

DRAFT CITY OF MOORPARK GENERAL PLAN 2050

Responses to Public Comments received online



The following matrix shows public comments on the *Draft Moorpark General Plan 2050* received online. Some comments pertained to minor clarifications, such as revising text containing typographical or grammatical errors. These clarifications will be reflected in the final draft of the General Plan. Where comments warrant substantive changes content of the Plan, including narrative text, goals, policies, and implementation measures, and errors of figures and graphics referenced by policy, these changes have been recorded and itemized in the accompanying Addenda and Errata document.

Response	Comment
Typographic change - text updated	missing comma
Typographic change - text updated	Is this really called the "Oak Park" oil field or is it the "Oak Ridge" oil field? I think the latter...I will forward you a google search to show it near Happy camp road. Also I believe that the Oak Ridge Oil field is the EAST (not West) in Moorpark, if I am right about the name as this is in the newest NE open space acquisition of the city, east and south of Moorpark College. Where is the Moorpark ABD oil field? Is that on the AB properties site? Please double check if your directional words are accurate for each of the three oil fields you name.
Typographic change - text updated	The rest of bulleted list after the colon (:) should be indented from the bullet above that starts with "The Moorpark Historical....."
Typographic change - text updated	Name of Park is "Happy Camp Canyon Regional Park" You left out one word.
Typographic change - text updated	Happy Camp Canyon... You left out the word "Canyon" and it needs to be there!
Typographic change - text updated	Change "the provision of" to "provide" for parallel structure in the sentence.
Typographic change - text updated	Change "...": the preserve, enhance and expand" to ": preserving, enhancing, restoring and expanding"
Typographic change - text updated	Typo, should be "rare"
The Draft Environmental Impact analyzes the water impacts of implementing the Draft General Plan.	Subject: General Plan Essential Amendment Needs January 31, 2023 LA Times has a comprehensive section on the critical issue of water in the West and in Southern California. LATIMES.COM/COLORADO-RIVER-IN-CRISIS JANUARY 31, 2023 The Colorado River is in crisis And a water reckoning is about to transform the landscape of the Southwest A SERIES OF STORIES,VIDEOS AND PODCASTS It is very mch worth your consideration and inclusion in any continuing conversations about the essential need for amendments to the current Moorpark General Plan regarding water/the environment/new developments/density. Please include this in your research before any further consideration for signing off on the General Plan without considering the need to amend it taking the environment and future water needs in Moorpark. Thank you. Barbara Loczi Cell: 805.990.7036
The densities are defined in the text following this statement.	"...as specified below" -- What is below?
The color coding will be revised to ensure clarity.	It is very hard to distinguish the subtle color differences on the map to be able to accurately tell the difference between the different greens for example and the different orange/tans/reds. Can you provide a color scheme that is more clearly delineated for easier interpretation? It is so hard to tell sometimes that I cannot be sure I fully agree with your descriptions, via color. Also the three/four at top of legend for reds. The difference between the color for ag vs. alluvial scrub vs. channel vs. chaparral are not clear. and the difference between "disturbed", developed", and chaparral and hard to distinguish; as are the difference between landscaped and eucalytus woodland.
The amendments and environmental review would be funded by the project applicant.	Who pays for these amendments, especially since they require and Environmental review?

