

541 E. Whittier Starbucks

Response Summary from Rodney Rivani Applicant

Received by Owners on 5/13/2024

Applicants Response Summary in Black / Owners Responses in Blue

Property Conditions of Approval

1. The existing north perimeter wall will be removed. A new solid masonry wall will be constructed along the north side of the property, similar to the new north wall constructed at the Starbucks on Beach Blvd. & Whittier Blvd. This new wall will be a minimum of 8' feet in height.

Owner's Response on Wall – Townsend Triplex

Applicant's response regarding the wall indicates the existing North perimeter wall (the shared wall with 821-829 Chestnut St.) will be removed and a new solid masonry wall will be constructed at a minimum height of 8'. This response provided no details or considerations for the owners of the Townsend Triplex and our tenants and the impact to our privacy, safety and the security of the existing personal property on our side of the shared wall. A higher wall will reduce our air flow as well as reduce our view. There is no mention or considerations of how removing and erecting a new wall will impact our property, ours and our tenant's privacy and safety during demolition and construction. Our current privacy gate for 829 is attached to the existing wall. The existing wall and gate provide safety for ourselves and containment for our dog. Our outdoor living area/BBQ island is right next to the existing wall. Another issue with removing and replacing the block wall is that we use the entire driveway to park our vehicles and boat. We will need to find parking for all our vehicles during the wall demolition and construction; parking on Chestnut St is a problem as has been noted.

If the project is to move forward regardless of our concerns, then the only resolution is to demo the current shared wall and erect a new block wall to reduce noise and reduce the higher levels of vehicle emissions drifting to our property and open windows. What conditions can be added to address our concerns of safety and privacy (including replacing our gate) and concerns regarding the demolition of the existing block wall and the erection of a new block wall? We would request a Wall Demolition and Replacement Construction Plan and Timeline for this part of the project from Mr. Rivani. This would allow us to review the detailed plan and set a date to discuss in person and on the property with Mr. Rivani. Is the Block Wall demo and replacement plan part of what the Planning Commission needs to include in the Project conditions and approve as part of the overall project?

2. Starbucks will close at 9:30pm daily to match the closing time of the Starbucks location at Beach & Whittier.

Owners' response

The response from Mr. Rivani does not indicate a proposed opening time? Regarding the closing time, just because the closing time of the Starbucks on Whittier and Beach is 9:30 pm, why does this proposed location need the same (late) closing time? What are closing times for other Starbucks in the general area and cities that are so close to residential homes and apartment buildings? Please advise.

3. Deliveries will be made at the property between the hours of 8:00am to 6:00pm daily. These delivery hours are less than the Starbucks at Beach & Whittier.

Owners' response

Commissioners suggested implementing similar delivery hour restrictions as the Whittier and Beach Starbucks has since they are also so close to residential properties yet the suggestion of anytime between 8 am and 6 pm does not restrict delivery hours? The applicant's response appears to suggest wide open delivery hours. We would need a better understanding of hours for deliveries. Large delivery trucks will create additional noise and potentially increase congestion on both Chestnut St and Whittier Blvd impacting the residents of Chestnut St. We would guess that Starbucks would have a good idea on what hours are less busy with customers to allow for identifying more specific delivery truck hours. Please provide more detail on specific delivery hours.

4. Drive Thru Management Plan: Step Plan for the Chestnut Street driveway.

a. Place a prominent, highly visible sign at the Whittier Blvd. driveway that includes the Starbucks logo and "DRIVE THRU" to direct customers to enter the property from Whittier Blvd. This concept is similar to what was implemented for the Starbucks on Beach Blvd. & Whittier Blvd.

Owners Response

We agree that this should be required signage by Starbucks if the project is approved.

b. During the peak hour times, if the drive thru lane exceeds its capacity and vehicles are backing up close to the Chestnut Street driveway, Starbucks will position a team member with a wireless headset at the Chestnut Street driveway to take orders prior to the order board, and direct vehicles entering from Chestnut Street into the property, to avoid any vehicles backing up onto Chestnut Street.

c. In the event 4.b. above does not work; Starbucks will open the Chestnut Street driveway entrance lane daily at 8:00am.

