

Hosozawa, Carrie

From: Schlotterbeck, Melanie
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 10:18 AM
To: Ken
Cc: Hosozawa, Carrie
Subject: RE: Hines Project Place

Ken,

Apologies for a delayed response. Thank you for submitting your comments to me.

I wanted to be sure that you've sent them to the City for inclusion in the public record on the project. I've cc'd Carrie Hosozawa with the City as she is accepting the comments for this project.

Thanks and I appreciate your thoughtful comments on the Hines project.

My best,

Melanie

From: Ken [kens@keneva-ins.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 12:36 PM
To: Schlotterbeck, Melanie
Subject: Hines Project Place

I have been very active with this project since Feb. 2016 and have tried to get myself educated as to the process of evaluating how to get a project either approved, altered/approved or denied.

I started with the council that were in office in 2016 and met with only four of the members. The other member had scheduling conflicts, so we never met. I was surprised of the very little information that they were able to share regarding the project. It had always been my belief the council should have complete knowledge of any and all projects especially on how it would affect the public.

Recently, through the effort of a former member of planning commission I am what I believe more knowledgeable of the process to get a project approved.

Here are some activities I have been involved with the past year:

> Hines Meetings-- I guess I can be considered one of the neighbor leaders since I have met with them along with others at least 6 to 7 times. The meetings were about details regarding the building of the project and other issues (traffic, air quality, parking, visual impact, lighting and shadows, noise and site alterations). I think we help get the North Building altered to step down height, cutout on Birch and State College and some reduction in the number of units to name a few.

> Neighbor Meetings-- There have been at least 8 meetings since Feb. 2016 with neighbors in Avocado Area both East and West and neighbors west of the Brea Project

Closer to the current parking structure. There has never been a consensus of what the design should be for the Brea Place Project, but all did agree the design of this project should be like downtown Birch street. (2 stories)

> Spreading the Word-- There were flyers pass out in several neighbors and even at the Brea Fest Event regarding the Hines Project. Also there were a few meetings with some council members, but no direction was offered on how to make sure the project met with public approval.

> Traffic-- All the meetings held with Hines turn to traffic and the number of apartments. If you use the 747 apartments as the sample size that will lead to an additional 1600 cars. We did see at several meetings Adaptive Traffic Control, but still

feel not enough and needs to be a significant part of the planning commission responsibility to evaluate in order to avoid adding to the already present traffic problems.

- > Lack of Knowledge on the Approval Process-- All of my neighbors including myself had no idea a year ago as to what the project was to get it approved. But, now we understand we the public feel the CEQA process that will developed a full EIR is unquestionably the only process to use to evaluate a project of this magnitude.
- > Loss of Quaint Brea and Personality-- The meetings with Hines always went back to the 2003 plan stating the project is fulfilling that plan. I guess the council of 2003 and planning commission had a different perception for the future of Brea in lieu definition of quaint?
- > Other Projects-- There are still open items with other projects like parking , traffic, and air quality still needing correction why take on more problems until resolved?

Do you as the current planning commission want your name on this project without a complete EIR?

Please take the necessary steps and require that there be a full CEQA process resulting in an EIR for this project.

Sent from my iPad

April 7, 2017

Commissioner Melanie Schlotterbeck
Brea Planning Commissioners
1 Civic Center Circle
Brea, CA 92821

Commissioner Schlotterbeck,

I have been a resident of Brea for 33 years, live at 815 Palmetto Place and have seen an extensive amount of growth and changes within our great city. My family moved here as many have, to raise our family because of the "small town" atmosphere. Well, that atmosphere is long gone. The purpose in writing is to discuss the Brea Place (Hines) Development. After observing the March 28, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting, I felt compelled to share my feelings and ideas regarding this mega mixed residential/retail complex being built just south of my neighborhood. To keep it simple, I will use a bullet form with some explanation if needed.

- ❖ The current 2003 EIR for the project is out of date. A new EIR is needed.
- ❖ Any tax revenue benefit to the City will be going toward new Public Services (Fire/Police, etc). The Hines tax revenue projection is inflated and manipulated.
- ❖ Surrounding property values (the two neighborhoods north of the project) will certainly decrease. Never has an apartment complex near single family homes, helped increase their value.
- ❖ Do not the La Floresta and Central Park Village developments fulfill the current City of Brea redevelopment residential yearly growth plan requirement?
- ❖ I imagine you are aware of College Town at California State University Fullerton that is currently in the planning stages. 13,000 new housing units, including the closure of Nutwood Avenue as part of this 84 acre development will surely change traffic patterns on St. College Boulevard and the 57 Freeway affecting Brea and the Brea Place project.
- ❖ The Yorba Linda Main Street retail shops and theatre development will certainly draw patrons eastward, away from our Birch Street shopping and theatres. Why fight the traffic to Birch Street when you can visit the Land of Gracious Living?
- ❖ Are more retail spaces needed? There is plenty of current retail space not leased throughout Brea. On that note, it was despicable for a Brea Chamber of Commerce Board member to speak for all board members and endorse the Brea Place project at the February 28, 2017 Planning Commission meeting having only viewed the submitted plans for one week.
- ❖ A Brea redevelopment precedent was set with the 3-story height limitation for mixed-use retail/residential development on Downtown Birch Street and at the Central Park Village. Just because Hines is constructing their building next to a 6-story office high-rise, what gives them or the City, authority to build a 5-story apartment complex and not adhere to the precedent?
 - Please do not allow the 3 to 5-story tiered apartment complex to be built overlooking single family residences. I am certain you would not want this in your backyard.