Sustainability goals and policies are integrated throughout the General Plan Elements, as the strategies to address its objectives are derived from land use, mobility, infrastructure, and conservation and are clearly identified in those elements.	I would like to see the sustainability chapter more prominent in the General plan. The city of Thousand Oaks Sustainability Manager has developed a Climate and Environmental Action Plan(CEAP) as an equal document to their General Plan because of how important it is for city's to address green house gas emissions, actively. To do this a city must know how much GHG it generates, how it can reduce it's emissions and monitor the improvements. It needs to be a priority in a city's operations. Our environment has changed and continues to become more extreme. We as a city need to urgently take maximum actions to adapt and mitigate the effects of climate impacts. We need to take responsibility for our share of the emissions that are warming our planet and take care of disadvantaged communities. I look forward to this development in Moorpark and our community all moving in the same direction.
Specific recreation improvements would be guided by the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan.	Where's the Pool?
See comment 24 above.	Why is there not a separate Climate Change Element? -mentions in text that public was extensively involved, along with GPAC. Pulling out climate change issues, goals and policies into separate element makes these clearer and more achievable to the residents to follow.
Permitted development densities will be reduced correlated with increases in the slope of the property.	What does this mean?
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata: Land Use Element	While I have already told key City Staff this I will say it here too. This is the first time you mention SOAR and so far, throughout the entire document, the discussion of SOAR is insufficient because the voters approved it as a General Plan AMENDMENT that had to be added to the Land Use Element of the General Plan. So far, no where has this really happened. I did receive an email saying that it would now be done but until we can see exactly how you will do it, it will remain unacceptable since without it in the general plan, it violates what the voters voted for. I look forward to seeing what gets changed to correct this problem.
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-5	This statement is incomplete about where in Moorpark the Santa Monica-Sierra Madre connection is (and how important it is). It is not JUST near the college and those neighborhoods. It IS MOSTLY in the eastern half of the city but goes through the entire Ensign Bickford property and the property from there all the way to Hwy 23 AND it includes about half of the Serenata (Carlsberg SP) all the way to Tierra Rejada Rd to provide a much bigger swath of connectivity to the county's Tierra Rejada Critical Wildlife Passage Area (CWPA). Additionally, there is a western part of this same connection that connects Happy Camp Canyon, through the eastern half of Moorpark Highlands through the Caltrans open space properties and across the Arroyo Simi to meet up through Virginia Colony to connect to Ensign Bickford property by the Arroyo Simi and to the TR CWPA as well. That then continues through both the TR Valley and Santa Rosa Valley into Thousand Oaks and the Santa Monica Mts. for an admittedly narrow but still viable connection to that side of the Santa Monica Mts. This additional area through Moorpark is partly located in CENTRAL moorpark at the northern most portion of it and not just eastern moorpark as you suggest. See Figures C-4 and 5.4-4 for how much more IN MOORPARK this Santa Monica-Sierra Madre connection goes, over and above what you name by the college. Your statement that it "largely restricts movement in this area" largely minimizes the importance of the connections through BOTH the college area AND the areas I named to Tierra Rejada Valley in what I believe is an unacceptable way. I respectfully request that you beef up this discussion to be more accurate and to reflect the real importance of the REST of the Santa Monica-Sierra Madre Connection as well as what you do say. I will have a suggestion about implementation later about wildlife corridors and linkages.
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-4	In this sentence, it is more accurate to add a phrase that is missing so it reads: "The primary...Arroyo Simi, part of the Calleguas Creek Watershed, which runs....the city." I think it is important for people to know what watershed we are in and this seems to be the best place to put that.
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-3	you said above there were three sub-sections. Then here you have seven topics but there are really 8 topics if you look at the text to follow. You left out from this list the fourth one (Energy Use) for which you have a whole sub-section. Add that to this list in the right place. Also what do the "three" refer to? Or did you mean to say "eight" like there are in the rest of the document. Please clarify as it is confusing to say three when there appear to be eight.
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-3	This sentence that starts "The city underlain..." is not a complete sentence. Something is missing. As it reads now, it is awkward. Please fix.

Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-3	<p>This sentence is accurate for Moorpark's SOAR and for those in the cities that have a CURB that was passed as part of their SOAR, but it is not accurate everywhere in the county, as you are stating.</p> <p>Again, you can go to the SOAR website to see how they explain the coordination between the county-wide SOAR that was passed by all county voters for unincorporated areas and the various city SOAR measures that apply to 7 of the 10 cities that have a CURB and one (Ventura) that does not have a CURB but addresses the issue in its SOAR similarly to the county-wide SOAR. I am not going to try to edit your text to make it accurate for you but you do need to fix it so you do not have our General Plan inaccurately describing SOAR.</p>
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-3	should say "...and other state, county, and regional governmental entities."
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-24	<p>Why are you ONLY talking about SC Edison and not also Clean Power Alliance (CPA) here? You do discuss CPA under circulation p. 3-44 but not here too and it needs to be in both places. CPA is more green than Edison with 40% from renewable for lean tier, 50% with clean tier (the city's current default tier), and 100% for the 100% green tier. There should be a goal/policy/implementation strategy to go with this that says something like this: "Re-evaluate every year to consider altering the city's default tier for CPA to be 100% green instead of just 50% like it is now." You can figure out the right place to put that. This might be an implementation strategy for COS 4.5. I think it would be good to have a policy to evolve to the 100% green tier for city's default tier for CPA over time. [Please note that even if we do ever change to 100% green for our default, individual people can still choose a lower tier and we would just need to have good education to inform folks about it.] You should NOT be talking only about Edison when the lions share of residents and businesses use CPA and NOT Edison..</p>
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 7-2	<p>By saying "each" city you are erroneously saying that every city has a CURB that was passed as part of a SOAR measure there. That is not true. You could perhaps say "most cities" instead of "each city" to be more accurate. FYI, Ojai and Port Hueneme did not have any SOAR votes to establish SOAR there. Also the SOAR in the city of Ventura works similarly to the SOAR at the countywide (unincorporated) level instead of having a CURB. All the other cities did pass SOAR with a CURB. While I do not expect you to explain about every city or about the county-wide version of SOAR in our General Plan, the way you have explained it here is INACCURATE for any cities that did not adopt SOAR or that did not adopt a CURB as part of their SOAR. You could go the SOAR website to see how they describe SOAR for more information.</p>
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 6-19	<p>add one more to this sentence....</p> <p>"....bike riding, wildlife observation)</p>
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Page 1-11	This adds up to 89%, what is the other 11%?
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Land Use Element	See prior comments about how you are not explaining SOAR completely accurately. Adapt changes I suggested everywhere in whole general plan where they appear to eliminate the inaccuracies.
Language updated - see Addenda & Errata re: Implementation Action COS-I15	<p>This implementation strategy is too weak. It does NOT take into account that on January 18, 2017 the Moorpark city council voted to SUPPORT the County of Ventura's effort to create a Wildlife Corridor Overlay Zone; AND, submitted a letter to the county saying so; and, saying (among other things) that "Should the County decide to proceed with the establishment of a Wildlife Corrido Overlay Zone, the City Council will consider a similar effort for wildlife corridors that extend through Moorpark." I provided a copy of this letter to Doug Spondello and the GPAC on March 31, 2022 and commented to GPAC about this.</p> <p>Given that the County DID adopt the a Wildlife Corridor Overlay Zone, along with the Critical Wildlife Passage Area (CWPA) for Tierra Rejada Valley which was upheld through the court appeal process when litigated by those who did not want it to happen, it is now settled law and DOES exist as noted in this Draft General Plan. THEREFORE, a better Implementation strategy to honor the statements made by Moorpark at that time, would be to say something like this instead:</p> <p>"Establish a Wildlife Corridor Overlay Zone in the City of Moorpark following the Santa Monica-Sierra Madre Regional Wildlife Corridor Connection illustrated inside Moorpark City Limits on Figure 5.4-4 of this Draft General Plan, collaborating with Ventura County to ensure it mirrors the way it was done in the County's General Plan to the greatest extent possible."</p> <p>NOTE: This implementation strategy, as revised, is necessary to adopt because of what else the City said in its letter of support for the Wildlife Corridor Overlay Zone, which was "...preservation of the regional wildlife corridors through Moorpark depends on efforts of both the City and the County." The County has done its part so now it is our turn to do our part for the City of Moorpark in its updated General Plan</p>
Figure CI-5 depicts a bike trail along the Arroyo Simi.	Include bike trails along Arroyo Simi to connect Moorpark with Simi Valley trails along the Arroyo Simi.