Owners Response

B and C above is confusing and we question which Starbucks employee will be specifically responsible for "Traffic Management" at the Chestnut St entrance. If the traffic volume is so high doesn't that mean Starbucks is very busy and how can they part with an employee to be an outside traffic manager?

Congestion from vehicle lanes will back up onto Whittier Blvd/Chestnut Street, thus impeding the ability of those living on Chestnut from leaving and returning to their homes.

At the neighborhood meeting with Mr. Rivani, he told us that this Starbucks would have room for 17 vehicles, which was longer than any of the surrounding Starbucks, thus minimizing possible backups.

After talking with the City, we found that the length required for a parked car was 9 feet, plus a foot in front and a foot in the rear and this was used by Starbucks to generate their site map. To allow for a foot between vehicles, we need to add 6 inches to the front and back to give 1 foot between vehicles waiting in line. This means that the 17 vehicles in line would use 170 feet of space. (10 feet per vehicle)

The problem with this argument is that the average length of a car in the US is 14.7 feet (from the internet). When we add the 6 inches to the front and back to provide space between vehicles, we then have a length of 15.7 feet. Now dividing the 170 feet of space available by the 15.7 we get 10.8 vehicles, which I rounded up to 11 vehicles.

This is a difference of 6 less vehicles being able to queue on the Starbucks property, or a decrease of 35%, which increases the possibility of cars backing up onto Whittier/Chestnut by over one third. We request feedback from the applicant after reviewing the above information on how specifically they came up with the number of vehicles that could occupy the space.

Now to address the revisions Mr. Rivani recently sent to the neighbors on Chestnut, Starbucks and the City, he is proposing to open the entrance on Chestnut when traffic backs up and allow vehicles to use Chestnut St to enter the queue. However, there is only room for 2 cars to get in the queue on the Starbucks property from Chestnut. This means any more vehicles, (other than the 2) will be waiting on Chestnut to get their coffee, further reducing the ability of the homeowners to enter and exit their private Street and property. This could create a major safety issue with the potential of blocking both Chestnut St and Whittier Blvd. and could result in car accidents.

d. In the event both 4.b. and 4.c. above do not work; Starbucks will close the Chestnut Street driveway entrance for customer access. Customers will enter the property from Whittier Blvd. The Chestnut Street driveway will become an exit only. Only waste management, utility companies, and emergency vehicles will be able to enter from the Chestnut Street driveway.

All the owners would like to see D implemented to close off the entry and exit on Chestnut St and make the only entry and exit at Whittier Blvd. This will require a gate of some sort at the Chestnut St driveway entrance to the Starbucks property to allow for Waste Management vehicles, Utility vehicles and, Emergency vehicles to enter the property via the gate. This will also reduce the traffic coming on to our Chestnut St and the potential of cars coming up our private street.

Resident Recommendations (as noted by Mr. Rivani)

A. The Chestnut Street residents can get in touch with Caltrans and request either “Keep Clear” striping at the Whittier and Chestnut Street intersection, or a new traffic light at the Whittier and Chestnut intersection. It will be at Caltrans discretion to approve and implement the request, based on the La Habra Traffic Engineer’s comments.

Owners Response

We are advised that this is not a responsibility of the Owners on Chestnut St to contact Cal Trans. In the minutes from April 22, 2024, Mr. Plotnik, the City Traffic Manager, gave the example of Imperial and Walnut and stated it was the City that reached out to Caltrans and that Caltrans did the traffic study. Once Caltrans made their determination the City was informed in order to determine the next steps. This is clearly not an owner/resident responsibility to contact Caltrans.

We also believe the “Keep Clear” striping is used for Emergency vehicles only and not for commercial businesses. We don’t believe this is an option and requires more research on the part of the applicants.

B. The Chestnut Street residents have a few options they can explore, as discussed with the La Habra Traffic Engineer, and with the review and approval of the City of La Habra, to limit vehicle access in the Chestnut Street residential area by placing:

i. A gate on Chestnut Street at the entry of the residences, or in a location they feel is appropriate within their property line.

