From: Amy Hageman <tahageman@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2021 6:13 PM

To: List - City Council

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Sunrise Project Appeal

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Mayor Hadley and Councilmembers Franklin, Montgomery, Napolitano, and Stern,

I am writing to ask that one of you join Councilmember Napolitano in appealing the decision to move forward with the Sunrise Assisted Living complex that will replace Goat Hill. Not only does this seem like an inappropriate spot for such a project, but it would be replacing one of the few remaining remnants with "old" Manhattan Beach character left in the town. The businesses that now occupy Goat Hill appear to be thriving, though it seems to have taken awhile to find the right combination of businesses for the location. There are very few nostalgic places left in the city, and this is a big one for many of us "lifers.". Please consider doing whatever it takes to appeal this project, as even though I believe it to be a worthwhile and needed one, this is not the location for it.

Thank you, Amy Hageman

From: Christine Dillon <cdillon7466@icloud.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2021 1:54 PM

To: List - City Council

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Sunrise Assisted Living

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello Council members. I heard through the grapevine that the proposed Sunrise project has now come to City Council for approval. For what it's worth, I thought I would give you all my two cents...

I am a long time resident of Manhattan Beach and the Block Captain for the 1100 and 1200 blocks of 5th Street. I've lived at 1147 5th Street for 21 years. Needless to say, our street will be directly impacted by whatever goes into the Goat Hill center. Back in 2018 I attended the Sunrise meeting for residents. Philip Kroskin introduced us to the proposed project. He was very informative and transparent. The renderings were clear and to scale. Upon completion of the meeting, he opened it up to the residents for comments and concerns. It goes without saying that I was the "vocal" one. The largest concern for the 5th Street neighbors was the main access (possibly the only access) to the building was via a driveway off of 5th Street. For those who are not familiar with my street, it is a steep drive down which lends itself to cars/trucks speeding. Speeding or not, the last thing we want it more traffic down our street. My concerns and comments were heard and noted.

Over two years passed and I hadn't heard a peep about the project. I assumed it was dead in the water. Much to my surprise, I was contacted by Philip Kroskin asking if we could have a Zoom meeting to show the changes made to the project plans. I have to say, I was pleasantly surprised! Not only had our neighborhood concerns been heard, they had actually been met! Philip showed me that they had redesigned the main in/out access to be on Sepulveda and 5th Street would only be used for deliveries (very few weekly.) He also mentioned that additional subterranean parking was designed to ensure visitors would not park on 5th Street. It was clear that these changes to the plans were well thought out and costly but made simply because the residents asked for them. In my book, that's a pretty darn good corporation!

I am aware that the all of the Goat Hill tenants are on a short term lease. Something is going to go there. I would be thrilled if it was Sunrise's proposed Senior Living project...a beautiful building run by an ethical corporation! Christine Dillon

(310) 259-7492

Sent from my iPad

From: Laura Kiely <laurakiely@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2021 12:30 AM

To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Goat Hill

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council Members,

I've just learned about a plan to redevelop Goat Hill. Please appeal this plan from the Planning Commission. Please support the current small businesses at Goat Hill. Make sure that there will be a future for small businesses at Goat Hill. Small businesses help create quality of life for residents, especially those who live in close proximity. Thank you for your consideration.

Best, Laura Kiely Manhattan Beach resident since 1994

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kristin Happ <khapp7@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 9:05 PM

To: List - City Council

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Please Spare Goat Hill!

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

To Whom It May Concern,

As a Manhattan Beach resident, I am dismayed by the plan to replace the Goat Hill shopping center on Sepulveda.

This will put many small businesses, including my Chiropractor, Dr. Schwarz out of business. Erecting a senior living facility which provides no continuous financial gain to the community and will clearly be an eye soar from the road... That's the wrong move for MB, our residents, AND the local business community you all swear to support.

Please do the right thing for small, local businesses in MB and our residents! Keep businesses in the area that add value to the Sepulveda corridor, such as the ones that are already there! I know Dr. Schwarz alone has been in the Goat Hill center for 22 years, and is an example of what being a caring MB business owner and resident looks like.

Please reconsider your position in favor of the small businesses in Goat Hill. We have enough Goliaths in the area trying to take over our amazing city... Let's support the solution, and not partake in letting larger, more well-funded entities come in and push out our proud mom and pops!

Please reach out by phone or email should you care to discuss.

Best regards, Kristin Happ #310.421.5357

Sent from my iPhone

From: Stephen Ferrone <s_ferrone@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 5:58 PM

To: List - City Council

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Goat Hill Proposed Senior Center

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Please do not approve this project. Keep MB the way it is. Not all "progress" is good and folks love the current use of the property.

