

Dekermenji, Melissa

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2022 5:59 AM
To: City Council DL
Subject: Council Meeting 6-7-2022 Item N: Fee Schedule

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of Council,

I am writing to express support for adopting the updated development and associated fees at the rates proposed. The City will no longer lose out on the sort of funding all of our neighbors generally enjoy, as well as begin to offset a small part of the strain on finite resources and increased consumption caused by the unmanageable and environmentally unsustainable coerced population explosion.

This is a great start and a good foundation, in general, but certainly for as long as we are not free to govern customarily local issues. I urge you to seek clarification on the issue of properties that have not been developed in over 30 years. Are there areas of infrastructure growth and City services that have expanded in such a time period (or longer)? If so, should not those properties that are significantly remodeled by complete demolition make some payment to these expanded services?

Finally, as with the change to the zoning code, I believe it is prudent to direct the staff to revisit this issue at regular intervals, perhaps every three years or so to determine if the fees are still providing the same level of infrastructure funding or if an increase is needed.

Best regards,

Simon Hammel

Dekermenji, Melissa

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 5:57 AM
To: City Council DL
Subject: CC meeting Agenda 5/24/2022: question

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Members of Council,

I may not be able to view the meeting tonight, and I'm writing to please ask if some of you would ask about an update on the DIF changes/ updates that passed the planning board with 4-0 vote (one member absent) a few weeks ago. If somehow I missed it in the City Council, please forgive me. I would think I would have seen it though.

There were very few comments (including mine), at the planning board hearing. We posted our own notice among a few of us, and I take from the lack of response people are as satisfied as I am. With a tweak or two I feel it's a good deal, and certainly an excellent improvement from our current structure.

Members of the public seemed satisfied with the public outreach meeting, the planning board decision, and so it is curious that it would not already be on the docket for a hopefully quick passage.

I'm asking because I'd hope they go into effect before Pickwick has a chance to advance one way or another, there have been no terms and conditions signed, and so I hope the City will not lose out twice on the issue.

On that subject, I believe the City should argue its position that any suggestion for a change in the use of the area was made in error, if that error is used as a reason to override the will of the voters.

Further on that point, I'd like to meet with any of you about the person that authorized that change in use/ designation, especially if that individual causes the City to lose its case by their arbitrary and incorrect decision to interpret the language in the least obvious way and most obtuse interpretation of the general plan/ goals. It seems that this is not the first time certain current City employees have abused our code, plans, and their position for the limited scope of benefiting a single developer to the detriment of the greater populace of the City and future generations of residents

After years of obstruction, seemingly purposeful delay, and missing out on the enjoyment of the sort or revenue our neighboring cities have enjoyed - it's a victory to get those DIF's passed.

Thank you for your consideration,
Simon Hammel

Dekermenji, Melissa

From: Tamala Takahashi [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2022 10:49 AM
To: City Council DL
Subject: Comments regarding a few items on the agenda tonight

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi all,

I will not be able to call in tonight, but I'd like to briefly share my thoughts on a few items tonight:

1. Item O.8. - LPU. This is an excellent program and Home Again LA is an excellent resource to run the program. **Full support.**
2. Item O.6. - Elections. \$1600 plus \$300 subsidy is still far too much to ask for local election candidates to be allowed to put in a statement for this local, small scale, part time position election. \$1600 is more than one month's worth of pay for being a city council member. Please consider a **signature gathering option** to reduce the cost of the statement.
3. Item N.4. - DIFs. The community seems to be generally happy about this update. Great job staff and council. One thing I'd like to add - please add in the discussion a possibility to reduce DIFs for developments that **leverage public transit/pedestrian/bikes** or boost public transit usage, and consider increasing DIFs for developments that increase travel by car.

General: **Gun safety** - lots of folks will be calling in tonight re: gun stores. Please do more than do an impact study. Our community is embarrassed for being #2 gun store per capita and #3 gun store per sq. mile in the country. Fair warning - there will be news crews tonight and it's possible this will be highlighted in the next few days news cycle.

Thank you for all you do. Have a great meeting!

Kindly,
Tamala Takahashi
[REDACTED]