

**SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENT LETTER RESPONSES, SEPTEMBER 29, 2021**

Reference Number	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response
S1	9.21.21	Raj Mehta	7055 Elmer Street parcel is currently in the Whittier Boulevard Specific Plan's Workplace District Residential designation. The proposed General Plan designates the parcel for Innovation use. The current land use is an older (1911) single family residential use. Mr. Mehta states that this parcel is the only residential unit on the street and it is attracting illegal activities as well as use by the unhoused. Mr. Mehta requests that the Innovation designation allow for residential use including ADUs. Note, the Mr. Mehta states that his son owns the property; he does not state that he is writing on his son's behalf.	Innovation land use designation is intended to accommodate creative design and manufacturing businesses focused on new technologies, maker industries, research and development, and craft businesses. As such, a residential use is not appropriate for the designation for this parcel in this neighborhood. However, the residential building structure may be attractive to Innovation district users as an adaptive reuse structure.  No change to the draft General Plan is proposed.
S2	9.27.21	Luciano Coral	The letter highlights the inconsistency between the current and proposed General Plan designations and the existing land use condition. Per Mr. Coral, the sites around 10727 Orange Grove Drive appear to be constructed at a density equal to or higher than 40du/ac. The current General Plan and the proposed General Plan designations is for Medium Density Residential, which allows for 15 units/ac.	An inconsistency occurs between the current and proposed General Plan designation, Medium Density Residential, and the zoning R-3. R-3 corresponds to Medium High Density Residential (25 du/acre).  While Mr. Coral does not request a land use designation change, one may be inferred. The inferred request would be that the Medium Density Residential designation be changed to High Density Residential (35 du/ac) or Very High Density Residential (55 du/ac).  After reviewing Mr. Coral's letter and other planning materials, it appears that the cited parcels may have undergone a General Plan amendment sometime in the past from High Density Residential to Medium Density Residential, thus creating legal nonconforming uses.  As such, a General Plan land use designation change to <b>High Density Residential</b> is proposed.
S3	9.28.21	David Dickerson	The Resources Management section should be modified as follows: RM 11.1: Strengthen the City's <del>tree policies and ordinances.</del> <b>existing thirty-three year-old ordinance codified at WMC 12.40.</b>  RM 11:7 Aim to protect mature trees and our urban forest. Develop a <del>tree preservation ordinance and/or program</del> <b>an urban forest management program.</b>	Attachment E, General Plan Errata Reference Number 6 provides for General Plan text revision in response to Mr. Dickerson's verbal comments that the General Plan tree ordinance policies conflict.  General Plan Errata Reference Number 6 states: With Council direction, RM-11.7 will be revised as follows: Aim to protect mature trees and urban forests. Develop a tree preservation ordinance and/or program. A new ordinance will not be adopted; however, Program 26: Urban Forestry Management will be revised as follows: Adopt a tree preservation ordinance. Time Frame: Tree preservation ordinance – Short-term; Parkway tree ordinance - Ongoing Responsibility: Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Funding Source(s): General Fund  With Mr. Dickerson's written comments provided; the following is proposed: 1) Rescind the proposed changes as identified in the General Plan Errata Reference Number 6. Changes to RM 11.7 (below) are appropriate. Also, the Urban Forestry Management Program (Program 26) already provides for the urban forest management program identified in the proposed RM 11.7 language. 2) Revise RM 11.7 to read: Aim to protect mature trees and our urban forest. Develop an urban forest management program.

**SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENT LETTER RESPONSES, SEPTEMBER 29, 2021**

S4	9.28.21	Helen Rahder	Attachment F-1A provides the 1993 Goals and Policies that may confuse readers into thinking these policies are proposed.	Comment is noted.
S5	9.28.21	Abundant Housing LA/YIMBY Law/Homes For Whittier (AHLA/YIMBY Law/HFW)	The letter provides excerpts of HCD's August 2021 letter to the City of Whittier and comments that the draft responses to the HCD letter do not fully address the HCD comment. The letter provides additional recommendations for draft Housing Element revisions.	<p>As required by law, the City of Whittier submitted its HCD Draft Housing Element to HCD for its review in June 2021. AHLA/YIMBY Law/HFW provided written comments to HCD for HCD's consideration in its review. HCD issued an August 2021 comment letter, in the transmittal email HCD states it received and considered AHLA/YIMBY Law/HFW's letter and other letters in its comments.</p> <p>In accordance with HCD's direction, a jurisdiction has two options. Option 1 - a jurisdiction may revise its element to address HCD comments, adopt the housing element, and then submit the adopted element to HCD for certification review. Option 2 - a jurisdiction may edit its draft document, submit the edited draft to HCD for review, and later adopt a negotiated element.</p> <p>The City of Whittier is proceeding with Option 1. The City of Whittier anticipates adopting the draft Housing Element with revisions provided in track changes. The adopted element will be submitted to HCD for a second 60-day review. During this review, HCD will determine if additional changes are necessary to attain a certified Housing Element. It is important to note that HCD representatives have stated that they anticipate most, if not all SCAG region jurisdictions will have to undergo two or even three rounds of review given HCD's constrained capacity and recent State law requirements. City of Whittier staff and its consultants think the responses provided in the revised Housing Element address the HCD comments sufficiently and, if adopted, the Housing Element should be submitted to HCD for its certification review. The comments have been noted. No changes are recommended.</p>
S6	9.28.21	Whittier Conservancy, Mary Gorman-Sullens	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Add policy HR 2.7: <b>Update and keep current the City's official list of historic resources.</b></li> <li>2) HR 3.1: Consider the impact of climate change on historic and cultural resources and act to take preservation measures. The policy doesn't have an implementation measure.</li> <li>3) Implementation Program 9 – <del>Consider Adopting</del> <b>Adopt</b> the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties as the City's official tool for reviewing alterations and changes to historic resources.</li> <li>4) Implementation Program 10 – <del>Explore updating Chapter 18.84 of the Whittier Municipal Code, the Historic Resources Ordinance, to</del> <b>Adhere to the State Office of Historic Preservation guidelines and procedures that</b> ensure consistency and compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.</li> <li>5) Land Use Policy Map – Include an overlay of the four historic districts on the city's Land Use Policy Map as they are already part of the Zoning Code in Title 18, and this should be reflected in the City's official map.</li> </ol>	<p><b>WAITING FOR City RESPONSES. The response below follows previous instructions. If this is no longer the case, please provide the correct response.</b></p> <p><b>Items 1, 3-5 Comment Noted. No changes are proposed.</b></p> <p><b>Item 2 – The revised Historic Resources Matrix identifies two implementation programs as addressing the policy. Specifically Program 17 Building Code Update and Program 66 Post Disaster Policies and Plans</b></p>
S7	9.29.21	Jeff Nickell	11654 Grand Vista Drive parcel is currently designated Low Density Residential. Mr. Nickell requests that his property and his neighborhood be designated Hillside Residential.	<p>This is Mr. Nickell's second letter requesting a designation change. Please see Attachment E for the first letter and request response.</p> <p>Hillside Residential designation is appropriate for neighborhoods with up to 3 units per acre. Overall, the parcels Mr. Nickell refers to does not meet the density requirement.</p>

**SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENT LETTER RESPONSES, SEPTEMBER 29, 2021**

				<p>Low Density Residential is the appropriate land use designation. Furthermore, a Low Density Residential designation allows for a Residential Estate zone. The upcoming zone code revision may consider changing this neighborhood from R-1 to Residential Estate.</p> <p>No changes to the General Plan are proposed.</p>
S8	9.29.21	Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters, Mitchell M. Tsai, Attorney at Law	<p>The letter suggests that the City should require development project applicants to provide additional community benefits such as requiring local hire and use of a skilled and trained workforce to build the Project. The letter continues to state that the City should require use of workers who graduated from a Joint Labor Management apprenticeship training program or have at least as many hours of on-the-job experience in the applicable craft as required in a state approved apprenticeship program. The letter suggests the City require local hire mandates; consider using skilled and trained workforce policies and requirements to benefit local area economically and mitigate GHG, air quality, and transportation impacts; and require projects to build to standards exceeding the current 2019 California Green Building Code.</p> <p>The letter states that the project fails to provide the information and analyses required of all housing elements.</p> <p>If approved, the project would be approved in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act including the DEIR unlawfully piecemeals its environmental analysis and unlawfully omits information.</p> <p>The project violates the State planning and zoning law as well as the City's General Plan including internal (horizontal) and vertical (zoning ordinances and other land use decisions) consistency. The DEIR fails to demonstrate internal consistency with the General Plan.</p>	<p>No specific development project or development application is part of the proposed project, General Plan Update and Housing Element Update.</p> <p>Mitchell M. Tsai, Attorney at Law, has previously submitted letters regarding the Housing Element and the EIR as well.</p> <p>Mr. Tsai submitted a letter to HCD as part of HCD's initial 60-day review. Like the AHLA/YIMBY Law/HFW letter, HCD considered Mr. Tsai's comments in its August 2021 comment letter to the City of Whittier. HCD's transmittal email specifically identifies Mr. Tsai's letter as well as others that HCD reviewed and considered. The City of Whittier is addressing HCD comments with the proposed revisions included in the Revised Draft Housing Element. Upon adoption, the City of Whittier will submit the adopted housing element to HCD for a certification review. If additional changes are necessary to attain certification, HCD will provide the City of Whittier with its comments. All members of the public may provide HCD with additional written comments for its consideration. Please see Attachment E for additional response to Mr. Tsai's previous letter.</p> <p>Mr. Tsai's previous letter on behalf of the Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters is also responded to in the draft Final EIR (Attachment I), Comment Letter G.</p> <p>No revisions to the General Plan or Housing Element are proposed.</p>

9.28.21 ) David  
Dickerson

9.27.21 Luciano Coral