

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

OCTOBER 5, 2009			
	Name	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
1	Robert Kelly	<p>Represents Castaic Area Town Council.</p> <p>a) Opposes RL10 designation in Charley and Tapia Canyons.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons.</p> <p>c) Supports addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community.</p>	<p>a) Although Mr. Kelly does not mention specific parcels, he and other property owners have previously identified Parcel Numbers 2865-004-007, 2865-004-018, 2865-004-019, and 3244-023-011. The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The parcels do not contain, and are distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The parcels are not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcels are distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>These constraints generally apply to adjacent properties in Charley and Tapia Canyons, which are also designated RL10.</p> <p>b) The primary current designation for this area is Hillside Management (HM), although some areas are designated Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this area include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A large portion of the area contains slopes over 25%, with some slopes over 50%;• The area contains significant ridgelines, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD;• The area is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone;• Portions of the area are located in a Landslide Zone;• Portions of the area are located in a Liquefaction Zone;• Portions of the area are located in a Flood Zone; and• To staff's knowledge, this area is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Areas designated RL2 to the south and east are relatively less constrained. Areas designed RL1 and RL2 to the west reflect the density of previously approved subdivisions.</p> <p>c) This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting to discuss this matter and determined that it would not be feasible to add a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community. Therefore, the IEC did not recommend the addition of this Highway designation. However, language has been added to the Circulation Element of the Draft Plan that acknowledges the need for additional access for</p>
--	--	--	---

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>Castaic and calls for future land divisions between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community to explore the feasibility of accommodating a collector street to link these areas. Collector streets are not shown on the Highway Plan.</p>
2	Jeff Preach	<p>Represents Castaic Area Town Council. Indicates that the Town Council is still reviewing the documents and may have additional comments.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Subsequent to the hearing, the Town Council submitted additional comments. Staff welcomes further comments from the Town Council.</p>
3	Ralph Grunauer	<p>Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Number 2813-017-002. Suggests RL2 designation, which is consistent with adjoining Parcel Number 2813-017-003.</p>	<p>The primary current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM), although a portion is designated Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff has re-evaluated the designation of this parcel, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and agrees that both parcels have similar constraints. Therefore, staff recommends changing the designation to RL2. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the RL2 designation.</p>
4	Denise Jens	<p>Opposes H18 and H30 designations in portions of Forrest Park.</p>	<p>Staff has re-evaluated the H18 and H30 designations in this area, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing these designations to H5. The Land Use Map has been updated to reflect the H5 designation.</p>
5	Karl Reinecker	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 2865-006-004, 2865-006-016, and 2865-006-017. b) Believes that the theory of man-made climate change is based on flawed science. Disagrees with AB32 and SB375, State laws intended to address man-made climate change. c) Believes that land use and zoning changes are unconstitutional.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcels are not served by sewer or public water. <p>b) The County is required to comply with all State laws, including AB32 and SB375.</p> <p>c) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.</p>
6	Chris Ball	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3231-010-016, 3231-010-017, 3231-010-018, 3231-010-019, 3231-010-020, 3231-010-021, 3231-010-022, and 3231-010-023. Suggests urban designation.	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Landslide Zone; and • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to urban land uses.</p>
7	James Perry	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 2865-055-019. Concerned that re-designation and re-zoning will not allow horse-keeping and equestrian uses.	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM) and the current zoning is RPD-1-2U. The proposed designation is H2, which is consistent with the zoning. No zoning change is proposed at this time. Horse-keeping and equestrian uses are allowed in the H2 designation, pursuant to current Zoning Ordinance regulations.</p>
8	Cheryl Hawkins	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle	When the Tesoro del Valle project (Tract No.

