



# 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.

**From:** Blonde and Brunette Productions [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2022 11:29 AM  
**To:** Public Comment <[publiccomment@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:publiccomment@cityofsierramadre.com)>  
**Cc:** PlanningCommission <[PlanningCommission@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:PlanningCommission@cityofsierramadre.com)>; Jose Reynoso <[jreynoso@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:jreynoso@cityofsierramadre.com)>; Vincent Gonzalez <[vgonzalez@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:vgonzalez@cityofsierramadre.com)>; Jessica Sarber <[REDACTED] 'Natalie Peterson' [REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Public Comment for 6/14/2022 City Council Meeting

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

Honorable Council Members:

We request your consideration of the attached as you review the Qualified Citizen Petition For Initiative Measure To Change The General Plan Land Use Designation From "Institutional" To "Hillside" And The Zoning Designation From "Institutional" To "Hillside Management" For The Mater Dolorosa Property at this evening's June 14, 2022 City Council meeting.

We also request that the attached be made of record for the June 14, 2022 City Council meeting.

To date, it appears the only recourse, aside from legal action, that is available to our family is voting on this ballot measure in November. Despite repeated requests, the Meadows project developer and its representative, Mr. Frankel, will not meet to discuss the mitigations requested in the attached letter. At the June 4, 2022 Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Frankel presented a new drawing of the same problematic set up for the wall blocking the [REDACTED] Drive view of the mountains, which will have a negative impact on [REDACTED] property value.

At this time, since the Meadows project developer continues to refuse to have substantive mitigation discussions with the adjoining property owners, the only options for Sierra Madre residents, voters and tax payers are litigation or voting on our concerns this November. The Meadows project is no shape to move forward until the developer addresses the mitigations repeatedly requested or until the matter is voted upon in the November election.

Sincerely,

Sally Shore  
Sierra Madre resident

on behalf of Queenie Shore, Sally Shore, Natalie Shore Peterson and Jessica Shore Sarber

**From:** Lou Losorelli [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2022 9:03 AM  
**To:** Jose Reynoso <jreynoso@cityofsierramadre.com>; Vincent Gonzalez <vgonzalez@cityofsierramadre.com>  
**Cc:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@cityofsierramadre.com>; Public Comment <publiccomment@cityofsierramadre.com>  
**Subject:** Meadows Project

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

Dear City Council and Planning Commission Members,  
In advance of tonight's meeting of the City Council, please let me register my continuing opposition to the Meadows Project. I can repeat here the many arguments against this project that you both have repeatedly heard before, but let me mention only one here - the most important - the overwhelming disbelief by the residents of Sierra Madre that the City is continuing to explore allowing this particular development to move forward. This is evidenced by the fact that, despite major efforts taken by those favoring the Meadows Project to promote it, and to frighten the residents of Sierra Madre into not opposing it, the residents of Sierra Madre have, with very limited resources, organized themselves to successfully put a Petition on the ballot, as you know, to let the residents of Sierra Madre, and not any outside parties, decide whether the Mater Dolorosa property should conform to the development guidelines to which all other hillside properties are subject, rather than sitting quietly by and accepting the devastating result that will occur if the Specific Plan is approved.

No action in tonight's City Council meeting should be taken that will move this project forward. The Planning Commission in its last meeting noted that there are several major issues with the plan as currently proposed. The citizenry of Sierra Madre have spoken clearly against this project as evidenced by bringing the matter to a ballot measure. Many important and vital issues need to be resolved in order to determine what course of action is in the best interest of our great and beloved little town.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Lou Losorelli  
Sierra Madre resident

**From:** Cynthia Gitt [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2022 12:10 AM  
**To:** Public Comment <publiccomment@cityofsierramadre.com>  
**Cc:** Cynthia Gitt [REDACTED] Cynthia Gitt 2 [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Proposed Ordinance Banning Smoking

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

I am a long time resident of Sierra Madre, but a relatively new resident of townhouse condos at [REDACTED]. I am not a smoker, but I have to oppose the proposed ordinance banning smoking in units of 3 or more.

First, there is no proof that banning smoking in one's own home is going to affect the health of anyone other than the residents of a particular unit. It is not the function of the City Council to protect smokers from themselves, to the extent that smokers are not protecting themselves. There is no evidence that by banning me from smoking in my unit, the health and safety of others will be affected. I am advised by local architects that these units do not share air circulation systems. Smoke does not travel through walls. I have not seen any scientific evidence that would justify such an incredible intrusion into the privacy and rights of Sierra Madre residents.

This also is discriminatory against the non-rich of Sierra Madre who can't afford to buy or rent single family homes. And people who sit in their yards and smoke can cause just as much harm—in fact more—by smoking on their porch or in their yard near where others are passing or playing.

What more is the City planning to regulate for us poor condo owners. Will there be a ban on alcohol. We will be limited to certain sexual practices and on certain days? What about tv programs?

