



City of Sierra Madre

Office of the City Clerk

232 W. Sierra Madre Blvd.,

Sierra Madre, CA

(626) 355-7135

THE BROWN ACT PROVIDES THE PUBLIC WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS AT ANY PUBLIC MEETING.

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED IN ADVANCE OF THIS MEETING AND WILL BE POSTED ONTO THE CITY'S WEBSITE FOR PUBLIC ACCESS AND TRANSPARENCY.

THE COMMENTS ATTACHED ARE SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. THE CITY DOES NOT CONFIRM THE VERACITY OF THE STATEMENTS PROVIDED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

January 10, 2023

To: **City of Sierra Madre**
232 W. Sierra Madre Boulevard
Sierra Madre, Ca. 91024

To: **The Citizens of Sierra Madre**

To: **City Council**
Edward Garcia, Mayor
Kelly Krebs, Mayor Pro Tem
Kris Lowe, Council Member
Gene Goss, Council Member
Robert Parkhurst, Council Member
City Manager, Jose Reynoso

Cc: **Planning Commission**
William Pevsner, Chair
Thomas Denison, Vice-Chair
Peggy Dallas, Commissioner
John Hutt, Commissioner
Bob Spears, Commissioner

Via: PublicComment@CityofSierraMadre.com

From: Glenn Hickman, [REDACTED]

Re: **MAD - PEACE TALKS**
Community Meadows Wildlife Preserve Alternative
The Meadows at Bailey Canyon Development – REFERENDUM AGAINST ORDINANCE NO. 1461
City Council Meeting of January 10, 2023

Citizens of Sierra Madre and Dear City Council and Mayor: In my numerous written public comments to the City regarding the Meadows at Bailey Canyon Development, including one unpublished opinion to the Mountain Views News, I recommended **PEACE for All, Profit for Some** **A Community Meadows Wildlife Preserve**, and I forewarned, although so obvious based on the division in this Community, of the Russian Roulette now before US, including the Applicant.

Unfortunately, Mayor Goss and the City Council with legal advice, grossly miscalculated and Approved the Meadows Development with Ordinance 1461, September 27, 2022, in advance of the People's HR Vote, November 7th, 2022; rather than stand down to listen to the People. That Action gave rise to a large number of Stakeholders and Preservation Group to advance the Referendum now before you.

This is MAD, and many on all sides of the aisle, if not already MAD, will become more MAD or possibly go MAD. MAD, a term some of us are familiar with from our life during the American – Russian Cold War and as applicable today, is as appropriate now in Sierra Madre with civil and peaceful interpretation. Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD), figuratively used for the Meadows Development process, might be avoided with Great Leadership and Passionate Parties interested in PEACE, who believe they can Negotiate Anything, if they elect to.

The original MOU appears to represent good intentions for a Win Win, however it failed to be inclusive, to have heard the People, was crafted by The FEW, without understanding the possible consequences for The Many. By the time it was deployed, it was too late for the inheriting Leadership; and took on the typical and prescriptive development entitlement process.

I believe a Mutual Win Win can still be achieved, with an armistice and Peace Talks with all Parties, with credible private/public finance and real estate resources, and expert legal advice, to parlay the acquisition of the land for **A Community Meadows Wildlife Preserve**. There are numerous means and methods for deployment and with less cost than the direct and indirect costs and loss to human equity should the "MADness" continue.

In my earlier Real Estate Development Carrier, contacts Alan D. Kotin, Real Estate Consultant in Public-Private Joint Ventures, Piper Sandler, Public Finance, and Peter Bedford, Bedford Investments among others, had the expertise to possibly now help the Parties negotiate, facilitate and identify resource pathways to pencil a proforma for Mater Dolorosa, the Developer, the City and the Community..... to Negotiate Anything for Any and All and a Mutual Win Win. Clearly, the cost and time to pursue this, and with credible resources, is meager compared to what is before All of Us.

Possible public/private strategies for **A Community Meadows Wildlife Preserve** might be:

A Syndicated Land Conservancy Easement or Land Donation and Purchase Strategy: 1) The Owner (in this case doesn't pay property taxes and has no tax benefit in this strategy other than the land sale) sells the land to the Developer. 2) The Developer, may or may not syndicate, utilizes an IRS conforming appraised higher best use value than the cost it paid for the land. 3) The Developer transacts the land as a land donation or conservation easement to the Sierra Madre Mountain Conservancy for a net-net tax offset to its other financial profits.