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

		Phases B and C.	<p>51644) was approved, specific dwelling unit allocations were given to Phase A, Phase B, and Phase C. Phase A has been constructed, but Phases B and C have not. Phase A was constructed with fewer dwelling units than allocated. It has been determined that, under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan, these unconstructed dwelling units may be transferred to Phases B and C without a Plan Amendment. The proposed H2 designation acknowledges this determination.</p> <p>A revised Tract No. 51644 must be approved before the density transfer can occur. An application for revised Tract No. 51644 has been submitted to the Department of Regional Planning and has been deemed complete.</p>
9	Rosie Heffley	Supports the Draft OVOV Plan.	Comment acknowledged.
10	Milo Brown	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-020-046.	The current designation for this parcel is Non-Urban 1 (N1) and the proposed designation is RL2. Both designations allow the same density (1 unit per 2 acres). The primary current zoning designation is A-1-20000, although a very small portion is zoned C-3. The proposed zoning designation is A-1-2, which is consistent with both the current and proposed land use designations. The existing C-3 zoning is inconsistent with both the current and proposed land use designations.
11	Moise Monasebian	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-024-007, 2853-003-013, and 2853-006-006 to -016. Cites incompatibility with proposed Tract No. 47574. Suggests RL1, IL, and IO designations.	<p>If the Draft Plan is adopted, approved Tract No. 47574 may proceed under the conditions and time limitations of the previous approval.</p> <p>The current designations for these parcels are</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of these parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of these parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of these parcels are located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to industrial land uses.</p>
12	Lynne Plambeck	<p>Represents Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE).</p> <p>a) Indicates that SCOPE is still reviewing the documents and may have additional comments.</p> <p>b) Believes that population projections maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are overstated.</p> <p>c) Suggests additional public hearings in the Santa Clarita Valley.</p> <p>d) Concerned that Draft Plan does not adequately protect floodplains and groundwater recharge areas.</p> <p>e) Concerned that the Board of Supervisors will make changes to the Draft Plan.</p> <p>f) Opposes changes to adopted Specific Plans.</p>	<p>a) Comment acknowledged. Subsequent to the hearing, SCOPE submitted additional comments. Staff welcomes further comments from SCOPE.</p> <p>b) Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>c) Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>d) Floodplains and groundwater recharge areas are addressed in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the Draft Plan. Staff feels that these issues are adequately addressed but welcomes follow-up comments regarding specific concerns.</p> <p>e) The Board of Supervisors is the ultimate decision-making authority and is able to make changes to the Draft Plan prior to adoption.</p> <p>f) The Draft Plan does not propose any changes to adopted Specific Plans.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

13	Mike Thomsen	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3231-011-007. Suggests RL2.	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; and • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone.
14	Sadiq Ghias	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Numbers 3209-010-026, 3209-010-030, and 3209-010-031. Concerned that Conditional Use Permit for campground cannot be renewed if Draft Plan is adopted.	<p>The primary current designation for these parcels is Floodway/Floodplain (W), although portions are designated Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and 50%; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a proposed SEA; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Flood Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcels are not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcels are distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>The proposed zoning for these parcels is A-2-2. Campgrounds are permitted by right in the A-2 Zone, and RV trailer parks are permitted in the A-2 Zone with a Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the existing Conditional Use Permit could be renewed, pursuant to Zoning Ordinance requirements and the public hearing process.</p>
15	Henry Urick	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	<p>This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting to discuss this matter but did not make a recommendation and continued the matter to a future date. On December 6, 2010, the IEC will hold another public meeting to discuss this matter and will make a recommendation. Staff will provide this recommendation to the RPC on December 8, 2010.</p>
16	Vernon Sprankle	Opposes RL5 designation for Parcel Number 3247-026-056. Cites adjoining RL1 designation to the north.	<p>The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM), Non-Urban 1 (N1) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A majority of the property is located in a

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>Landslide Zone;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer.
17	Judy Reinsma	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #8 above.
18	Allan Cameron	<p>a) Suggests additional public hearings in the Santa Clarita Valley.</p> <p>b) Suggests that the traffic study evaluate additional access routes between the San Fernando Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley.</p> <p>c) Suggests that the Development Monitoring System (DMS) be retained.</p> <p>d) Suggests online overlay map that identifies changes between the currently adopted Plan and the proposed Draft Plan.</p> <p>e) Believes that the Draft Plan's Safety Element could be strengthened. Cites seismic hazards and threat of dam inundation.</p>	<p>a) Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>b) The County Highway Plan does not include any proposed additional access routes between these areas. To staff's knowledge, the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is not proposing any additional access routes between these areas. The traffic study only evaluates routes that are proposed.</p> <p>c) The DMS is a component of the Countywide General Plan. No amendments to the DMS are proposed at this time and it will remain in effect until such time that the Countywide General Plan is amended.</p> <p>d) The OVOV-NET application is available on the Department of Regional Planning Web Site.</p> <p>e) Staff feels that the Safety Element of the Draft Plan adequately addresses all safety issues but welcomes follow-up comments regarding specific concerns.</p>
19	Igor Nikitine	Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Number 3209-010-006.	The primary current designation for these parcels is Floodway/Floodplain (W), although portions are designated Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure for these parcels include those listed in #14 above (this