There are serious constitutional issues with such broad prohibitions with so little basis and no attempt to address any problem that exists in the least restrictive manner. I am sure there will be a lawsuit, which is a complete waste of funds.

Pardon my skepticism, but this sounds like a bid from management companies to avoid painting units when people move out.

Please do not do this. Stay in your lane.

Cynthia E.itt  
Brown Gitt Law Group ALC

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Direct: [REDACTED]

Alt: [REDACTED]

**From:** Josh Gitt [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2022 12:04 AM  
**To:** Public Comment <publiccomment@cityofsierramadre.com>  
**Subject:** Ordinance No. 1457

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

Hello, hope everyone is well. I want to talk about Ordinance No. 1457, which would prohibit smoking in all multi-unit residences. This whole matter is so ridiculous, I don't even know where to begin. Number 1, the fact that this is considered a "health and safety" matter is ludicrous. There is no proof that smoke goes from one unit to another. An architect in Sierra Madre has advised us that condo's in Sierra Madre do not share air circulation systems, so that smoke would not go from one unit to the other. Second, this blatant discrimination on lower income groups and those who need smoking (i.e. medical marijuana) as a form of medicine. Third, and most importantly, this seems to be an attack of younger people, of which Sierra Madre is already in short supply. The population of Sierra Madre is predominately senior, and this measure will only tilt the matter against younger people moving here.

I have lived in Sierra Madre, and have grown in this town. I love living here. It would be to see the city try drive some over bogus "health and safety" measures. I have never believed that Sierra Madre has ever tried to engaged in discrimination matters. I hope I am not wrong in this case.

Please take all of this into consideration.

Thank you for your time,  
Josh Gitt

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 7, 2022 4:22 PM  
**To:** Laura Aguilar <laguilar@cityofsierramadre.com>  
**Subject:** Contact City Council 2022-06-07 04:21 PM(PST) Submission Notification

**Contact City Council 2022-06-07 04:21 PM(PST)** was submitted by Guest on 6/7/2022 7:21:57 PM (GMT-08:00) US/Pacific

Name	Value
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Message</b>	To the City Council, re the Meadows project: My wife, Diana, and I thank the Planning Commissioners for their continued hard and thorough work again, on June 2. Thanks very much to each Commissioner. We were especially moved by Commissioner Peggy Dallas' saying what is a small town: It is houses' size, and that the Residents talk to each other She is concerned that we in Sierra Madre may be at the point where the Meadows Project is becoming critically divisive. We hope before the final determination is rendered, that the issue has a vote open to all Residents. Important issues in life are Career, Spouse, Community. Thank you. Chris and Diana Houser Residents for 58 years [REDACTED]

To view this form submission online, please follow the link below:

<http://www.cityofsierramadre.com/form/one.aspx?objectId=18606439&contextId=17460512&returnto=submissions>

From: Susan Hoskins [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 2:10 PM  
To: Jose Reynoso <[jreynoso@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:jreynoso@cityofsierramadre.com)>  
Cc: Vincent Gonzalez <[vgonzalez@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:vgonzalez@cityofsierramadre.com)>  
Subject: Do the right thing

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

Hello Jose,

"The time is always right to do the right thing" (Martin Luther King Jr.) pertains to protecting our Sierra Madre hillsides from harmful development.

The right thing to do is to have the Meadows Housing Project voted on by Sierra Madre residents to be placed in the Hillside Residential zone so that any development must follow the same rules as we the people of Sierra Madre.

I strongly oppose the Housing Project because it will create environmental hardship for current citizens, stress our natural resources, change the character of our hillside community, threaten the local wildlife, trees and the ecosystem of Bailey Park, destroy habitat and negatively impact our water conservation efforts which are only growing greater each year due to man-made climate change.

Thank you,

Susan Hoskins  
[REDACTED]

Sally Shore

May 31, 2022

VIA EMAIL AND US MAIL

Commissioner Peggy Dallas  
Commissioner Tom Denison  
Commissioner John C. Hutt  
Commissioner William Pevsner  
Commissioner Bob Spears  
c/o City of Sierra Madre Planning Commission  
232 W. Sierra Madre Blvd.  
Sierra Madre, CA 91024

Re: [REDACTED]  
New Urban West/Meadows at Bailey Canyon Monastery Development Impacts

Dear Honorable Commissioners:

We are the daughters of Queenie Shore, resident and owner of the above-referenced property (the "Residence") which directly abuts the southeast border of the proposed Meadows at Bailey Canyon Subdivision (the "Subdivision") located at 700 N. Sunnyside Ave.

Thank you for your continued consideration of our concerns and for your decision to review the Subdivision's proposed Specific Plan with care at the May 5, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting.

We met via Zoom with the Subdivision's representative, Jonathan Frankel, on April 20, 2022. At that time, we shared our concerns and asked our questions regarding impacts on the Residence. As of the date of this letter, we have not received the written response we requested, nor have we received any other follow-up.

