Mr. Mitch Glaser, AICP  
County of Los Angeles  
Department of Regional Planning (countywide studies section)  

RE: Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update and attached Summary PDF file.  

Dear Mr. Glaser:  

I have just been made aware of the “One Valley, One Vision” General Plan activity going on for the Santa Clarita Valley area, and the proposed “down-zoning” of the approximately 6,000 acre property commonly known at the Hathaway Temescal Ranch. At this time I am representing the majority of the Hathaway family ownership, which includes the Hathaway Temescal LLC, Five Points Temescal LLC and the Temescal Ranch Limited Partnership. Only one family member’s minority ownership is excluded here because I do not yet have her response on this matter. Attached please find a PDF file (courtesy of Sikand Engineering Associates) providing approximate, existing zoning and General Plan density information for the Hathaway Temescal Ranch, along with topographical maps for your reference.  

We are very concerned and object to the change in the existing General Plan density and zoning from the current A2-2, which we feel maintains the maximum flexibility necessary to meet future challenges, unanticipated trends and opportunities that may unexpectedly present themselves. As such, we would appreciate it if the county would at the very least retain the current General Plan density as a zoning. Changing the General Plan and zoning as currently set forth, which effectively forces a reduction from approximately 2,155 du to 310 du, seriously impacts our future ability to take advantage of yet unforeseen opportunities that would allow us to develop the property to its highest and best use. While the economy may be depressed at the moment, no one knows what the future may bring, what new trends may occur, or what unforeseen opportunities might become available. Thus, being that the future is both unknown and unpredictable, arbitrarily restricting the use of the property to NU1/RR1 (0.05 du/af), for instance, could turn out to be just as detrimental to us (the property owners), as it may well be for the county and the area in general. We want the property to be as zoning unrestricted as possible so as to accommodate any unanticipated, unforeseen and potential development possibilities that may occur in the future. Keeping the property zoning as it is now is easy, changing and/or reversing it at some future date to accommodate what cannot be foreseen can be difficult, time consuming and expensive for everyone, including the county.  

We are asking that the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning reconsider any ideas about changing the current General Plan density and A2-2 zoning and/or arbitrarily “down-zoning” the use and potential of the Hathaway Temescal Ranch property.  

Thank you for your consideration and assistance. Please feel free to contact me at your convenience by telephone (941-349-9805) or e-mail (terry707@hathaworld.com).  

Sincerely,  

Terry Hathaway  

(941) 349-9805
6,200 ACRES
HATHAWAY ("TEMESCAL") RANCH
SANTA CLARITA VALLEY, CA

LOCATION: The property is located in the Castaic area of Northern Los Angeles County, generally between Interstate 5 (I-5) and the Ventura County line. The property is just east of Lake Piru in Ventura County and just south of the Los Padres National Forest.

SIZE: 20 assessor parcels total approximately 6,200 acres.

TOPO: Topographic relief varies over the property with elevations ranging from about 1,100 to 2,600 feet above sea level. Slopes with a gradient of 0 – 25% encompass about half the property.

WATER: The property has several wells, numerous springs and a number of streams.

CURRENT: The property is currently a working cattle ranch with ranch house.

DEVELOPMENT: A number of years ago there was a development proposal for an 11,000 to 14,000 dwelling unit project plus extensive office, retail, and research park. This was an ambitious proposal, but was not processed through the County.

EXISTING ZONING: A2-2 or 6200Ac/2Ac = 3100 DU

EXISTING GENERAL PLAN: HM (Hillside Management) 0-50% slope = 1 DU/2Ac

APPROX. GENERAL PLAN DENSITY (EXISTING):

$0-25 \% \text{ slope } : 3100 \text{ Ac} \times 1 \text{ DU/2Ac} = 1550 \text{ DU}$

$25-50 \% \text{ incl. } : 1000 \text{ Ac} \times 1 \text{ DU/2Ac} = 500$

$\text{OVER 50} \% \text{ incl. } : 2100 \text{ Ac} \times 1 \text{ DU/20Ac} = 105$

Total = 2155 DU

SUGGESTED GENERAL PLAN (OVOV) MODIFICATION:

RR2 for Southerly Parcels 1-5 ... 2234 Ac x 0.1 = 223 DU

RR4 for Northerly Parcels G-14 ... 3872 Ac x 0.5 = 1936

Total = 2159 DU

(by Sikand)
From: Luke Salzarulo [mailto:lukesalzarulo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2009 9:03 PM
Subject: Val Verde AGAINST SCV Area Plan Update

LOUD AND CLEAR...READ MY LIPS-

LEAVE OUR RIDGE-LINES ALONE!

I have lived in Val Verde for 22 years (nearly my entire life!). I am a high school teacher
with the William S. Hart School district, a property owner and an extremely concerned
citizen.

Val verde has always been an "Agricultural area" mainly identifying with farm communities
of highway 126 (e.g. Piru, Santa Paula, Fillmore). We still have multiple working ranches
and farms in our community. Caballeros and equestrians use our streets regularly.