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			parcel is adjacent to those described).
20	Dianne Wohlleben	<p>a) Opposes H18 and H30 designations in portions of Forrest Park.</p> <p>b) Suggests additional public hearings in the Santa Clarita Valley.</p>	<p>a) Staff has re-evaluated the H18 and H30 designations in this area, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing these designations to H5. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the H5 designation.</p> <p>b) Comment acknowledged.</p>
21	Sherrie Stolarik	<p>a) Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.</p> <p>b) Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.</p>	<p>a) See #8 above.</p> <p>b) This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting and recommended that the Highway designation be retained.</p>
22	Henry Schultz	Opposes density increases in the Draft Plan.	Comment acknowledged. Staff welcomes follow-up comments regarding specific concerns.
23	Robert Lombardi	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2813-012-006. Suggests RL1.	Staff has re-evaluated the RL2 designation, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing this designation to RL1. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the RL1 designation.
24	Linda Haring	Opposes change of Vasquez Canyon Road from a Major Highway designation to a Limited Secondary Highway designation.	This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting and recommended that the change from a Major Highway Designation to a Limited Secondary Highway designation be retained.
25	William Dudra	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2813-011-005 and RL5 designation of Parcel Number 2813-011-014.	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL2 and RL5 designations are appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcels contain slopes over

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>25%;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer or public water.
26	Sherry Paradise	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3247-026-053. Suggests RL2.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons.</p>	<p>a) This parcel is currently designated Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the parcel contains slopes over 25%, and a portion of the parcel contains slopes over 50%; • The parcel is bisected by a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The parcel is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the parcel is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the parcel is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>This is one of the parcels included in the Hasley and Sloan Canyons area, discussed in #1b above.</p> <p>b) See #1b above.</p>
27	Dean Paradise	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3247-026-053. Suggests RL2.</p>	<p>a) See #26a above.</p> <p>b) See #1b above.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

		<p>b) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons.</p> <p>c) Supports addition of a proposed Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community.</p>	<p>c) See #1c above.</p>
28	Glenda Bona	<p>Represents the Calgrove Corridor Coalition. Concerned about the Draft Plan's possible impacts to the Calgrove Corridor area, which is located in the City of Santa Clarita but is adjacent to unincorporated areas across Interstate 5.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Subsequent to the hearing, staff contacted Ms. Bona and provided information. To date, the Calgrove Corridor Coalition has not submitted additional comments. Staff welcomes further comments from the Calgrove Corridor Coalition.</p>
29	Gary Shaw	<p>Opposes Highway designation between Forrest Park and Plum Canyon Road.</p>	<p>The Draft Plan will remove this designation. This change has been recommended by the Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC).</p>
30	Neil Nadler	<p>a) Supports IL designation of Parcel Numbers 3244-014-051, 3244-014-052, 3247-017-025, 3247-017-058, 3247-017-060, 3247-07-090, 3247-017-092, and 3247-018-034.</p> <p>b) Concerned that portions of Parcel Numbers 3244-014-051, 3244-014-052, 3247-017-025, 3247-017-058, 3247-017-060, 3247-07-090, 3247-017-092, and 3247-018-034 may be designated TC.</p> <p>c) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons.</p>	<p>a) Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>b) Staff has verified these parcels are not designated TC. The TC designation applies to the adjacent Interstate 5 right-of-way.</p> <p>c) See #1b above.</p>
31	Patricia Howell	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3247-042-012. Suggests RL2.</p> <p>b) Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	<p>a) This parcel is currently designated Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel contains slopes over 25%, and slopes over 50%;

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcel is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcel is located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of the parcel is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A portion of the parcel is located in a Flood Zone; and • To staff’s knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>This is one of the parcels included in the Hasley and Sloan Canyons area, discussed in #1b above. b) See #15 above.</p>
32	Joel Brandon	Does not oppose Draft Plan but generally opposes regulation and suggests that land use decisions be made on a case-by-case basis.	Comment acknowledged.
33	Janette Gabellieri	Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation.	<p>The Draft Plan does not allow unlimited commercial uses in the RL designation. The commercial uses must serve the local rural area and are only allowed in “activity areas” that meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 mile from any commercial land use designation; and • No greater than 5 acres in size. <p>Although a Plan Amendment would not be required for commercial uses in “activity areas,” a zone change would be required. A zone change would require public hearings before the RPC and Board of Supervisors, which would allow adjacent residents and property owners to review the proposed commercial use(s) and to provide comments.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			The intent of these provisions is to allow local-serving businesses in rural areas so that residents are not compelled to travel large distances to meet their daily needs. This could potentially reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled.
34	Karl Mallick	<p>a) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcels 3231-001-011, 3231-001-015, 3231-001-018, 3231-001-019, 3231-004-014, and 3231-004-015. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision (32 residential lots with average 1 acre lot size, 1 school lot, and 1 proposed commercial lot).</p> <p>b) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-018-002, 2813-018-003, 2813-018-004, and 2813-018-009, 2853-002-001, and 2853-002-007. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision (102 residential lots with average 0.5 acre lot size), existing commercial zoning, and approved Tract No. 47573.</p> <p>c) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3247-043-011. Cites inconsistency with pending Tract No. 52475.</p>	<p>a) The overall density of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the RL2 designation. However, the proposed commercial lot is not consistent with the RL2 designation. Therefore, staff recommends changing the designation on that portion of the property to CG. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the CG designation.</p> <p>b) The overall density of approved Tract No. 47573 is consistent with the RL2 designation. However, the existing commercial zoning was removed and those portions of the property were designated as IL. Staff has re-evaluated the IL designation and recommends changing this designation to CG, which is consistent with the existing commercial zoning. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the CG designation.</p> <p>c) A designation for this parcel with a density greater than RL2 would be inconsistent with the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size for new subdivisions in this area. If Tract No. 52475 has been deemed complete, the application may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan.</p>
35	Cherylann Busey	a) Oppose re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3209-008-016. Concerned that Conditional Use Permit for campground cannot	a) The primary current designation for this parcel is Floodway/Floodplain (W), although a portion is designated Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

