

Esparza, Patty

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 10:09 AM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: Items 25 and 25, 2/18/20 Council Agenda

From: Galen Pickett <Galen.Pickett@csulb.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 9:15 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Items 25 and 25, 2/18/20 Council Agenda

Dear honorable members of the city council:

I write to you today in support of items 24 and 25 on today's city council agenda, both of which deserve your serious consideration.

It is extremely challenging to finance affordable development and permanent supportive housing solely through market mechanisms, and membership in the OCHFT would give the city more tools in supporting that development and in specifying the properties of that development. Controlling the financing mechanism for an affordable project, the city would have even more control over the direction of the development than in the usual zoning process and in the issuing of a conditional use permit. Given the fact that the money in the fund originates with taxpayers, we would be in a position to reclaim dollars sent to Sacramento and put them to use here, in the city and for the benefit of our residents. Surely this is a responsible expression of our determination to locally control development and maintain the character of the city.

Similarly, item 25 supports and protects the autonomy of the city. Several members of the council expressed trepidation at the "by right" character of possible development in the affordability overlay of the Beach-Edinger Corridor Specific Plan. In my opinion, it is doubtful that including 20% affordable units in any proposed project for the 6 overlay sites is feasible in this market, but if that is not the case, the proposed action transfers ownership (and an option on ownership) of two of the sites to the city itself, using funds that will have to be returned to Sacramento in June if not used. As the property owner, the city would have a large degree of control as to the character of any development on those sites. You as the city council would have far more local control than in the usual CUP process, as your input and support would be required at every stage of the planning and construction process.

Allowing these funds to expire and return to Sacramento, or declining membership in the OCHFT is tantamount to telling the state and county respectively that they know better than we do how to use tax dollars to support the welfare of our city.

With best wishes,

Galen T. Pickett
Dept. of Physics and Astronomy
CSU Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90840

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2-18-2020

Agenda Item No.: 25 (20-1432)

<http://www.csulb.edu/~gpickett>

Estanislau, Robin

From: Chi, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:05 PM
To: Estanislau, Robin
Subject: FW: Question on Housing Element Site #1

FYI!

Oliver Chi
City Manager

City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
P.O. Box 190
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
Office: (714) 536-5575
Cell: (310) 663-9837

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMUNICATION

Meeting Date: 2-18-2020

Agenda Item No.: 25(20-1432)

From: Luna-Reynosa, Ursula <ursula.luna-reynosa@surfcity-hb.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 10:07 AM
To: Chi, Oliver <oliver.chi@surfcity-hb.org>
Cc: Gates, Michael <Michael.Gates@surfcity-hb.org>; Hopkins, Travis <thopkins@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: FW: Question on Housing Element Site #1

FYI

From: k s <iamalmira@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2020 6:15 PM
To: Semeta, Lyn <Lyn.Semeta@surfcity-hb.org>; Hardy, Jill <Jill.Hardy@surfcity-hb.org>; Peterson, Erik <Erik.Peterson@surfcity-hb.org>
Cc: Luna-Reynosa, Ursula <ursula.luna-reynosa@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Fw: Question on Housing Element Site #1

I noticed a posting on the HB Comm Forum regarding an article that appeared in the LA Times about a "historic house" being located on the Cameron Lane property.

A month ago, I was asked about this by Alan Ray. My response is attached and I copied Ursula on it at the time. I am doing so here again. I am directing this to the three of you since you have been or are council liasons to the HRB and are the mostly likely to have questions or to be in a position of having to answer any.

As you can see, I have no thought that this small dilapidated structure would prove "preservable".

The LA Times article adds to this discussion by bringing up the formation of what was previously known as Wintersburg. This identification spans a large area which has now been largely developed except for the few buildings Mary Urashima has been trying to save across from Rainbow. I have no idea where the Times got their information, but it is quite overly expansive.

While this particular Cameron property and its sister site facing Beach was at one time part of Wintersburg, it no longer has any historical context that would support preservation. It is far too remote from the Rainbow area property to be considered part of a historic district.