Respectfully,

Steve Ferrone 609 Longfellow Ave Hermosa Beach

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: stuartsackley@aol.com

Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2021 5:34 PM **To:** List - City Council; City Manager

Subject: [EXTERNAL]

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council Members:

I'm writing today in regards to Goat Hill Plaza in Manhattan Beach. I have owned this site for over 20 years. We have been working hand and hand with Sunrise Development for almost 5 years to bring the only Senior Living Community to Manhattan Beach. We were very pleased with the 5-0 Planning Commission vote and are excited about this project coming forward. We have worked with all of our tenants at Goat Hill over the last 3 years to make sure they have been able to either relocate or have enough time and notice to make plans for this new development. At this point, everyone on site is ready to move their business elsewhere and will be vacating. We have very strong relationships with our tenants and their future was critically important to us during this process. It also important to note that the property and buildings are well beyond their useful life. all leases have expired. Regardless of Sunrise, we are going to be vacating the property to make way for development. It's always hard to see change to the landscape of our city. However, this project has had massive support from the neighbors, the community and this will provide a much needed service that Manhattan Beach currently doesn't have. We are excited to be a part of that change.

From: Diana Coronado <dcoronado@bialav.org>

Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 10:41 AM

To: Suzanne Hadley

Cc:Joe Franklin; Richard Montgomery; Steve Napolitano; Hildy Stern; City ClerkSubject:[EXTERNAL] Item #12: Energy Efficiency of Buildings - BIA-LAV Comment Letter

Attachments: BIA-LAV Comment Letter_Energy Efficiency of Buildings_08.03.2021.pdf

Importance: High

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Mayor & Councilmembers,

The Los Angeles/Ventura Chapter of the Building Industry Association of Southern California, Inc. (BIA-LAV), is a non-profit trade association focused on building housing for all. On behalf of our membership, we would like to share our comments on the staff report document associated to item number 12 of the Tuesday, August 3rd City Council Agenda, "Potential Regulatory Actions that Increase Energy Efficiency of Buildings".

When reviewing the suggested policy alternatives, we are asking that option number two not move forward. We are also requesting that if any policies are adopted, that they are done so in voluntary and incentive-based way. We will be providing public comment, as well.

Thank you, Diana





Diana Victoria Coronado Vice President

Building Industry Association of Southern California, Inc. dcoronado@bialav.org

ph: (951) 233-1506 w: bialav.org

New Mailing Address: 17192 Murphy Ave., #14445, Irvine, CA 92623 Baldy View • Los Angeles/Ventura • Orange County • Riverside County









From: Zac Dean <zakdances@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 5:24 PM

To: City Clerk

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello City Council -

I'm a resident of east Manhattan Beach. I notice that we have many discussions about homeless here in Manhattan Beach. Feels like all the attempts at mitigation (such as homeless court) are really just band aids and the problem will continue to get worse until we start tackling the root causes. I think it's important to recognize how the spiraling cost of housing in LA County is one of those root causes. It's not just a lack of low income housing, but a lack of housing at anything but the highest price points that is pushing people on the margins into homelessness. All cities in LA County, including Manhattan Beach, have a responsibility to make sure that more housing is built. Looking at Manhattan Beach's zoning maps reveals many low hanging fruit opportunities for more housing. We simply need to stop banning multifamily housing. Allow duplexes and small apartments to be built on corner lots. That would be a great first step.



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dave Little, *David Little Construction*President

Donna Deutchman, *Homes 4 Families* Vice President

John Hrovat, *Equity Residential* Vice President

Larry Hoffman, CDCS Vice President

John Lavender, *Lennar* Vice President

Haggai Mazler, KB Home

Greg McWilliams, FivePoint Vice President

Frank Su, *Toll Brothers* Vice President

Henrik Nazarian, *D & D Engineering, Inc.* Secretary, Treasurer

Derek Leavitt, *United Dwelling* Immediate Past-President

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Tyler Bargiel, New American Funding Richard Dunbar, Oakridge Landscape, Inc. Ryan Flautz, KTGY Architecture & Planning, Inc. Mike Frasco, Bio Clean Environmental Services Amy Freilich, Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac LLP David Grunwald, National CORE Peter Gutierrez, Latham & Watkins Andy Henderson, The Henderson Law Firm Marc Huffman, Brookfield Residential Krysti Irving, Gothic Landscape Mary Perdue, Landscape Development, Inc. Karl Mallick, David Evans & Associates, Bill McReynolds, Warmington Group Rachel Freeman, Tejon Ranch Company Brian Murtaugh, Great American Loans John Musella, The Musella Group Scott Ouellette, Williams Homes Erik Pfahler, Borstein Enterprises Harriet Rapista, Comstock Homes Darrell Simien, Habitat for Humanity of Greater LA Alyssa Trebil, DuctTesters, Inc. Rick White. Larrabure Framina