A Hybrid Resourced Land Purchase Strategy: If the Conservancy Strategy doesn't pencil, a hybrid strategy might be in order such as: augmenting the strategy with mix and match funding from **State Conservation Sources** and Or a **Sierra Madre General Obligation Bond Measure** using Property Tax augmentation.

- Note, The State Watershed Conservation Authority, is a Joint Powers Authority, has Board representation with Supervisor Barger, and is in the Meadows Project Public Records to consider the site for acquisition (or at least assumed for a partial contribution to the proforma).

Regards and Thank You in Advance for Your Consideration,

Glenn Hickman

Ref. Prior Hickman Public Comments: The Meadows at Bailey Canyon Development

Amber Tardif

From: Daniel Golden [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 2:54 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Comment for Entire City Council: Latest NUW end-around proposal

CAUTION: This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

In advance of tonight's Council meeting, please distribute this Comment to the Mayor and all City Council Members as soon as possible. Please read at tonight's session if allowable and place into the public record.

New Urban West has a track record of bait and switch and duplicitous dealings with municipalities, so it's no surprise that this current disingenuous effort to muster support from the City began under cover of the holiday week. Please do not agree to any concession requests from NUW that would unleash their over-building manipulations under the false flag of providing token and hardly-affordable units.

Especially laughable is NUW's legally flawed effort to win (or re-win) your support by introducing this especially phony and insincere component of 'affordable units' to their bloated project plan.

Where were the Passionists in terms of affordability when they sold out to the pressures of their Chicago headquarters and took the NUW monies? Price over principle prevailed, even when they could have forced significant affordability elements into the deal. Where were their spiritual values and virtues?

Speaking of values and virtues, the Monastery isn't just to blame for the absence of concern for affordable housing-- where was the City throughout this process, when you could have used the bully pulpit to demand larger proportions of any build be dedicated to affordable units,

Amber Tardif

From: Susan Neuhausen [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 2:59 PM
To: Public Comment; Laura Aguilar; Edward Garcia; Gene Goss; Kelly Kriebs; Robert Parkhurst; klowe@cityofsierrmadre.com
Subject: Public comment for January 10, 2023 City Council Meeting

CAUTION: This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Regarding a vote for the measure to repeal city council ordinance #1461: I and other residents who I have spoken to want this measure to be brought to a vote. We collected signatures for 50% more signatures than required showing how important this issue is to Sierra Madre residents. However, we do NOT think that the city should pay for a special election and that the referendum should be at the time of a regularly scheduled election in 2024. The rush to have a special election and pass on the cost to the residents of Sierra Madre appears to be occurring at the behest of New Urban West and the Passionists. If there is to be a special election, New Urban West should pay for it and not the City of Sierra Madre; they are the ones who keep telling the City that their investors want to move forward.

The City of Sierra Madre continues to be reactive rather than proactive, which is why we are in the situation we are in. The City Council could have properly structured the Development Agreement to delay the change in the General Plan until after the process of the then-known Initiative, and contingent Referendum, were completed. Instead, the CC rushed through approval of the Meadows Project before residents could vote on Measure HR, resulting in the need for the new petition. The actions of the CC allowed New Urban West the opportunity to submit the SB330 application.

Moreover, the City Council, the City Attorney, and the City Staff need to be diligent and completely read and understand our General Plan and zoning codes and SB330 and the bonus density law. SB330 calls for houses to be built following the city's General Plan and zoning rules. What that means is that the new proposal that New Urban West has presented to the city does NOT follow the General Plan standards as required by SB330 specifically with regard to minimum lot size; gross floor area allowed for a given lot size; minimum front, side, and rear setbacks; and angle encroachment planes. Their plan to include 6% "very low-income housing" does NOT allow them circumvent the General Plan. Also, their preliminary plan repeats the trick they used in the Meadows Project plan, where they didn't present gross floor area and thus made it seem as if the houses would be smaller and not so ridiculously over the top in terms of house-size-to-lot-size ratios, and not so out of sync with the General Plan and the character of surrounding neighborhoods. If the General Plan and zoning rules are followed, as stipulated under SB330, the houses they build must be MUCH smaller than they propose per given lot size.

Lastly, please stop tolerating New Urban West's ongoing deceit, disinformation, and hard-ball tactics. Doing so jeopardizes the quality of life in neighborhoods adjacent to the retreat center while potentially harming the long-term interests of Sierra Madre. Please listen to your constituents.

From Susan Neuhausen

Grove St