		<p>be renewed if Draft Plan is adopted.</p> <p>b) Concerned that properties with less than 20 acres cannot be developed in the RL20 designation.</p>	<p>that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure for these parcels include those listed in #14 above (this parcel is adjacent to those described). The proposed zoning for these parcels is A-2-2. Campgrounds are permitted by right in the A-2 Zone, and RV trailer parks are permitted in the A-2 Zone with a Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the existing Conditional Use Permit could be renewed, pursuant to Zoning Ordinance requirements and the public hearing process.</p> <p>b) If a legally created lot is in the RL20 designation but has less than 20 acres, it may be developed with a single family home pursuant to current Zoning Ordinance requirements, as discussed on page 9 of the Introduction of the Draft Plan.</p>
36	Virginia Wolf	<p>a) Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation.</p> <p>b) Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	<p>a) See #33 above.</p> <p>b) See #15 above.</p>
37	Diana Larios	<p>a) Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation.</p> <p>b) Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	<p>a) See #33 above.</p> <p>b) See #15 above.</p>
38	Susan Rauch	<p>a) Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation.</p> <p>b) Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	<p>a) See #33 above.</p> <p>b) See #15 above.</p>
39	Kevin Coon	<p>a) Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Number 2813-006-003.</p> <p>b) Opposes H18 designation of Parcel Number 3231-019-006.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety,</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>and infrastructure constraints for this parcel includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the parcel contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcel is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcel is located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of the parcel is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The parcel does not contain, and is distance from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>b) See #4 above.</p>
NOVEMBER 23, 2009			
40	Krista Sloniowski	<p>Represents SCV Green.</p> <p>a) Supports Alternative 2 in the Draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Would like more information about OVOV, especially resource protection provisions. Indicates that SCV Green is still reviewing the documents and may have additional comments.</p>	<p>a) Comment acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>b) Subsequent to the hearing, staff met with Ms. Sloniowski and provided information. To date, SCV Green has not submitted additional comments. Staff welcomes further comments from SCV Green.</p>
41	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA)</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

		<p>designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>c) Believes that land use and zoning changes, as well as proposed SEA designations, are unconstitutional.</p> <p>d) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p> <p>e) Believes that the City of Santa Clarita has had undue influence in the development of the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or designation prior to the next public water; and • The property is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>b) Staff has re-evaluated the proposed SEA and has determined that it is appropriate given the County's SEA designation criteria. However, the name of the proposed SEA and the description of the proposed SEA have been revised.</p> <p>c) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes and the proposed SEA designations. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.</p> <p>d) The Draft Plan does not include policies that require conservation easements. Currently adopted Zoning Ordinance regulations for hillside management areas and Significant Ecological Areas (Section 22.56.215) have open space standards, but do not require conservation</p>
--	--	---	--