August 3, 2021

Mayor Suzanne Hadley City of Manhattan Beach 1400 Highland Avenue Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Re: BIA-LAV Comment Letter – Energy Efficiency of Buildings

Dear Mayor & Councilmembers,

The Los Angeles/Ventura Chapter of the Building Industry Association of Southern California, Inc. (BIA-LAV), is a non-profit trade association focused on building housing for all. On behalf of our membership, we would like to share our comments on the staff report document associated to item number 12 of the Tuesday, August 3rd City Council Agenda, "Potential Regulatory Actions that Increase Energy Efficiency of Buildings". When reviewing the suggested policy alternatives, we are asking that option number two not move forward. We are also requesting that if any policies are adopted, that they are done so in voluntary and incentive-based way. This will ensure that there are no increased costs or hurdles to the development of housing.

BIA-LAV and our members have been ardent supporters of the sustainability goals described in the staff report. In fact, new construction has led the way in the adoption of natural resource resiliency and energy efficiency. Particularly, California and Los Angeles County have some of the highest environmental standards in the Country; CALGreen is the firstin-the-nation mandatory green building standards code and the Building Energy Efficiency Standards, Title 24, Part 6 & Part 11 update (Energy Standards) include mandated solar for all new housing construction. Additionally, according to the California Energy Commission (CEC), the Energy Standards are a unique California asset that have placed the State at the forefront of energy efficiency, sustainability, energy independence, and climate change issues, and have provided a template for national standards within the United States, as well as for other countries around the globe. LA County not only exceeds State standards, but we go far and above them. It is our goal to work with staff and City officials in striking the right balance of environmentally sustainable practices that also allows for



the fair production of housing. Below we have included general comments we hope are considered when evaluating the suggested policy alternatives.

General Comments:

- 1. Housing Crisis: We cannot lose sight that the State and the region are experiencing a housing and homelessness crisis. As the City evaluates energy efficiency regulations, there should be a focus on strategies that allow for the development of residential building. According to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the City will be responsible for the creation of nearly 800 more homes as a part of their Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation to meet the housing shortfall. In tandem with reviewing energy efficiency standards, the City should also be working on efforts to increase home ownership attainability, housing affordability, and ending homelessness. If the policies within the staff report make it harder to build housing or more costly to provide housing opportunities, those actions should be reevaluated within this scope to ensure that the City's housing needs are still being met. We suggest the application of a housing feasibility/impact analysis or study when evaluating the alternatives affecting housing construction.
- 2. Consistency with Sate Standards: We ask that the City not adopt actions that are inconstant with state standards. As described above, California has adopted aggressive greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. This includes returning to 1990 levels by 2020, moving to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, and carbon neutrality by 2045. Trying to move above and beyond these standards without the readiness of technology or infrastructure would be unproductive. Specifically, related to development, buildings already have to be in compliance with the CALGreen building code. In 2019, the State adopted its most recent triannual building code updates and will evaluate those standards again for the 2022 triannual adoption. We are the first in the nation to require solar photovoltaic systems on residential development, and the CEC states that the latest codes cut energy use in new homes by more than 50 percent. As a result of these actions, the CEC equates the reduction of GHG emissions to taking 115,000 fossil fuel cars off the road. This processes works. It allows for a diverse stakeholder input and creates certainty for builders. Creating separate standards hinders this effort. New construction is leading the way in decreasing carbon emissions and is already on track to meet the State's aggressive goals. Creating newly mandated targets, such as those found in policy alternative two, is the wrong approach. Instead of a blanket mandate, we would prefer to see any alternatives as voluntary and incentive-based.



As a conclusion to this comment letter, we want to harken back to focusing on the current housing shortfall. California ranks top in the United States for poverty and homelessness – both of which are largely attributed to the housing supply shortage and sky-high housing prices that are nearly three times above the national average. Balancing the need to address sustainability efforts should not negatively impact housing when achieving this goal. For those reasons, we are asking that policy alternative number two not be adopted, and that any alternative that is adopted be done so in a voluntary, incentive-based way. BIA-LAV believes that the comments found in this letter provide balance to the current suggestions found in the staff report. Should you have any questions, please contact BIA-LAV Vice President, Diana Coronado, at dcoronado@bialav.org.

Sincerely,

Diana Victoria Coronado

Vice President

BIA - Los Angeles/Ventura

Sent via e-mail

CC:

Carrie Tai, AICP, Community Development Director Dana Murray, Environmental Sustainability Manager Ryan Heise, Building Official