As such, we request that the Commissioners, commencing with the Specific Plan review during the June 2, 2022, Planning Commission meeting, require the Subdivision to address the following issues with specificity before approving any part or the whole of the Specific Plan:

1. Construction Dust Mitigation: Given the [April 27, 2022 Metropolitan Water District water shortage emergency declaration](#) and the drastic water use cuts mandated by the MWD, it is critical that the Specific Plan set clear remedies for dust mitigation during construction to avoid damage to the Residence, the adjoining properties and the health of all residents in the immediate vicinity.
2. View Blockage: No variance of SMC Ordinance Chapter 17.20.010 should be allowed in the Specific Plan. Blockage of the Residence's view will significantly damage the Residence's property value. The Specific Plan at Section 2.5, Site Planning 5.4 proposes a "slump" wall extending 3-8 feet upward, which violates the mountain view protection of the Ordinance.

3. Use of Proposed Dedicated Park: The Specific Plan currently proposes a parking lot directly above the residence. Creation of a parking lot adjoining the Residence will negatively impact the Residence's property value. At the May 5, 2022, Planning Commission meeting, it was determined that plenty of additional street parking is already incorporated into the Meadows subdivision and no parking lot is needed. Regarding the space itself, a setback and landscape buffer is the best way forward for all parties concerned. The Subdivision has already designed a setback between the homes along the western border of the development. Likewise, a setback with a landscape buffer should be established between the Subdivision and homes along the southern border of the project. We support a walking path set back to the northernmost edge of the space with low native landscaping.
4. Sewer Line and Construction Damage: The Residence is at the lowest elevation point of the Subdivision. The Subdivision's proposed 75-foot sewer line puts the Residence at high risk of both immediate drainage damage and cumulative harm over a period of years. The sewer line needs to be relocated. Additionally, the Subdivision should provide and pay for an independent civil engineer's assessment of the retaining wall and agree in writing to fully compensate the Residence for any and all damage to the Residence caused by the Subdivision construction and its related activity, as well as any and all future damage to the Residence caused by the Subdivision sewer line and drainage therefrom. In our Zoom conversation with Mr. Frankel, he verbally offered to name our mother and her property as an additional insured on relevant policies. This would address some of our concerns and we are amenable to this action. However, we have yet to see any follow-up in writing.
5. Discrepancies in Subdivision Diagrams: There is a discrepancy between the Conceptual Plan Views #3-6a and #3-8 (Exhibit A): the existing homes and streets along the southern boundary are placed differently in each rendering. Also, Sunnyside Avenue does not appear to align with the existing main Mater Dolorosa entrance in one of the renderings, which raises questions about the overall layout. We ask that the Subdivision identify the governing Conceptual Plan View. The commission should not act on any proposed changes and/or amendments to maps, zoning and plans that contain discrepancies.
6. Wildfire Mitigation: The Specific Plan should contain a schedule of brush and debris clearance during construction. As of this writing, Mater Dolorosa has not cleared the current buildup of dry brush from the property and has not returned our calls requesting attention to brush clearance. This has been a problem in the recent past. In 2021, Mater Dolorosa stacked flammable plant debris on the property directly bordering the Residence and did not respond to our repeated requests to remove flammable material. They acted only after we contacted City of Sierra Madre and CalFire code enforcement. Debris will significantly accumulate during construction. It is imperative for the safety of the entire City of Sierra Madre and neighboring communities that the Specific Plan set forth regular debris removal during construction.

The Commissioners have repeatedly urged the Subdivision to engage with the community. During public meetings, Mr. Frankel has represented he is committed to doing so. This has not been our experience. Despite our efforts to resolve our ongoing concerns, neither he nor anyone else representing the Subdivision or the Applicant has made further contact with us.

In closing, we again thank the Planning Commission for its attention to our family's concerns about the proposed project. We believe mitigation is preferable to litigation to protect the value and physical integrity of our mother's property and the safety of Sierra Madre.

Sincerely,

*/s/Sally Shore*  
Sally Shore

*/s/Natalie Shore Peterson*  
Natalie Shore Peterson

*/s/Jessica Shore Sarber*  
Jessica Shore Sarber

cc:

VIA EMAIL

[jfrankel@antlanissd.com](mailto:jfrankel@antlanissd.com)

[agiragosian@chwlaw.us](mailto:agiragosian@chwlaw.us)

[planningcommission@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:planningcommission@cityofsierramadre.com)

[nshollenberger@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:nshollenberger@cityofsierramadre.com)

[vgonzalez@cityofsierramadre.com](mailto:vgonzalez@cityofsierramadre.com)

[jrietze@pw.lacounty.gov](mailto:jrietze@pw.lacounty.gov)

[TDUONG@dpw.lacounty.gov](mailto:TDUONG@dpw.lacounty.gov)

[chairman@gabrielenoindians.org](mailto:chairman@gabrielenoindians.org)

[admin@gabrielenoindians.org](mailto:admin@gabrielenoindians.org)

[bpalmer@strumwooch.com](mailto:bpalmer@strumwooch.com)

VIA US MAIL