Comment acknowledged--No change.	I think this should be "short" instead of "medium"
Comment acknowledged. The Draft Environmental Impact Report evaluates the impacts of the adjacency of development with agricultural lands and traffic impacts resulting from future developmetn permitted by the General Plan.	<p>It's a wonderful idea to have varied home prices in Moorpark so that more people can afford housing. I am, however, concerned with the placement of some housing. At one of the meetings, an idea was floated to have housing above commercial property or near farms. The problem with both of these ideas is noise. The noise of business open at night and of music venues at restaurants, and food smells will impact homes above commercial properties, which will cause conflict. It's fun to go to dinner and hear live music. For years those living in Moorpark have been asking for more evening activities so that we don't have to go to other cities for entertainment. But we must plan our housing so that the new homeowners are not impacted by noise. When I first moved to Moorpark, there was a problem because homes were near the farms on Hitch Road, and the "new homeowners" complained about the noise from the animals on the farms. This was unfair to the farms that were there first and had their animals. Although I can understand the new homeowners were unaware of the noise factor. With proper planning, we can alleviate both of these issues.</p> <p>Another issue we must consider is traffic. With more bike lanes, we can encourage our community to ride bikes to local events, schools, or businesses. Look at cities like Santa Barbara, Davis, Ca. Both have colleges (we have Moorpark College), and they have many cyclists, alleviating some of the street congestion. Plus, it would help with obesity and encourage shopping and activity in Moorpark. A safe bike lane along Los Angeles Ave. or the Arroyo would go a long way in solving this problem. I've heard that bike lanes have been in the works for many decades in Moorpark, but little has been done. Bike lanes would ease road congestion and pollution.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration,</p> <p>Leslie Bennett</p>
Comment acknowledged. Opportunities for public comment will continue to be available	This document was released on December 22, 2022, only 3 days before Christmas. To do this right before the biggest holiday season is insensitive to the public who will have lost at least two weeks of possible review time because of the holidays, preparation for them and follow-up. It is the busiest time of the year for people then. It is not clear if you are going to close off comments in this tool as of the Feb. 16th hearing, but I strongly suggest that that you do NOT close off commenting online but allow people to keep making comments throughout the time that future public hearings/meetings on this are held in the coming months. If you were going to close off the ability to add comments now, then at least give everyone another two to three weeks to comment further, because of losing the holiday time. I hope it will remain open for comment for much longer though, as I mentioned. Thanks
Comment acknowledged. Note that the draft General Plan contains multiple parcels focusing on future greening opportunities including Land Use Goal LU 8 and associated policies, Infrastructure policies CI 8.4 and 8.5 and Goal CI 13 and associated policies.	<p>Greetings!</p> <p>My husband and i recently moved to Moorpark and we love it! I have a couple suggestions, which i know would not be easy to implement, but might be worth looking in to. I've lived in Europe and recently was impressed with Sweden's Waste -to -Energy Incinerators. I believe there is some environmental debate here in the US but Sweden feels clean as a whistle to me! Is there any way Moorpark could look into a Waste-to-Energy option for our trash? Also, how are we capturing rain water in Moorpark? Besides rain barrels, i'm wondering about fog nets? Just few thoughts for our greening possibilities.</p> <p>thank you! Sincerely Christina Linhardt 310 313 3084 805 552 4108</p>
Comment acknowledged.	<p>Agreement with LU9.6 Urban Agriculture:</p> <p>I would like to see a community garden or two in Moorpark where residents can come together to learn how to grow organic food and design their own yards to be pollinator and eco- friendly by using native plants instead of grass.</p> <p>It's social, it's healthy, it's educational and will demonstrate how we can live more sustainably and productively with nature.</p>
Comment acknowledged.	i am waiting to see what it lets me say
Comment acknowledged.	Trying to find the document and itis not here

Comment acknowledged.	I love this idea of a linear park along the Arroyo Simi. Not just a trail for pedestrians and cyclists, but features to see along the way. I hope much will be native plantings, naturalized areas, information, to inspire it's residents to create the same in their backyard or just to appreciate it for nature and the joy it brings them as the seasons change.
Comment acknowledged.	I absolutely agree that we have to expand the recycling/reclaiming of waste water in Moorpark. Being reliant for 88% of your water needs from rivers hundreds of miles away is not sustainable, to us and to the rivers that give us their water. We share that water with other living beings and they not only deserve to live too, they may be the basis of life for all the ecosystem. When it falls, we fall.
Comment acknowledged.	Building a network of safe bicycling routes is essential in our new, renewable, sustainable economy. Kids should be able to bike to school, employees within the city, bike to work. For recreation and our health and the enjoyment of nature, we should have places to cycle for different levels, not just athletes mountain biking. The later can accommodate tourists and visitors that will bring commerce and interest to the city.
Comment acknowledged.	I love Monte Vista as a little slice of wilderness in our neighborhood. There used to be a native plant garden at the base of the park. I would like to see it re-established with signs, so visitors can learn which plants are in the park and native to our area. Also, there are resident ground bees along the trail that I've seen for many years after I learned about native bees being ground dwelling. They could use our protection and it's an opportunity to learn about bees that do the service of pollinating our flowers and vegetables. They are in drastic decline due to pesticide use, habitat loss, and climate change, as all pollinators are. This park could be a wonderful demonstration park to learn about our natural environment and how to protect it.
Comment acknowledged.	I'd like to suggest that residential density be calculated based on gross acreage instead of net acreage because of the topography that exists within the city. Many properties have areas with topography that prevent those portions of the sites from being developable, so basing density on net acreage could prevent the City from meeting their ideal density goals within certain areas. Basing density on net acreage could also make a project unfeasible if it is unable to meet the minimum density requirements, so I'd strongly suggest basing density on gross acreage.
Comment acknowledged.	Correct spelling of Virginia.
Comment acknowledged.	Consider using gross for residential density, not net acres. Given the varying topography, hillsides and habitat area throughout the city, using net will have a negative impact on achieving the planning goals identified in the GP and the ability to offer diversity in housing options.
Comment acknowledged.	We strongly advocate that the City change this language to state, "Standards of building density for residential uses are stated as allowable dwelling units per GROSS acre (du/acre)." Varying types of topography, site conditions, easements, and/or encumbrances can severely impact a site's development potential. Limiting the density calculation to net acreage, as opposed to gross acreage, may put the City at risk of not meeting its housing goals, especially in a City like Moorpark which has significant topography and slope to contend with, as well as a floodplain/arroyo (i.e. fewer units will actually be developed once "undevelopable" land is factored in). Projects may be rendered infeasible because they cannot generate enough units to offset additional site development costs and/or constraints as a result of the "undevelopable land" that is reducing gross land area to net land area. Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, linking density to "net" is incredibly subjective. Who is to determine what is actually the net acreage of any given property? Without conducting an ALTA survey, how can a property owner understand what their maximum density potential is? The concept of "net acreage" creates significant ambiguity for property owners, developers, and the City.
Comment acknowledged.	glad you have this. This is VERY IMPORTANT. I hope you can add something somewhere to "facilitate creation of mutual agreements between HOA and city: to make this really happen! Or something like that. Maybe that goes in implementation chapter. not sure.
Comment acknowledged.	You changed Rural from 1 DU/ per 5 acres to only 1 DU / acre. I think there should be areas that allow more than 1 du/acre. If not 5-acre lots then how about some for 2-acre or 3-acre for a compromise? This change to only 1-acre will cause many folks to subdivide their ranches so there are really no more ranches eventually and I do not think that is a good thing to have happen.
Comment acknowledged.	How do I log back in so I can see what else I said??? and so I can add more comments?
Comment acknowledged.	why cant I login to see my own comments that I know I made here before? I want to pick up where I left off and see what I previously said. This is not user friendly. I logged in before when I first did it and I need to get back in!

