

Anitra Bibbs

From: Shirley Concolino
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 11:09 AM
To: Anitra Bibbs
Subject: FW: Tonight's Meeting, Agenda Item 22: 10th Ave. Entrance to Curtis Park Village

One more

From: Lauren Hammond
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 5:08 PM
To: David Kwong; Heather Forest; Joy Patterson; Jennifer Hageman; Stephanie Mizuno; Shirley Concolino
Subject: FW: Tonight's Meeting, Agenda Item 22: 10th Ave. Entrance to Curtis Park Village

From: Michael Hearn [mailto:mfhearn3@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 3:20 PM
To: Lauren Hammond
Subject: Tonight's Meeting, Agenda Item 22: 10th Ave. Entrance to Curtis Park Village

Dear Council Member Hammond:

We are residents of 2517 11th Ave., in the southwest corner of the Curtis Park neighborhood. This letter concerns the agenda item 22—"Curtis Park Village"—which is scheduled for public hearing on September 28, 2010. We ask that you make the 10th Ave. entrance into Curtis Park Village (CPV) a permanent bike/pedestrian only entrance, rather than adopt the temporary design currently being proposed to the City Council. The permanent design alternative reflects the desires of the neighborhood, does not face opposition from interested parties, and avoids the unnecessary level of uncertainty caused by the temporary alternative.

The permanent bike/pedestrian design represents the desires of the neighborhood and faces no opposition from interested parties. On September 20, 2010, the Sierra Curtis Neighborhood Association (SCNA) voted in favor of the permanent bike/pedestrian only entrance on 10th Ave. The temporary barrier solution was proposed by a board member, but quickly retracted given the clear desire of the community to have a permanent solution in place.

The Department of Transportation also supported this alternative, informing SCNA members that the restriction of vehicle access at 10th Ave. would have little if any impact on traffic elsewhere in the neighborhood. Further, there is no evidence that there will be a future need for vehicular access at the 10th Ave. entrance—the only reason supporting the temporary alternative. Once CPV is complete, the entire area will be built out to capacity. This is seen in the EIR's traffic study, which shows a negligible increase in traffic at 10th Ave. over the next 30 years. No interested party has argued and supported the need for future vehicular access.

In addition, the bike/pedestrian entrance was supported by the City Planning Commission (Feb. 25, 2010), which recommended that the Traffic Division evaluate and advise the City Council on the various options for the 10th Ave. connection. Lastly, Petrovich Development also supports the permanent bike/pedestrian entrance, as it told the Planning Commission that it would agree to desires of the community on the 10th Ave. entrance. Again, the SCNA's decision was to have a permanent bike/pedestrian entrance.

The permanent bike/pedestrian entrance also avoids some of the problems created by a temporary barrier. Most importantly, the permanent entrance will provide the surrounding community with a voice and peace of mind that vehicular traffic will not be allowed in the future. In contrast, the temporary solution unnecessarily creates uncertainty that will overshadow the benefits of having a developed CPV next door. Current and future residents will need to remain

aware of any proposed changes and undertake a constant effort to prevent a conversion to vehicular traffic in the future. Furthermore, unlike the current public process, the proposed language gives sole discretion over such changes to the DoT and leaves the community out of the decision-making process.

Thank you in advance for taking our community's concerns into consideration on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Michael Hearn & Shannon McKinney

Michael Hearn

mfhearn3@yahoo.com

(916) 216-7236