

Martha Alvarez

From: Gary Osterhout <garyosterhout@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 10:06 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Planning Commission/PPIC Workplan Meeting

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

Here's what I see as priorities:

1) **Addressing Climate Change.** Everything we do for now on should have a climate change component discussion. Not in respect to mitigating effects (i.e., "resilience"), but actually addressing how and what we are consuming and doing contributes to climate change. Or, such as palm trees, does nothing to assist with climate change and heat-island cities. Should also address light, visual and noise pollution.

The Planning Commission should address mansionization, and how that impacts climate change. Even with 100% renewable, community choice, just means that such unnecessary energy use to heat/cool a 6 bedroom/6 bath monstrosity can't be used elsewhere. Further, such authorization serves to remove perfectly good existing housing due to the profit potential, doesn't allow for adequate greenspace around the house, expends more construction energy, and adds to the housing crisis by taking up to 6 years of vacancy to build and sell. The excess space used for home gyms and office space then makes the residents more insular, as they don't need to go out of their house. The incomes to afford such houses are out of keeping to the existing neighborhood. There needs to be policies that address vacancy and size.

The PPIC needs to monitor (i.e., get regular reporting on) replacement trees and adding new trees. There needs to be reporting on residential trees as well as city trees. If a tree is a shared community resource, then enforcement of tree trimming should not be "complaint only," but should be proactively monitored and enforced through regular visual inspections of neighborhoods. There should be Saturday/Sunday morning enforcement teams (when a lot of this goes on). Needs education of the entire community--not just tree trimmers known to the city. There needs to be enforcement against the homeowner/renter (or whoever contracts with a professional trimmer, or over-trims by their own hand).

There needs to be an evaluation of our traffic lights so that cars are not idling waiting for the light to change. I have frequently been at the light at Valley and 15th with cars stopped all around and no one moving through the intersection for at least a minute. For some reason there is never a wait going east/west on Rosecrans at Highland, but there is a significant backup particularly on north/south traffic (particularly for the left-turn lane as traffic is held up at the too-frequent flashing crosswalk at 38th St.). And I'm sure one day there will be a dual left turn lane from eastbound MBB to southbound Sepulveda.

PPIC needs to evaluate whether the millions we have spent on bike lanes have a measurable increase bike utilization or safety (discounting the increase solely due to electric bikes), and should then evaluate/develop a better cross-Sepulveda solution (taking into account now the capabilities of electric bikes).

PPIC should take the lead in community conversations on funding the parking lots, and developing best practice parking meter fees.

2) **Addressing Public Outreach.** In a word, current outreach is execrable. The community should not be surprised by projects like the Sepulveda hotel, or the Verandas project. There is a disturbing lack of agency in our residents because information is effectively embargoed at City Hall. Issues are complex, but it should be your duty as leaders, using the commissions, to simplify those issues and bring them out to public awareness. The Verandas project should not be shoved into a complex, legalistic Housing Element report. I am tired of seeing the outreach analysis of "staff determined that public outreach was not required for this issue." To me, public outreach is ALWAYS required--if staff feels it is not, then then staff needs to definitively defend that position (or don't even ask staff to opine on outreach). Staff's limitations on stakeholders is frequently myopic--if anything, there are degrees of "stakeholders," direct and indirect, which should be addressed. I can't believe you guys fund this new "communications/propaganda" office under the CM, when issues you know are or will be of interest to the community are ignored, while the space is used instead to pump purchases of city-branded items. Our City Hall priorities are screwy.

Your commissions should be the initial community sounding boards, which can then reduce the time spent at council meetings and develop the commissioners themselves. Consider utilizing them as such, like they've been used in the more distant past when residents had more agency than they do now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gary Osterhout