To whom it may concern;

The General Land Use Maps (GLUMs) have been a useful tool in city planning and property development for many decades. They have served to assist both professionals and average property owners alike in understanding both the current use of their property as well potential uses. Their main weakness has been that they have not been adequately updated nearly as frequently as they should be, nor even as the city charter required. The GLUM for the Reseda area, for example, is at least 15 years overdue for renewal. Currently the city is transitioning from the GLUMs to General Plan Land Use Designation Maps (GPLUDM)…which makes for a clunkier acronym…but will bring us new maps which have been sorely needed. Considering how long we operated with GLUMs that hadn't been adequately updated for decades it is imperative we get this iteration as right as we can so the new GPLUDMs will have as long a shelf life as possible.

In considering the purpose of the GPLUDMs, the Reseda Neighborhood Council (RNC) believes their purpose should be to give a roadmap for responsible development. Development should respect the history and legacy of Reseda and also guide it into the future, improving the quality of life for our stakeholders.

The only mention of 'Agricultural' in the community plan update states, "Minimum Residential: Minimum Residential areas provide a mix of residential agricultural, and open space uses on larger lots in various contexts, most typically in hillside areas or in flat less dense areas where parcels are larger and street grids are less compact. The building form is Large Lot. The minimum lot size is typically greater than 40,000 square feet".

There is no mention of any sort of agricultural designation or zoning for any Agricultural Animal Keeping that we have seen on the Community Plan update.

Also, there is no reference to "Minimum Residential" in the Community Plan update map. There are terms such as Very Low Residential, Low Residential, Low Medium Residential, etc., but no Minimum Residential.

Additionally, the Community Plans formerly had RA, RA1, A, A1, A2, RE, RE1, K-overlay uses/zones, etc. It seems that any and all Agricultural animal keeping zones have been eliminated from this community plan update.

The Southwest Valley Community Plan includes Winnetka, Canoga Park, Lake Balboa, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Reseda, West Hills, Encino and West Van Nuys. There are horses and all types of agricultural animals in each of these areas now. Taking away any kind of animal keeping zoning will be a detriment to all of these areas, as well as other similar areas across the vast city of Los Angeles.

Looking over the proposed Community Plan map, we would like to request a few changes be made.

In regard to honoring our legacy, there is a section of Reseda in the northwest corner, a remnant of what Reseda started and thrived for many decades. This area is called Reseda Ranch and reflects the agricultural roots of our community. It is an area where horses walk down the street, chickens cross the

road (and wake residents up in the morning), goats bleat and pigs snort. Unfortunately, such uses do not coexist well with more intensive residential uses. For this reason it is imperative that any existing large, agriculturally zoned lots be protected. In the current map, a number of these lots have been categorized as Low Residential when they should be categorized as Very Low Residential. Every single family residential lot in the Reseda Ranch community greater than 15,000 square feet in size needs to be categorized as Very Low Residential. There are a number of lots on the west side of Wilbur between Strathern and Saticoy as well as a few on the south side of Keswick near Tampa which need to be properly categorized as Very Low Residential.

In regards to planning ahead for the future, it strikes us that there are a number of changes that could be made to make some properties more flexible that currently suffer a degree of obsolescence because of uses of adjacent properties. For example, in the 6600 block of Baird, the houses on the east side would be in a Low Residential category and the property directly behind them with which they share a property line would be in a Community Center category, which allows for a more dense and high development. Without any sort of a buffer between them such as a street, arrangements like this cause loss of privacy and negatively impact the value of single family residences (which these houses on Baird have suffered). Lots such as these should be opened up for more dense development, such as a Low Medium Category would allow. This would return some value to current owners or allow them to develop their properties to a more valuable asset for their families while creating more housing inventory for the community. In essence, wherever a property with a high impact use (for want of a better term) borders another of a use at least two levels below it (e.g. a commercial property or apartment building of more than 4 units bordering a single family residence) with no buffering street between than the property with the less impactful use should be categorized to allow it to rezone to a more impactful use and allow for a transition between the high impactful use to the less impactful neighborhood uses. In looking over the proposed map, we note that there are a few locations where such a strategy could improve the draft GPLUDM.

In summary, we would appreciate the planning staff carefully going over the currently proposed draft and making the necessary changes to the Reseda Ranch community area and also, using the strategy outlined above, evaluating whether there are other spots that could benefit from changes such as what we propose for the 6600 block of Baird. For our part, we will also study the Community Plan Update map to see if we can spot any areas with situations similar to what we see on Baird Street and report them accordingly.