<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>	<p>Hi Doug, I am planning to speak at the City Council Meeting to preview the Safety, OSCAR, E/J/Public Health and EIR. I will be asking for moving quickly on implementing a Climate Action Plan for Moorpark to be included in the General Plan 2050. Can you speak in favor of this as well? Can you tell me where the CAP would be included? Is it part of the Safety Element? For your information, the EPA is offering a grant right now, the Climate Pollution Reduction(CPRG) to help local govts to develop and implement plans for reducing GHG emissions. I am sending it on my iphone right now. Thank-you, Frances Lee</p>
<p>Comment acknowledged</p>	<p>This certainly does not look like planning for 2050. It looks like planning for 1950. It would be wonderful to see innovation and planning for the future. Instead, it's the same as usual.</p>
<p>Comment acknowledged</p>	<p>We really have loved Moorpark. My wife was raised here and has taught here for about 20 years. We are concerned for our future safety here. The Sheriff's Dept. doesn't do enough to keep our neighborhood safe. The city doesn't communicate nor enforce codes. Buiding a house here took all the patience we had to deal with disrespectful city officials. A man in our neighborhood hung himself possibly due to the fact that neighbors were harassing him. We don't know every detail but we knew him. He was a kind man. Neighbors on all four sides have been lude, crude, rude, defamatory and/or violent. We've had our vehicle tampered with three times in a life-threatening manner. A neighbor tried to run me over while working on my property. We often get blocked on the easement (driveway) from accessing our property. Neighbors have no regard for other's property or safety. We have gone months without being able to open a window because of cow manure flooding our property. And this is in a so called good neighborhood. It is very hard to read a general plan at this point. It looks like marketing and no substance. We want the basics. Safety, clean air to breath and a yard our children won't get sick in because of contamination.</p>
<p>Comment acknowledged</p>	<p>I think the GPAC should reconsider the Industrial Flex suggestion for the remaining vacant sites in the Carlsberg SP. I suggested it during all the meetings and open house I attended, but Medium/High Desnity Residential would really help boost foot traffic at Moorpark Marketplace and Village @ Moorpark shopping centers. Open land is limited and we should be strategic on where we build. Where will housing benefit the community the most? New and old businesses would have a steady stream customers in walking distance.</p>
<p>Comment acknowledged</p>	<p>On behalf of Mission Bell, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Moorpark General Plan. This is a thorough document with a strong and creative vision for the City's future. We look forward to working collaboratively with the City on the reimagining of the Mission Bell Shopping Center.</p>
<p>A standard of population density is required by the Government Code Section 65302 to be included in the Land Use Plan. The text describing the land use categories, pages 2.15 through 2-19 have been revised to include this standard. Seen Addenda & Errata.</p>	<p>What does "standards of population density" mean and why does this matter? We suggest this sentence be deleted. Without additional clarification, we are concerned "population density" may impact a site's development potential. Additionally, who is to determine the "average number of persons assumed for the applicable residential designation"? This is both subjective and ambiguous.</p>