We FLOOD EVERY YEAR! WE BURN EVERY YEAR. It would be extremely foolish to open up
hillsides to "establish maximum residential densities in all hillside management areas." It
would be a disaster...these "experts" that look at our drainage and mud-flow have no idea
of the kind of flooding we see when it's wet...they have not lived here and experienced it.

Has the County gone NUTS!!?!!

Our roadways are already way too narrow to accommodate existing traffic...and WE DONT
WANT THEM WIDER!

We do not want increased light pollution. We can actually see the stars at night...and WE
WANT TO KEEP IT THAT WAY!

WE have faults everywhere...our hills are constantly changing and shifting.

We have WILDLIFE. Deer, bobcats, cougars, coyotes, foxes, hawks, linx, bears, condors,
rabbits, badgers, skunk, racoons, frogs, horned toads, porcupines...WE ARE A WILD
COMMUNITY! I have personally seen everyone of these animals in the Val verde area. Our
valley has geographic access to Piru lake, we have a few natural springs and creeks which
run all year long (including Borton Creek) and animals live in our valley in abundant
numbers.

We are septic only...increased population would wipe out our water table...

How are emergency vehicles supposed to access the area? Where do these new families
work? Go to school?

We want to keep our community rural, and isolated and my household is against these
planning amendments 100%.

I hope you guys go back to the drawing board and figure something else out...because this
is not the answer.

Thanks for listening,

Luke Anthony Salzarulo

30367 Arlington St.
Val Verde, Ca 91384
661.295.0737
Sir

This letter is being sent at the recommendation of Mitch Glaser to you. Attached are portions of AMB 3244-030-029 as well as 3244-030-027 along with 2810-001-035 and -040. They have been incorrectly designated as RL5 by staff rather than the designation of RL2 which was agreed upon by staff. The reason being is that these 4 parcels, 3244-030-029 as well as an assemblage of the returning 3, make up 2 of the estate lots that were previously approved in tentative tract 51644. By designating these lots as RL5 it would then render them unbuildable per the new Plan. This was brought to the attention of staff when the One Valley - One Vision (OVOV) was originally being compiled and they agreed that the proper resignation should be RL2 for both. Therefore on behalf of our client, Montalvo Properties, we wish to have this correction made prior to the OVOV being approved. If you have any questions regarding this, you can either speak to Mitch Glaser directly or contact myself. Thank you.

Matt Benveniste
Senior Planner
Mr. Mitch Glaser  
Countywide Studies Section  
Los Angeles County  
Department of Regional Planning  
320 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Glaser:

**One Valley One Vision, County Project No. R2007-01226**

The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) received a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on September 3, 2009. We offer the following comments:

1. **Page 3.17-13, Impact Analysis, Impact 3.17-1, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence:** 34.1 should be changed to 28.1. 3rd sentence: 34.2 should be changed to 34.1.

2. **Page 3.17-15, Impact Analysis, Impact 3.17-2, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence:** 34.1 should be changed to 28.1. 3rd sentence: 34.2 should be changed to 34.1.

3. **Page 3.17-16, Impact Analysis, Impact 3.17-3, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence:** 34.1 should be changed to 28.1. 3rd sentence: 34.2 should be changed to 34.1.

4. All other information concerning Districts' facilities and sewerage service contained in the document is current.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

Stephen R. Maguin

Ruth I. Frazen  
Customer Service Specialist  
Facilities Planning Department
Dear Mitch!

Please, adjust boundary of zone R-1-11000 to exclude my lot #8.

This lot has a significant value as being R15000 now all the city of Santa Clarita.

See attached sketch.

From 1989 we own this lot (my husband passed away in 2007), I will really appreciate it if you do this for me.

If you have additional questions ask Ron Horn he is my project engineer.

Best regards,

September 11/09

Eva Kornev.
Please adjust boundary of Zone R-1-11000 to exclude my Lot #8 as being in Zoning Proposed (Boundary) of Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan - Proposed.

This Map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for general reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable. THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION.

See Attached Sketch.
Your property: Parcel Number 2853008008

Land Use Change (Existing to Proposed) / Zoning Change (Existing to Proposed):

HM to P / R-1-10000 to NO CHANGE

1 this lot 008 is part of my office property 007, 008, 003, 002, 002 what is a part of the same project.

Note: multiple lines mean that your property is divided into multiple land use/zoning designations.

For more information, please visit http://planning.lacounty.gov/ovov
Good Afternoon Dr. Ramey:

As Mark indicated, I am the primary contact for the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update (One Valley One Vision, or OOV), so I will respond to your inquiry. Please feel free to forward this response to Mr. Cota and Mr. Barrett.

OOV is an effort to update the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, which was adopted in 1984. This is a joint effort with the City of Santa Clarita. It was initiated several years ago and is now reaching the public hearing stage, which is why you received a public hearing notice for each parcel that you own. For more information on OOV, please visit the project Web Site at [http://planning.lacounty.gov](http://planning.lacounty.gov).