Owners Response

??

ii. Prominent, highly visible “DO NOT ENTER, PRIVATE PROPERTY” pole signs on Chestnut Street at the entry of the residences.

Owners Response

We believe new larger signs are needed but do not believe it is our expense. What is the Applicants’ plan to purchase and install new, larger and more visible signs if the project is to be approved? The location of the signage needs to be at the most prominent location where Starbuck customers will clearly see the sign before entering the residents’ portion of Chestnut St.

iii. Striping and/or surface street reflectors on Chestnut Street at the entry of the residences.

Owners Response

We are not clear on the striping of the street? What striping on the street is allowed? Please advise. We believe any allowed striping would be at the expense of the applicants. This needs to have further research by the applicants.

iv. A new speed bump on Chestnut Street at the entry of the residences.

Owners Response

We don't want a speed bump.

We suggest that the applicants research having a different roadway color to differentiate the street for Starbuck Customers versus private street residents. We believe the south part of Chestnut St near the Starbucks (and Medical building) will need to be resurfaced /repaved once the demolition of the Old Elks building and the construction of the Starbucks is completed and if the project is approved.

v. A prominent, highly visible "DO NOT ENTER, PRIVATE PROPERTY" pole sign at the northeast corner of our property

Owners Response

I believe this is a duplicate option from Mr. Rivani in this section. Yes, we need for Starbucks to furnish this type of sign. The location of the signage needs to be at the most prominent location where Starbuck customers will clearly see the sign before entering the residents' portion of Chestnut St.

Owners Additional Comments, Requests and Concerns

We would like to meet with Mr. Rivani and a Starbuck's representation to have an open, face to face conversation on our concerns. We would also like to invite Sonya Lui, La Habra Planning Commission Manager to attend our meeting as an observer. We will hold the meeting at Mr. Wood's home. This onsite meeting in our neighborhood will allow us to include a visit to the 541 E. Whittier Blvd property. We would like to receive more detail to our concerns noted in the response prior to the scheduled neighborhood meeting. Our objective for the face-to-face meeting is to resolve any open issues and come to some friendly and amicable compromises on the concerns and requests we have noted.

Owners Concerns and additional requests:

Owners request that as suggested at the April 22, 2024 meeting by Michelle Bernier, that conditions be included that the City would follow up with the neighbors at 6 months, 1 year and two years to see if our concerns regarding traffic management, traffic congestion and noise levels have been addressed by conditions and recommendations put in place.

Owners request that they receive a written plan and timeline on the demolition of the old Elks building. Additionally, we request that the demolition plan includes addressing the removal of hazardous waste (Asbestos) that we understand is in the building,

Owners request that the applicant put in place written restrictions for any construction vehicles entering the residential area of Chestnut St. These written restrictions will be shared with the residential owners on Chestnut St. There should be no larger construction vehicles going north on Chestnut St and in the residential area of the street to turn around etc. Any and all road damage needing repairs/replacement caused by construction vehicles, dump trucks, etc. will be at the expense of the applicants.

We reserve the right to add to our noted concerns and requests regarding the Starbucks proposed development at 541 E. Whittier Blvd., La Habra. This document only includes the Owners' detailed responses to the Response Summary submitted to us by Rodney Rivani on 5/13/2024.

Respectfully submitted by the Owners of the Properties on North Chestnut St., La Habra.

Names:

Linda Bennett, 960 Chestnut St La Habra

Laurel and Tony Martinez, 961 Chestnut St La Habra

Huy and Pauline Nguyen, 900 Chestnut St La Habra

Gary Takessian, Owner Apartments at 831-839 ½ Chestnut St La Habra

Tom and Kathy Townsend, Owners (occupied) Apartments at 821-829 Chestnut St La Habra

Jesse Vidro, 901 Chestnut St La Habra

(Arthur) Dan Wood, 940 Chestnut St La Habra

Deanne Zamora and Steve Zamorano, 941 Chestnut St La Habra

Please see additional comments from Owners Laurel and Tony Martinez on the following page

CC via email 5/23/2024

Rodney Rivani

Sonya Lui

Michael Plotnik