



Carolyn Petty

Oppose

05-20-
2024
02:41 pm

First thing I want to mention is the reduction of public comment by 1/3 the time is a bad practice that should have never been approved. The planning commission deals with serious land use issues and if there is an item of concern to the residents, they should be given an appropriate amount of time to comment. 2 minutes is insufficient.

This item should be continued until more data is obtained. Issues that I would like to bring to your attention:

- The traffic study was commissioned by the applicant so there is an inherent conflict of interest. This is not an objective study as is clear when one reads it: 1. Page 1 - they say there are no traffic issues at PCH/2nd Street. How is that possible? I drive that area often and walk my dog on that street early morning (I don't know why he wants to walk on PCH but he does), and from 6 am until 7pm it is nearly always gridlocked traffic. 2. The parking requirements are completely inadequate for the uses:

- Where will the employees park, and how many employees will actually work there? There are statutory guidelines governing the ratio of workers to children. For instance, 1 adult: 4 children aged 0-2 years old, 1 adult to 12 children 2-6 years old. It is hard to believe that 77 students could be handled by only 8 employees. By the way, if they claim that one employee will always be outside directing traffic, they are in potentially in violation of the worker ratio unless it is someone not counted towards that ratio. Of course they will need one or perhaps two managers. The employees should not be parking in the neighborhood.

- If any of you have children, you know that if 77 children are being dropped off and picked up, there is no way 3 spaces are sufficient for loading/unloading. Inevitably there will be a line of cars going up the street, which turns into a one way street. How are residents who live on that street going to be able to leave their homes during pick up and drop off? How will emergency vehicles get through the line of cars?

- Parking space turnover rate of 3-4 minutes. Much of their assumptions rest on this. It is totally unrealistic. Parents have to get their children out of carseats. Sometimes they have more than one child. Then they grab whatever items they may want to leave at the center for their child. Just that portion alone could take 3 minutes. What if they want a brief chat with the people at the daycare? That is not uncommon. Sometimes children are fussy and don't want their parents to leave. The turnover rate should easily be double that number.

1. Where is the data that backs up their claim the number of trips would be lower? That also defies logic for everyone who has gone past the existing use. The place always looks empty - I actually thought it was closed. Plus the distribution of uses is completely different. At a retail, uses are throughout the day. Clearly for a daycare the intensity is completely different.

I could write 10 pages analyzing the insufficiency of this proposal, but you would not read it due to time. But the other part that disturbs me is that a resident did a public records request for all correspondence pertaining to this item and staff is refusing to adequately respond within the statutory timeframe. As a public agency, all information should be made available. When they hide this, it absolutely leads the residents to wonder what is going on and why staff is recommending this project. Until we know - without any redactions - what is going on behind the scenes, the approval process should stop.

Thank you,

Carolyn Petty