## **Thomas Dearborn**

**From:** birgepa@gmail.com

**Sent:** Sunday, October 16, 2022 10:08 PM

**To:** Thomas Dearborn **Subject:** Lake LA CSD

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Mr. Dearborn,

I like that the Lake Los Angeles Community Standards District (LLACSD) proposal specifies in writing that LLA will remain a rural community with low lighting, lack of sidewalks and curbs, no multi-dwelling units (apartments), has west/southwest building designs requirements for new commercial construction, allows for home businesses, does not allow billboards, creates standards for new construction of housing and associated horse trails (multi-purpose trails) and forbids home owner associations and gated communities.

I oppose ALL the rest of the LLACSD proposal.

Not much is 'grandfathered' for existing home and business owners.

The LLACSD proposal contains many restrictions that place fiduciary obligations on existing home owners, under the term "..., encourage aesthetic measures ..." (Community Standards District, Completed Draft, para 1) to meet standards related to:

- 1. fencing (offset, height, material),
- 2. shipping containers (quantity, color, placement),
- 3. truck owner/operator (quantity, parking, hours of operation)
- 4. Animals (type, quantity, location)
- 5. Home businesses (type, location on property & type of structure, hours of operation)

Restrictions on the items 2-5 above also require some type of concealment from public view. How much is this going to cost a property owner? Some new requirements mandate compliance schedules (6month, 2years, etc.), causing financial expense to the property owner.

Where is the demographic data such as age groups and percentages of group to total population with respect to working/disabled/retired, and income, and associated analytical analysis that projects individual property owner costs to come into compliance? The proposal does not contain information on if the property owner is of an age or physical ability to even be capable of performing the tasks or if it will create an added financial expense for them by having to hire skilled workers or specialized equipment?

Home businesses are 'allowed' to have (or build) a place to conduct business, but they are not allowed to convert a shipping container. Nor is a shipping container allowed for housing animals or creating a workshop. Why? Might it have to do with the inability to collect taxes?

Environmental sensitivity is prominently highlighted throughout the draft, yet actual population demographics is only marginally referenced as it relates to horses & trails, truckers, home businesses animals, etc. Nowhere does it place requirements on vacant lot owners whose property are often used as short-cuts by drivers, thus destroying vegetation which creates blowing dust and trash on windy days. We have a lot of windy days.

The requirement for underground utilities is perfect. Yet the language allows wiggle room for deviation. The language suggests that a waiver could easily be obtained by the waiver requestor saying it is prohibitively expensive or some other argument. A large utility could easily use their political and financial influence to obtain a waiver.

The boundary maps show land mass that is far from the town center. Town center being defined as residential and commercial areas, which is approximately bounded by 150<sup>th</sup> St East to 180<sup>th</sup> St East, Ave M to Palmdale Blvd. Some of the property owners who live beyond the town center live in trailers and fifth-wheels. That is their right to do so.

The rural town council (RTC) is set up specifically to imitate a form of local government and is merely an advisory group of 'involved' people. Lake Los Angeles is home to many people who choose to NOT get 'involved'. The RTC does not put effort into contacting each property owner other than social media. Social media is not used by many property owners, including me. Fortunately, the county mailed a hearing notice or I would not have even known about a proposed CSD. The LLACSD states that the RTC will be involved as a voice in approval processes. The RTC is not authorized to approve of, or agree to, or recommend denial of any proposal on behalf of any property owner without having first communicated with each property owner. The RTC does not communicate with all property owners.

Having containers, goats, chickens, vehicles, tall fences and all the other restrictions being proposed are not yours or mine to make or mandate. The rules for life are "do no harm". The property owner has the right to do what they want on their property as long as they do no harm. Creating a community standards district is a gateway gentrification-type process and a profit center for the county that I do not want for my rural community.

Please record my opposition to all parts of this LLACSD. There are existing laws, regulations and statutes to ensure safety. I recommend the LLACSD be summarily and permanently denied.

v/r

Pamela Birge