

Hector,

Please add this to GPCComments and contact me, if you can discuss the issues I have noted.

Thank you,

Tim Platt

05/24/2022

Measure I General Plan Comments---Land Use Designation Problems

In previous GPCComment e-mails to you, I have detailed problems with Measure I's inclusion in the draft GPU, including (1) sections of Measure I not included in the GPU, (2) the GPU maps not showing the lands protected by Measure I or some maps, like the Land Use Map, needing to be magnified before the POPO is visible and (3) a variety of typos and other errors and issues that undermine making Measure I an integral part of the draft GPU.

In this GPCComment, I want to address the issue that several of the Land Use Designations (LUD) protected by Measure I and explicitly called out by Measure I are shown with what appear to be material errors in their Land Use Designations (LUD).

I would like to discuss these issues below with someone, as I know they are complicated and reasonable explanations may be possible.

It appears that certain requirements of Measure I do not appear in the Land Use Designations (LUD) protected by Measure I. And in other cases, stipulations that are not in the current General Plan have been added to some LUDs---for instance FAR limits, that I believe are not in the current General Plan, and, therefore, cannot be added without a vote of the people.

For ESL, CUL and PPOS--- Measure I Section 5.h. and Exhibit C put clear restrictions on those lands, and these restrictions are not noted under those LUDs. Indeed, contradictory conditions are noted for all three of those

LUDs. Stipulations in Measure I that relate to lot coverage, density, minimum lot size, number of units, application requirements, slope density limits are not shown.

Also OS and P&R have an inappropriate stipulation, the FAR. This stipulation does not appear in the current General Plan, to the best of my knowledge.

Additionally, the 2% coverage stipulation does not appear to be noted in the appropriate LUDs that cover private open space. Measure I Section 5.h. and Exhibit C specify a limit of 2% of total lot area can be used for residential uses including related facilities.

All of these restrictions should logically appear in the appropriate LUDs. Please advise if there is some reason why the stipulations don't appear. Also please advise if there is any valid reason for the contradictory additions, and, if so, what the reason is.

Please advise if there is some reason why the stipulations don't appear. Also please advise if there is any valid reason for the contradictory additions, and, if so, what the reason is.

With regard to OS-S, where are the stipulations on density and lot sizes called out in the current General Plan and what are they? They should be the same for the draft GPU, and we need to make sure of that.

I repeat that I would like to discuss these issues with someone, as I know they are complicated and reasonable explanations may be possible.

I have also made this comment elsewhere, but believe it is worth repeating here. A statement such as: "This LUD is protected by Measure I. See Policy LU-P-1.2 for more information." should be added to all the LUDs protected by Measure I, just as you have added other pertinent information to other LUDs. This statement would be appropriate and help reduce any confusion on what Measure I protects.

Also under the POPO LUD, pg. 2-39, I believe you should note the LUDs that are covered by Measure I to reduce confusion. For instance add: "Land Use Designations that are protected by Measure I include: Alhambra Valley Open Space (AV/OS), Environmentally Sensitive Land (ESL), Neighborhood Park (NP),

Open Space(OS), Open Space and Recreation Permanent (OS&R), Open Space 30% Slopes (OS-S), Open Space, Parks and Recreation (OS/P&R), Open Space Private (OSP), Open Space/Conservation Use Land (CUL), Parks and Recreation (P&R), and Permanent Open Space (PPOS).”

And also you should name in this LUD the Policy section LU-P-1.2 and any appendices or attachments you use to explain Measure I.

Last, there are a few more typographical errors that can lead to misunderstandings in the future. Your list of LUDs on page 2-47 does not match the list on the Measure I map, Exhibit A, and also does not match the LUD names used on pgs. 2-36 through 2-39.

Please clean that up and make them all match the LUDs on the Measure I map, Exhibit A. Most of the problem seems to be with your having added “Park and Recreation” into your Policy LU-P-1.2 paragraph b on pg. 2-47.

Also the “NP” has been left off of Neighborhood Park on pg 2-37.

This has been a lot of work, but hopefully it will give us a better and more accurate General Plan Update.

Tim Platt

05/24/2022