

From: [Streamline](#)
To: [BoardComment](#)
Subject: New form submission received: Written Public Comment
Date: Thursday, August 17, 2023 9:47:42 AM



Written Public Comment

First Name:	Linda
Last Name:	Prentiss
Address:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Written Public Comment:	Hello Again, I have owned 5 lots on Norwich Ave. with Water Meter #91, over 10 years, I bought it as my retirement dream. I'm now 75. I did not know about the restriction when I bought it. PLEASE could you open 100 building permits? THANK YOU FOR LISTENING Linda Prentiss
Written Comment to be read at::	PROS Commission
Written Comment to be read at::	Board Meeting
Written Comment to be read at::	Finance Committee Meeting
Written Comment to be read	Policy Committee Meeting

at::	
Written Comment to be read at::	Resources & Infrastructure Committee Meeting

[Reply / Manage](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [BoardComment](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: New form submission received: Written Public Comment
Date: Saturday, September 9, 2023 11:50:56 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Thank you.

Looks like my paragraphs got all funky in that transmission. Here's another version with the paragraphs so it's not a big-ol-bob of text.

Have a great day.

Truly, Aleta

Here it is again with the paragraphs back in the mix.

RE Resolution 54-2009 and the Community Park Plan in the Parks, Recreation & Open Space area

Any further development of the Cambria Community Parks Recreation & Open space Community Park Plan should go through a constructive process starting with a community wide survey, further analysis and a formal process to change the plan that was originally approved in 2009 and currently appears on the website. [https://www.cambriacsd.org/community-park-plan & resolution 54-2009](https://www.cambriacsd.org/community-park-plan&resolution54-2009).

Adding features such as a skatepark, disk golf or pool at this point in time will directly violate the Resolution 54-2009 and approved plan of 2009 and is ill advised. Justifications for doing so such as, the people need this, or it's for the kids, or we have the money or it's taking too long are not legitimate legal reasons to violate Resolution 54-2009 and alter the approved plan of 2009 without due process.

The site has been allocated to the community at-large. The site has not been allocated to smaller subset groups of people with special interests in getting individual projects built on the site that were not on the approved plan of 2009. Further these interests appear to be competing, which is counterproductive and not based on at-large community needs. This approach is neither transparent, fair or nor a cogent approach to integrate these ad-hoc, post-approval projects into the recreation complex.

If the plan, as presented in Resolution 54-2009, no longer meets the needs of the community at-large, the plan needs to be formally and officially revised along with Resolution 54-2009.

Changes to Resolution 54-2009 and the Plan of 2009 should be transparent and done with at-large community input and involvement. Any other approach to getting the recreational complex built is a diagram for trouble, and diametrically opposed to the purpose of a community committee or commission which is to serve the community at-large, no more no less.

Regarding timing, the Parthenon, an engineering phenomenon, was built in 10 years by a group of people who spoke many different languages each with their own units of measure. 14 years in, it is unclear to me why this recreational complex remains unbuilt. I would be interested in understanding what the obstacles have been, as I do feel this community would be well served by having these improvements, sooner rather than later, if that's what the community at-large wants.

Further I would be interested in understanding the overall up-front investment for construction and as well as the projected running costs required to maintain the entire recreation complex.

I would be interested in understand the various funding source:

- 1) Where will the initial investment funds come from to subsidize the construction of each element, and if those funds fall short how would more funds be obtained for the complex as a whole.
- 2) Where will the initial investment funds come from to subsidize construction of the infrastructure of the complex?
- 3) Where will the funds come from to maintain the entire complex?

If there are any expectation that Cambria property owners will have to contribute to the complex those property owners should have a say in that funding option.

If there are any costs or fees for individuals to participate in any of the features of the complex that should also be determined and conveyed.

An unfinished construction site or derelict unmaintained recreation area will be a blight on the community. These scenarios typically arise from underfunding. These scenarios should be aggressively avoided!

First things first.

14 years have passed since Resolution 54-2009 and the original plan were approved. The questions I have today is are these elements still what the community wants? Are there additional features the community at-large would want such as a skatepark, disk golf or a pool that

were not on the original plan or in Resolution 54-2009?

As a stakeholder and constituent of this community, and a person who has actively participated in community service endeavors for many decades, these are the questions I would want to be able to ask, answer and convey to the community at-large. With answers to those questions, adjustments to the original program and design of the plan of 2009 can be reconsidered. Revisions can then be presented to the community at-large and a formal approval process can be concluded.

The bottom-line goal for the recreation complex should be to find out what the at-large community members want today and make it happen, as quickly as possible, to the extent investment capital and running cost funding can be made available.

This process shouldn't take over a decade, because the Parthenon.

I appreciate your consideration and for taking the time to read my comments.

