

COMMPLAN

From: BClonts@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 3:32 PM
To: COMMPLAN
Subject: Draft Community Plan for Hacienda Heights

Hello, Lisbeth and/or Veronica,

After reading the entire Draft Community Plan I have some concerns. We have an appointment with you on Thursday, June 24th @ 1:20 P.M. We have some questions regarding the Land Use section, but also the following concerns. I am emailing these now in case our time is short on Thursday.

Thank you, Barbara Clonts

Concerns regarding the Draft Community Plan for Hacienda Heights.

Page 16

Policy LU 2.1: *Allow vertical expansion of commercial and mixed-use development on existing commercial sites.*

- ***What are the limits on height of buildings?
- ***What set of guide lines will they follow?
- ***Will these just be the general building codes for all of the unincorporated area?
- ***Where can a person view these codes for building? Is that found under Title 22?

Page 17

Policy A 1.2: *Require street furniture and community signs to be consistent with established street furniture and right-of-way standards, as established and implemented by Department of Public Works.*

- ***What is "street furniture"?

Policy A 2.1: *Promptly remove outdated or illegal signs and notices on public rights-of-way.*

- ***Who is going to remove these illegal signs and notices on public rights-of-way?

Page 18

GOAL A-3 Attractive and well-maintained residential areas

Policy A 3.1: *Require that trash receptacle storage areas of all multi-family residences be effectively screened from view from the street by landscaping, berms, compatible structures, or a combination of these.*

- ***Shouldn't this Policy include **ALL RESIDENTIAL AREAS**?

Three residents on our short street leave their trash receptacles **ON the STREET EVERY DAY**. One family has lived in their house since Feb. 2000 and has **NEVER** taken their receptacles off of the street area. They are picked up one day. The gardener comes that evening and fills them up and over flowing with things sticking out of the top. They sit there all week.



Page 25

(In regards to implementing the Community Plan)

Last sentence on the page.... *Collaboration between county agencies, residents, and other key stakeholders will help to keep service providers connected to the constituents they serve and to one another.*

***Who are these “**other key stakeholders**”?

***Who will be the main person or agency responsible for enforcing this Plan?

***Where in this plan are these issues addressed?

The number of **yard sales** allowed per year?

What kind of **signs, banners, and flags** are allowed?

What policy limits **mobile homes, trailers, boats, old cars**, etc. from sitting in front yards, driveways, and grass areas?

COMMPLAN

From: Pluth [pluthj@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 4:10 PM
To: COMMPLAN; Dickie Simmons
Subject: Hacienda Heights Community Plan Draft

To the Hacienda Heights Community Plan Committee,

It is already July 15th and I have not commented on the draft of the H.H. Community Plan. Since today is the deadline in voicing comments about the draft, I will try to summarize instead of picking out particular items. The Rhetoric of the draft is lengthy, but I don't really see much that protects the community visions that I heard at the first two meetings I attended.

I counted 108 policies in the draft which should guarantee that we would get a beautiful community, but the only time I saw words like require, prohibit, preserve, restrict, or similar words was when it would insure that the County would have control over what was important to the County.

The majority of the policies in the H.H. draft used words like encourage, develop, enhance, minimize when possible, avoid and the much overused word of promote. None of these words mandate or carry any weight of enforcement of what the community originally wanted. They are all a bunch of rhetorical terms that sound good, but usually mean nothing when it comes to enforcement.

The only thing wrong with the 1978 H.H. Community Plan was that the plan was often not enforced, and that it too had many "fluffy" words that didn't mandate anything. If compliance is important, an excuse used to write up a new plan, it was because development was allowed even when the community objected. After 2 1/2 years spent on this new plan, no one has mentioned that there was a PAC II (Planning Advisory Committee II) that met in 1979-80 and was asked to consider major amendments to the 1978 plan especially in the south end of the community. The greater H.H. community was not asking for them, but certainly there must be a record that someone asked for them. It is interesting that with all the research that the Regional Planning Department must have done in looking at the old 1978 plan the PAC II changes have never been mentioned.

In short, I will mention a few things I noticed lacking in the 2010 plan: I did not see any mention of height limits especially where the vertical expansion of commercial and mixed uses are mentioned. I saw no mention of park space or recreational plans for anything except north of the freeway and yet the south end of the community has nothing but gated communities in place of green areas. The south end actually had proposed parks with the old "Medicine Lodge" as well as the excess school property at Vallecito and Los Altos. Both became housing developments. The south end still has nothing. Thirdly, is there some kind of limits and controls as to how the distribution of low and moderate income units will be put into existing parts of the community? I am quite sure there are many other questions, but I will close.

Sincerely,
Sharon Pluth
a resident from the south end of Hacienda Heights