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>easements. Staff does not propose any amendments to these Zoning Ordinance regulations at this time.</p> <p>e) Although the Draft Plan is the result of a collaborative effort between the County and the City of Santa Clarita, it represents the independent analysis and judgment of County staff.</p>
42	Linda Pyburn	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>c) Believes that land use and zoning changes, as well as proposed SEA designations, are unconstitutional.</p> <p>d) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p> <p>e) Believes that the City of Santa Clarita has had undue influence in the development of the Draft Plan.</p>	See #41 above.
FEBRUARY 24, 2010			
43	Francine Rippy	<p>Opposes RL20 designation of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022-007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006)</p>	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or public water; and • The property is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services.
44	Roger Van Wert	Represents Norman and Patricia Howell. Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3247-042-012. Suggests RL2.	See #31a above.
45	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p>	<p>a) See #41a above.</p> <p>b) See #41b above.</p>
46	Lynda Pyburn	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007</p>	<p>a) See #41a above.</p> <p>b) See #41b above.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

		to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.	
47	Robert Kelly	<p>Represents Castaic Area Town Council.</p> <p>a) Supports addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL10 designation in Charley and Tapia Canyons. Suggests RL2.</p> <p>c) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons. Suggests RL2.</p> <p>d) Requests that the Castaic Area CSD remain in effect.</p> <p>e) Supports “grandfathering” of all previously approved projects.</p> <p>f) Requests that the clustering (density-controlled development) provisions in the Draft Plan be consistent with those in the Castaic Area CSD.</p>	<p>a) See #1c above.</p> <p>b) See #1a above.</p> <p>c) See #1b above.</p> <p>d) Staff does not propose any changes to the Castaic Area CSD at this time.</p> <p>e) Projects that have been previously approved by the RPC or Board of Supervisors are not affected by the Draft Plan. If the Draft Plan is adopted, these projects may proceed under the conditions and time limitations of the previous approval.</p> <p>f) The Draft Plan has been revised to allow clustering in all land use designations, provided that CSD requirements regarding minimum lot sizes are met, where applicable.</p>
48	Darryl Coe	<p>Represents the Gilmore Ranches, but did not provide Parcel Numbers. States that the Gilmore Ranches are in a similar situation as Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela and Lynda Pyburn (see #45 and #46 above).</p>	<p>Since the testifier did not provide any Parcel Numbers, staff is not able to re-evaluate the proposed land use and zoning changes for the Gilmore Ranches.</p>
49	Nancy Bertini	<p>Opposes rezoning of Parcel Number 3231-021-032 from A-1 to R-1. Cites existing agricultural use on property (growth and harvesting of trees).</p>	<p>Staff has re-evaluated the proposed zoning and recommends the R-A zone instead of the R-1 zone. The R-A zone allows for the growth and harvesting of trees. The proposed zoning map has been updated to reflect the R-A zone.</p>
50	Norm Haynie	<p>Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 2827-029-008, 2827-029-011, 2827-030-012, 2827-030-013, 2827-031-002, and 2827-031-007. Cites incompatibility with existing industrial zoning. Suggests RL2.</p>	<p>Staff has re-evaluated the portions of the property with existing industrial zoning and recommends that those portions be designated as IL to reflect the existing industrial uses. The existing industrial zoning designation will be retained. The Land Use</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>Policy Map and the zoning map have been updated to reflect the IL designation and the existing zoning.</p> <p>The current designation for the remainder of the property is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for the property include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer or public water.
51	Jeff McHaddad	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 2827-029-008, 2827-029-011, 2827-030-012, 2827-030-013, 2827-031-002, and 2827-031-007. Cites incompatibility with existing industrial zoning. Suggests RL2.	See #50 above.
52	Kathy Weber	Opposes RL20 designation of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006)	See #43 above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

53	Don Weber	Opposes RL20 designation of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006)	See #43 above.
54	Jeff Preach	Represents Castaic Area Town Council. a) Supports addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community. b) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons. Suggests RL2.	a) See #1c above. b) See #1b above.
55	Lynne Plambeck	Represents Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE). a) Suggests that the County allow approved tract maps to expire after a certain amount of time. b) Concerned about water supply issues. c) Believes that population projections maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are overstated. d) Suggests that the County and City of Santa Clarita release a single EIR for the County's Area Plan Update and the City's General Plan Update. e) Suggests that the County and City of Santa Clarita conduct joint hearings.	a) Recent State laws have extended the expiration of approved tract maps. The County is unable to shorten the expiration periods provided in State law. b) The Water Section of the Draft EIR has been completely revised. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR. c) Comment acknowledged. d) The County has prepared a Revised Draft EIR for its Area Plan Update and the City has prepared a Draft EIR for its General Plan Update. The County's Revised Draft EIR was developed in conjunction with the City's Draft EIR. The County's Revised Draft EIR evaluated potential impacts within the unincorporated communities of the Santa Clarita Valley, while the City's Draft EIR evaluates

STAFF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

			<p>environmental impacts within the City's incorporated boundaries and adopted sphere of influence. Although the County's Revised Draft EIR and the City's Draft EIR evaluate potential environmental impacts in different portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, necessitating two separate documents, the two documents reach the same conclusions with regard to potentially significant environmental impacts.</p> <p>e) Comment acknowledged.</p>
--	--	--	---