I thank you all for your dedication, commitment, passion and hard work.

From: BoardComment <boardcomment@cambriacsd.org>

Date: Saturday, September 9, 2023 at 11:18 AM

To: Aleta Pearce [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: New form submission received: Written Public Comment

Hi Aleta,

Received; thank you.



Haley Dodson

Confidential Administrative Assistant
Cambria Community Services District

Phone: 805-927-6235

Email: hdodson@cambriacsd.org

1316 Tamsen Street, Suite 201

PO Box 65

Cambria, CA 93428

www.cambriacsd.org

From: Streamline <noreply@specialdistrict.org>

Sent: Saturday, September 9, 2023 11:14 AM

To: BoardComment <boardcomment@cambriacsd.org>

Subject: New form submission received: Written Public Comment

Image removed by sender. Logo used for headers



Written Public Comment

**First
Name:**

Aleta

Last Name:	Francis
Address:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Written Public Comment:	<p>RE Resolution 54-2009 and the Community Park Plan in the Parks, Recreation & Open Space area Any further development of the Cambria Community Parks Recreation & Open space Community Park Plan should go through a constructive process starting with a community wide survey, further analysis and a formal process to change the plan that was originally approved in 2009 and currently appears on the website. https://www.cambriacsd.org/community-park-plan & resolution 54-2009. Adding features such as a skatepark, disk golf or pool at this point in time will directly violate the Resolution 54-2009 and approved plan of 209 and is ill advised. Justifications for doing so such as, the people need this, or it's for the kids, or we have the money or it's taking too long are not legitimate legal reasons to violate Resolution 54-2009 and alter the approved plan of 2009 without due process. The site has been allocated to the community at-large. The site has not been allocated to smaller subset groups of people with special interests in getting individual projects built on the site that were not on the approved plan of 2009. Further these interests appear to be competing, which is counter productive and not based on at-large community needs. This approach is neither transparent, fair or nor a cogent approach to integrate these ad-hoc, post-approval projects into the recreation complex. If the plan, as presented in Resolution 54-2009, no longer meets the needs of the community at-large, the plan needs to be formally and officially revised along with Resolution 54-2009. Changes to Resolution 54-2009 and the Plan of 2009 should be transparent and done with at-large community input and involvement. Any other approach to getting the recreational complex built is a diagram for trouble, and diametrically opposed to the purpose of a community committee or commission which is to serve the community at-large, no more no less. Regarding timing, the Parthenon, an engineering phenomenon, was built in 10 years by a group of people who spoke many different languages each with their own units of measure. 14 years in, it is unclear to me why this recreational complex remains unbuilt. I would be interested in understanding what the obstacles have been, as I do feel this community would be well served by having these improvements, sooner rather than later, if that's what the community at-large wants. Further I would be interested in understanding the overall up-front investment for construction and as well as the projected running costs required to maintain the entire recreation complex. I would be interested in understand the various funding source: 1) Where will the initial investment funds come from to subsidize the construction of each element, and if those funds fall short how would more funds be obtained for the complex as a whole. 2) Where will the initial investment funds come from to subsidize construction of the infrastructure of the complex? 3) Where will the funds come from to maintain the entire complex? If there are any expectation that Cambria property owners will have to contribute to the complex those property owners should have a say in that funding option. If there are any costs or fees for individuals to participate in any of the features of the complex that should also be determined and conveyed. An unfinished construction site or derelict unmaintained recreation area will be a blight on the community. These scenarios typically arise from underfunding. These scenarios should be aggressively avoided! First things first. 14 years have passed since Resolution 54-2009 and the original plan were approved. The questions I have today is are these elements still what the community wants? Are there additional features the community at-large would want such as a skatepark, disk golf or a pool that were not on the original plan or in Resolution 54-2009? As a stakeholder and constituent of this</p>

	<p>community, and a person who has actively participated in community service endeavors for many decades, these are the questions I would want to be able to ask, answer and convey to the community at-large. With answers to those questions, adjustments to the original program and design of the plan of 2009 can be reconsidered. Revisions can then be presented to the community at-large and a formal approval process can be concluded. The bottom line goal for the recreation complex should be to find out what the at-large community members want today and make it happen, as quickly as possible, to the extent investment capitol and running cost funding can be made available. This process shouldn't take over a decade, because the Parthenon. I appreciate your consideration and for taking the time to read my comments. I thank you all for your dedication, commitment, passion and hard work.</p>
Written Comment to be read at::	PROS Commission
Written Comment to be read at::	Board Meeting
Written Comment to be read at::	Finance Committee Meeting
Written Comment to be read at::	Policy Committee Meeting
Written Comment to be read at::	Resources & Infrastructure Committee Meeting

[Reply / Manage](#)