The Draft Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan update has several components:
- A revised policy document, with new Land Use, Circulation, Open Space & Conservation, Safety, and Noise Elements;
- A revised land use plan with new land use designations;
- A revised zoning map to ensure consistency with the revised land use plan; and
- A Draft Environmental Impact Report.

As the notices indicate, the revised land use plan and revised zoning map affect each parcel that you own. If you disagree with the revised land use designations and/or revised zoning designations, you should advise the Regional Planning Commission by 1) Sending written correspondence; 2) Testifying at the hearing; or 3) Both. Before the revised land use designations and revised zoning designations take effect, they must be approved by both the Regional Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors through a series of public hearings. These public hearings provide an opportunity for property owners to express their concerns and request changes.

The revised land use designations were determined through a suitability analysis that was applied to every parcel in the Santa Clarita Valley. The suitability analysis was driven by compatibility with the existing development pattern as well as environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints, including but not limited to:
- Slopes;
- Significant ridgelines;
- Existing and proposed Significant Ecological Areas;
- Biological resources;
- Very high severity fire zones;
- Seismic zones;
- Flood zones;
- Proximity to existing and proposed major roadways and transit facilities; and
- Proximity to existing urban infrastructure and services, such as sewers, water lines, fire stations, and schools.

The suitability analysis and the revised land use plan that resulted are consistent with the Vision, Guiding Principles, Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Draft Area Plan update.

The following information is specific to each parcel that you own:

**Parcel 3211-003-014**

The current land use designation for this parcel is HM (Hillside Management). In the HM designation, the maximum density is determined by the slope of the parcel. The proposed land use designation for this parcel is RL2 (Rural Land 2). In the RL2 designation, the maximum density is 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres, regardless of slope. For more information, please visit [http://planning.lacounty.gov/view/ovov_faq](http://planning.lacounty.gov/view/ovov_faq).

The current zoning designation for this parcel is A-2-1 (Heavy Agricultural, 1 Acre Minimum Lot Size). The proposed zoning designation for this parcel is A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural, 2 Acre Minimum Lot Size). The primary reason for this
change is that the property is located within the adopted Agua Dulce Community Standards District, which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size.

Parcel 3214-039-026

The current land use designation for this parcel is N1 (Non-Urban 1). In the N1 designation, the maximum density is 1 dwelling per 2 acres, unless the property has slopes over 25%, in which case the maximum density is adjusted downward, as determined by the slope of the parcel. The proposed land use designation for this parcel is RL10 (Rural Land 10). In the RL10 designation, the maximum density is 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres, regardless of slope. For more information, please visit http://planning.lacounty.gov/view/ovov_faq.

The current zoning designation for this parcel is A-1-1 (Light Agricultural, 1 Acre Minimum Lot Size). The proposed zoning designation for this parcel is A-1-2 (Light Agricultural, 2 Acre Minimum Lot Size). The primary reason for this change is that the property is located within the adopted Agua Dulce Community Standards District, which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size.

Parcel 3214-040-064

The current land use designation for this parcel is HM (Hillside Management). In the HM designation, the maximum density is determined by the slope of the parcel. The proposed land use designation for this parcel is RL10 (Rural Land 10). In the RL10 designation, the maximum density is 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres, regardless of slope. For more information, please visit http://planning.lacounty.gov/view/ovov_faq.

The current zoning designation for this parcel is A-2-1 (Heavy Agricultural, 1 Acre Minimum Lot Size). The proposed zoning designation for this parcel is A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural, 2 Acre Minimum Lot Size). The primary reason for this change is that the property is located within the adopted Agua Dulce Community Standards District, which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size.

I hope this information is helpful. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

Thanks,

Mitch

Mitch Glaser, AICP
Supervising Regional Planner
County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning
Countwide Studies Section
(213) 974-6476

From: Child, Mark
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2009 3:41 PM
To: Shane Ramey
Cc: Glaser, Mitch
Subject: RE: Project No. R2007-01226-(5)

Hi Shane,
Thanks for your comments. I have copied Mitch Glaser on this message because he is in charge of the section that is proposing this zone change. His team will consider your comments and of course enter them into the record.

Mark Child  mchild@planning.lacounty.gov

From: Shane Ramey [mailto:sramey21@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2009 9:49 AM
To: Child, Mark
Cc: Joseph A. Cota; James Barrett; Novak, Paul
Subject: Project No. R2007-01226-(5)

Mark,

We recently received three "legal notices" (one for each property in the Roy Ramey Trust) from the Department of Regional Planning (see attached) regarding proposed zone changes. We want to get on record that we oppose the proposed zone changes to these properties (parcel numbers 3211003014, 3214039026 and 3214040064). In addition, we'd like the following questions answered by the LACDRP:

1. What purpose is served by the proposed zoning changes?
2. Can these properties be rezoned even if the property owner does not agree to the zoning changes?
3. If not, what exactly does a property owner have to do to prevent proposed zoning changes?

Thanks!

--

Dr. Shane Ramey, Ph.D.