what they would or would not change! 2. Questions on 1/2 questions yes or no see#1- bad wording. Most exceptions require permit hearing, CUP, etc \$\$\$\$ with excessive costs for same!”*

**AC 9.** *“I like this approach to voting and the way you structured this meeting.”*

**AC 10.** *“we want our community to stay rural...some ques are not clear enough”*

**AC 11.** *“ we moved to Agua Dulce many years ago to get away from many of your proposed restrictions”*

**AC 12.** *“ thank you for your work on this”*

**AC 13.** *“Significant lighting changes imposed by "Dark Skies" initiative must be mitigated for our rural area to allow for residences that have lighting for home businesses and horse facilities. Arenas, barns, etc. Major economic impact will hit property owners if lighting changes are mandated without consideration for age of existing lighting, cost to retrofit, etc. Pathway must be allowed for gradual transition.”*

**AC 14.** *“Quit bothering us! Leave us alone! Everything is fine as it is! You are liars! You take 6000 a year from me- for nothing in return. You didn't state the law correctly- you are misleading people”*

**AC 15.** *“Hillside Mgmt- Where to comment not on ballot already voted on and is in current document?”*

**AC 16.** *“-No clustering of homes- \*larger lots should be required so that clustering does not happen\* - trails- for new development trails need to be observed instead of closing off trails. This is happening currently, closing trails. -regarding new development- I would really like to see a limit on parcel development. Currently there are land owners that have several acres that have proposed building 30+ homes. <please help with this issue> Please excuse the comments, I hope you can understand comments. No hard surface to write on. 8 Yes. 6 No.”*

**AC 17.** *“How can we vote on this if not specific. Not a fair vote-town not represented.”*

**AC 18.** *“if majority yes will proceed if majority no= no”*

**AC 19.** *“The notice did not say we were going to vote!!”*

**AC 20.** *“what about solar & wind installations”*

**AC 21.** *“Please on 7e & 7f Don't allow our property values to reduce & our community atmosphere to greatly suffer by allowing AD to become a storage place full of cargo containers and parked trucks. County already does not enforce its rules, this will promote escalation of this problem. If you allow them, please make setbacks, height limits and other regulatory restrictions.”*

**1. Boundary Changes:** Do you agree with the proposed boundary changes? **Circle one: Yes No**

Do you own property in the proposed addition areas (pink)? **Circle one: Yes No**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Highways and Local Streets:** Do you agree that streets in Agua Dulce should remain rural in nature, without improvements such as curbs, gutters and sidewalks? **Circle one: Yes No**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**3. Signs:** Do you agree to limitations on permitted sign types, which are generally more restrictive than the current requirements? **Circle one: Yes No**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**4. Trails:** Do you agree that all new projects requiring discretionary approval from the Department of Regional Planning shall contain public dedicated trail easements, to meet the objectives of the Trails Plan for Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan? **Circle one: Yes No**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**5. Significant Ridgelines:** Do you that agree that ridgelines should be protected by requiring a Conditional Use Project for new buildings within 50 vertical and 50 horizontal ft of the proposed ridgelines?

**Circle one: Yes No**

Do you agree with the proposed ridgeline locations?

**Circle one: Yes No**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**6. Drainage:** Do you agree to additional limitations on the amount of impervious (non draining) pavement and surfaces on parcels in order to help with groundwater infiltration? **Circle one: Yes No**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**7. Residential and Agricultural Land:**

**7.a** Do you agree with minimum widths and depths of 165 ft for all new parcels? **Circle one: Yes No**

**7.b** Do you agree to larger required front, side and rear lots than currently required, unless a parcel is under one acre in size? **Circle one: Yes No**

**7.c** Do you agree to Agua Dulce specific rules for home-based occupations? **Circle one: Yes No**

**7.d** Do you agree that up to 7 dogs may be permitted on parcels in the residential and agricultural zones?

**Circle one: Yes No**

**7.e** Do you agree that Cargo Shipping Containers may be placed on land in these areas, with up to 4 permitted on parcels smaller than 10 acres, and 4 plus 1 cargo container per additional 5 acres on parcels over 10 acres in size? **Circle one: Yes No**

**7.f** Do you agree that any parcel of over 5 acres in size will be permitted to park a Commercial Vehicle (eg, tractor trailer trucks)? **Circle one: Yes No**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

