

**From:** [BEATRICE ELLIOTT](#)  
**To:** [Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Item 08090821  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 2:11:13 PM

---

I own three lots on agoura road , west of Lewis,east of Cornell ,  
it is currently BPOR, can my property be considered for this project .  
Beatrice elliott

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Rosie Brockman](#)  
**To:** [Kimberly Rodrigues](#)  
**Cc:** [bpoliquin@pkarchitecture.net](mailto:bpoliquin@pkarchitecture.net); [Don Dusablon](#)  
**Subject:** AVE - LETTER - AGENDA ITEM NO. 8.pdf  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 2:28:27 PM  
**Attachments:** [AVE - LETTER - AGENDA ITEM NO. 8.pdf](#)

---

Warning! This message was sent from outside your organization and we are unable to verify the sender.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

Hello Kimberly,

Please see attached letter from Brian Poliquin, this is in regards to today's City council meeting, Agenda Item No. 8.

Please let us know if you should have any questions.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,  
Rosie Brockman

**pk:architecture**

architecture : master planning : interior design

29619 agoura road

agoura hills : california : 91301

t: 818.584.0057 f: 866.800.1289 w: [pkarchitecture.net](http://pkarchitecture.net)

The Honorable Denis Weber  
And Agoura Hills City Council  
Attn: Kimberly M. Rodrigues, MPPA, MMC,  
City Clerk  
Civic Center–City Hall  
30001 Ladyface Court  
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Re: Agoura Hills City Council Agenda, September 8, 2021, Agenda Item No.8, Public Hearing Regarding the Sixth Cycle Housing Element 2021-2029 Honorable Mayor Weber and City Council Members:

Honorable Mayor Weber and City Council Members:

As Architects who have practiced architecture in Agoura Hills and the surrounding area, we are aware of the upcoming review of the Objective Standards by City council. Being that we have worked in the City and own property in the City we feel that it is in our interest to address several elements of the objective standards which are of concern.


It is our opinion and, based on over 30 years experience in assisting clients in land planning projects, that the definition for setbacks and their interpretation in the Agoura Village Specific Plan are contradictory and flawed, regarding their implementation, and do not reflect the intent of the Agoura Village Specific Plan, and of the way setbacks are typically used. The AVSP considers multiple buildings on a site creating people spaces, driveways and landscape in between. The Setback code being currently utilized does not allow for that, by the way it is written and interpreted by planning staff. We would recommend a much clearer and more direct code which clearly defines a setback for an instance, from a property line, from a street or from a rear yard. Setbacks typically are used to define front, side and rear yards. There should not be a more than or less than, this can be achieved with building undulations, form and breakup. The code as written, creates confusion in how the envelope of a building is to be defined and it cancels the potential for a Multi building development. If one looks at the diagrams provided in the AVSP, we clearly see setbacks from the street and property line, and between buildings, and the diagrams clearly show the intent of how setbacks are to be used, and the envelope from which to develop within.

Another code that should be evaluated and possibly changed is the method by which height of a building is measured. The AVSP measures building height from natural grade. Other parts of the City utilize finish grade, which is typical, to measure height. For example, if a low site is graded from natural grade upward to a higher finish grade a building's height would be limited to the original "natural grade", making it lower, but what if natural grade is high, then a structure's height starts at that point (natural grade), making it higher. It seems that if the City wants the best of all conditions regarding building height it would be logical that height would be best defined from finish grade, rather than natural grade, as planning can control the finish grade within reason through the way a site will be graded. Finish grade allows for a more definitive interpretation of final building heights and how a site may be graded. And for that matter is used in other areas of the City.

We respectfully encourage council to consider our input as they move through the decision process of adopting the Objective Standard.

Thank you for the opportunity for us present these comments and concerns and to reiterate, there are stakeholders in the Agoura Village ready and willing to work with the City to establish meaningful and realistic Standards for by-right development.

Sincerely,



Brian R. Poliquin, AIA, NCARB. Leed AP  
President



**From:** [A Chodorow](#)  
**To:** [Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Public Hearing  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 2:48:58 PM

---

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

To Whom It May Concern -

The following are my concerns as it relates to new developments in our community.

Regarding housing mandates -

I understand we need housing and affordable housing. However, I do not believe it is a good idea to build in areas that are designated as a high fire severity zone.

There is a finite amount of space within the 8 miles of Agoura Hills. What happens when all that space is occupied? Do we start building up?

Regarding The AVE -

The issues with the development on the corner of Kanan and Agoura are many. We are the Gateway to the Santa Monica Mountains and it would be nice for our area to actually reflect this. Why can't the City of Agoura Hills look for developers who will incorporate the natural space into their design? There are incredible innovations happening all over the world, why can't we blaze a trail instead of turning into another Topanga Canyon? In addition, and very important, the public has not had the opportunity to review an EIR.

Our small town should work together in keeping out greed. Please protect the beauty that is our community.

Thank you for your time,  
Angela Chodorow

**From:** [Rae Greulich](#)  
**To:** [Kimberly Rodrigues](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Public Hearing 6th Cycle Housing Element  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 3:10:39 PM

---

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

1 of 2

*"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." Margaret Mead*

On Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 12:46 PM Rae Greulich [REDACTED] wrote:

City Council Members, I respectfully submit to you that California wildfires continue to break records year after year. Last year was the worst fire season in our state's history. Over 4 million acres burned. By July of this year **over 257** times as many acres burned in California as by the end of July, 2020. (<https://krcrtv.com/news/local/california-sees-257-increase-in-acres-burned-compared-to-2020> )

Why, then, is the City of Agoura Hills proposing placement of 17 of 21 of its state-mandated, high-density housing sites in the VHFHSZ/wildland-urban interface -- *the most dangerous place in our state to build in terms of wildfire risk?*

**HCD's own Wildfire Ordinance** seeks to limit development in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and to "prioritize and concentrate new housing developments in the **least environmentally hazardous areas...**" (County of Los Angeles Housing Element (2021-2029), page 19, Wildfire Ordinance Policy 11.4).

Agoura Hills is bordered on the south by the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. The area of Agoura Hills south of the 101 Freeway, where most of the potential housing sites would be located, and the entire North Area of unincorporated Los Angeles County are both in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The County of Los Angeles absolutely excludes sites in the VHFHSZ for state-mandated, high-density housing, period (County of Los Angeles Housing Element (2021-2029), pages 164, 171).

Is that point lost on the City of Agoura Hills who, just yards away from their southern border, is loading the majority of its high-density housing construction into the very same VHFHSZ in the most dangerous section of the city, endangering current residents and the new residents about to be invited in?

Have huge pending cases based upon **wildfire safety** concerns like Tejon Ranch (<https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2021-04-08/judge-blocks-construction-of-tejon-ranch-housing-development>) and Otay Ranch (<https://timesofsandiego.com/politics/2021/03/17/california-ag-seeks-to-join-lawsuits-challenging-otay-ranch-projects/>) not enlightened the City of Agoura Hills? They seem, sadly, to only have motivated the City to speed things up before safer legal precedents are set, or Senate bills like SB12 are approved.

State-mandated housing is a complicated issue and I applaud the Agoura Hills Planning Department for its hard work and diligence, but the Planning Department serves at *whose* behest? **The buck stops with the City Council.**

**Wildfires are real.** The consequences of overdeveloping the wildland-urban interface/VHFHSZ and at the mouth of the area's singular evacuation route will be real. The rest of the state is responding responsibly to the reality of wildfires. With all due respect, why isn't Agoura Hills?

Respectfully submitted,  
Rae Greulich  
PRISMM

*"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." Margaret Mead*