

**From:** [WilliRat@aol.com](mailto:WilliRat@aol.com) [mailto:WilliRat@aol.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 3:29 PM

**To:** Mitch Glaser; Emma Howard

**Subject:** Temescal Ranch

*I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to sit down last week and discuss the various draft ordinances, guidelines, and designations working their collective way through the public hearing process in anticipation of the approval later this year.*

*Following our meeting, and at your urging I reviewed the 2013 Draft Hillside Management Ordinance, the Draft Hillside Design Guidelines, as well as the maps for the proposed SEA to be known as the Santa Felicia SEA, and have some concerns specific to the Temescal Ranch for which I serve as the Referee in Partition;*

- The Draft HMA has a 70% open space requirement which is now applicable to the entire property. For example if you owned 6000 acres, you would have to set aside 4200 acres for open space before you even submitted for the approval of a discretionary CUP to do something with the balance. Even to farm it, much less develop it. The current ordinance stipulates that only areas which have a slope of 25% or more are included in the definition of a HMA. The new proposed ordinance, provides for the fact that if any part of a property has a slope of 25% or more, all the property is now to be included in the definition, not only the actual property with the 25% slope. So in essence this represents an ordinance that is designed to take property from hillside owners who may have had property zoned for agriculture/grazing under all the preceding regulations for many decades.*
- Under the existing provisions, a CUP is only required if the area of development which is proposed to be developed with residential uses exceeds the midpoint range of the adopted plan.*
- Under the existing regulations, accessory buildings and appurtenant structures would not require a conditional use permit; under the proposed regulations a CUP would be required.*
- It seems that any concepts of Land Use and Zoning will be circumvented by what appears to be a "anti-development" Hillside Management Ordinance". The language proposed in the new ordinance further defines development in a number of ways including "the removal of any vegetation, including fuel modification". So if the Temescal Ranch hillsides can not be used for agriculture and grazing, then all it might be useful for is open space, which of course puts this proposed ordinance, and its' supporting documents and maps in direct opposition to Government Code Section 65912.*
- Additionally the revisions to the existing SEA map to now include the Temescal Ranch in a newly designated Santa Felicia SEA for which the requirements for "development of any type" must be submitted to a Type B CUP hearing with SEATAC.*
- Finally when I put all of these various layering of proposed ordinances together, and then combine the thrust behind them with the 2011 Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan which was approved on 11/27/12, it appears that a case could be made, taken in total, that these when utilized together may serve to constitute a taking of lands that are desired as "natural buffer areas surrounding the entire valley... which shall be preserved as a regional recreational, ecological, and aesthetic resource".*

*With respect to grazing rights and the use of same on the Temescal Ranch amongst other properties, I would request to be kept in the loop as the language is developed with respect to these new proposed ordinances. Emma, I would also appreciate any contact information that you may be able to provide for; Peterson Ranch mitigation bank in the AV, as well as Thuy Hua's contact information regarding the proposed Renewable Energy Ordinance.*

*Can I also request to be placed on the list of interested parties for all future public hearings regarding these items at your convenience.*

*Thank you once again for your time last week.*

*Best*

*Bill Rattazzi*