As I've said before, I have no knowledge about RHNA and would not presume to comment on any aspect of that. Nor do I enter into HB Comm Forum discussions.

Your vote on this item is, of course, up to you. I just wanted to be sure this latest issue was addressed to you to the best of my ability.

As always, thank you all for the work you do!

Kathie Schey

From: k s <iamalmira@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2020 11:44 AM
To: Villasenor, Jennifer <JVillasenor@surfcity-hb.org>; Ray, Alan <Alan.Ray@surfcity-hb.org>; Beckman, Hayden <hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org>
Cc: Luna-Reynosa, Ursula <ursula.luna-reynosa@surfcity-hb.org>; James, Jane <jjames@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Re: Question on Housing Element Site #1

Hi Alan,

Thanks for such a thoughtful question.

I would not presume to comment on RHNA because that knowledge is well outside my wheelhouse.

Since I know you have a keen interest in city history, let me note that this site was listed as eligible for Cal Register status in both of the past historic surveys - the one you mention and the earlier one completed in 86. To my knowledge, that designation has not been applied for. Such status would not protect the property from demolition in any event. CR status sounds alot more important than it actually is.

Since I have a copy of the entire historic survey on my desk, I double-checked the DPR for that location. It is said to have been built in 1947. The survey states the significant period of Wintersburg activity extends from 1890 to 1940 (I would have said through 1941) so this simple structure was built after that. It likely does reflect the post-war return of Japanese-Americans to Wintersburg.

I would add that when I research structures in response to demo permits, I very often find inconsistencies between the info a DPR provides and other factual information. However, Mary Urashima contributed most of the information on that area to the survey. Mary has studied this area extensively, so I would consider this DPR to be reliable.

The Cameron property appears to have deteriorated quite a bit in the few years since the DPR was prepared. Despite any "historical significance" that may attach to the place, I suspect that preserving that building would not be likely.

Best,

Kathie Schey

From: Villasenor, Jennifer <JVillasenor@surfcity-hb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2020 10:22 AM
To: Ray, Alan <Alan.Ray@surfcity-hb.org>; Beckman, Hayden <hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org>; Schey, Kathie <jamalmira@hotmail.com>
Cc: Luna-Reynosa, Ursula <ursula.luna-reynosa@surfcity-hb.org>; James, Jane <jjames@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: RE: Question on Housing Element Site #1

Hi Commissioner Ray,

No, HCD has already accepted the site with this information.

Let me know if you would like more information. Thank you.

Jennifer

From: Ray, Alan <Alan.Ray@surfcity-hb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2020 9:03 AM
To: Villasenor, Jennifer <JVillasenor@surfcity-hb.org>; Beckman, Hayden <hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org>; Schey, Kathie <jamalmira@hotmail.com>
Subject: Question on Housing Element Site #1

Dear Jennifer, Kathie and Hayden,

At last night's Planning Commission meeting, a question came up regarding the historical status of Site #1, 17631 Cameron Lane. I see that the property is listed in the 2014 Historic Context & Survey Report (p. 166). Does this listing have any impact on its availability as a RHNA site?

https://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/files/users/planning/Historic_Context_and_Survey_Report_Final_Draft.pdf

Alan Ray
Vice Chair, Planning Commission
alan.ray@surfcity-hb.org

Estanislau, Robin

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:50 PM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: Vote No on Agenda Item 23 & 25

From: Taylor Haug <taylorhaug@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:38 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Vote No on Agenda Item 23 & 25

I urge you to repeat the vote on Agenda Item 23 and reject the item. The building does not fit the space, and it will cause even more traffic and safety issues at this intersection.

HB doesn't need to get into the real estate business. This was proven in the last purchase of the Pipeline disaster, costing taxpayers over 100K. The fact that you already have a letter of intent to purchase these two items prior to changing the overlay of these parcels shows you have already decided before the public meeting. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE reject this item. LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE YOU REPRESENT.

Thank you. A homeowner and lifelong resident.
Taylor Haug

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2-18-2020

Agenda Item No.: #25 (20-1432)