- I believe the Hines Building 'A' and Building 'B' are completely different heights. If this Brea Place eye sore is to be built, swap their locations and place the lower buildings at the north end of the development.
- Better yet, as part of the Tracks at Brea, a park and parking lot should be constructed at the old Lowe Field location. Open space in Brea is going away. Our neighborhood built in 1964 was constructed prior to the open space requirement. Give us a gift here.
- ❖ It was questioned at the meeting whether enough parking was part of this plan. I guarantee you that the Market Place parking will suffer due to this development. During the holiday season, it will be a disaster. This is the current parking trend each season now.
- ❖ The traffic plan Hines proposes will not work. If this Integrated Traffic Management System is the savior, the City should implement it now and test it under current traffic conditions for the 25% reduction. Do not wait until the additional traffic is upon us Breans after any selected option for the site is complete.
 - Send Hines' traffic plan to Brea's Traffic Committee for evaluation. Is that not one of their functions?
 - Hines stated a right-turn pocket lane will be added southbound to westbound St. College Boulevard and Birch Street. To facilitate the flow of traffic in and out of Brea Place, this right-turn lane should run the entire length of the project to expedite the turning traffic off of St. College Boulevard into each driveway or at the signal south of the Tracks at Brea. Additionally, the right-turn lane should continue westbound Birch Street to the Pei Wei parking entrance for the same reason. You must get traffic out of the flow of traffic and into Brea Place and Marketplace as quickly and safely as possible. Without dedicated turn lanes both north and southbound St. College, drivers use all lanes to make their turn, stopping the flow of through traffic.
- ❖ With the widening of Lambert Avenue in the near future, we will once again suffer the inconveniences and have traffic moved closer to our residences.

In closing, please vote against this current proposal for Brea Place. This is a **QUALITY OF LIFE ISSUE** for the affected residents and a **QUALITY OF LIFE ISSUE** for ALL who travel through Brea to live, shop or play. My family did not move to "Good Old Brea" to live in "Any Town USA."

Thank you for your time and consideration in this important matter.
Sincerely,

Robyn R. Bjorklund

Robyn R. Bjorklund
815 Palmetto Place
Brea, CA 92821

Hosozawa, Carrie

To: matthew vidovich
Subject: RE: Brea Place Project

From: matthew vidovich [mailto:matthewvidovich@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 6:18 PM
To: Hosozawa, Carrie <carrieho@ci.brea.ca.us>
Subject: Brea Place Project

Dear Planning Commission,

I'm writing this message to support the Brea Place project. I don't know if you've noticed, but we don't have very many places to rent in Brea. People my age, who can't afford to buy a house yet, have a hard time finding nice places to live in Brea, and even in this area of Orange County.

We need the apartments included in this project. It looks like a great place to live, with the pools, places to walk, and I like that people will be able to walk to eat out, go out for a drink, or something else.

I hope you'll approve this plan.

Thank you,

Matt Vidovich

Date: March 27, 2017
To: Members of the Brea Planning Commission
From: James McGrade, Planning Commissioner
Re: Brea Chamber of Commerce Board Position regarding the Brea Place Project

On February 28, 2017, the City of Brea Planning Commission held a Public Hearing regarding the Brea Place project being developed by the Hines Corporation. During the hearing, the Brea Chamber of Commerce President, Heidi Gallegos, spoke in support of the Brea Place project.

I am writing to assure my fellow Planning Commissioners and the members of the public that I was not aware of and did not take any part in the Chamber's decision to come out in support of the project.

Although I am a current member of the Brea Chamber Board, I have not been involved in any subcommittee or discussions regarding the project. I have always recused myself from any discussions at the Chamber regarding any matters related to the project and was not even aware the Chamber was going to take a position on the project until the public hearing.

As Planning Commissioner, it is my responsibility to gather all the information on any project that is before the commission and deliberate on the merits with my fellow commissioners within the public hearing process. I will maintain an open mind about the project and will not take a position, either for or against the project, until after I have heard all the evidence at the public hearings.

My goal with this disclosure is to put to rest any perceived conflicts of interest regarding this project.

Respectfully,

James G. McGrade

From: Janice Govaerts [<mailto:mjlgova@verizon.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 3:43 PM

To: McDaniel, James <JamesM@ci.brea.ca.us>; arthurw@cityofbrea.net; Fox, Pat <patf@ci.brea.ca.us>; Schlotterbeck, Melanie <melanies@ci.brea.ca.us>; Grosse, Jim <jimg@ci.brea.ca.us>; Crabtree, David <DAVIDC@ci.brea.ca.us>; Lilley, Jennifer <JenniferL@ci.brea.ca.us>

Subject: PUBLIC HEARINGS FROM AUDIENCE March 28, 2017 Meeting

For future city council meetings, it should **NOT** be allowed to read a letter and speak on behalf of an individual not present that cannot attend the meeting.

All of the letters read at the meeting on the evening of March 28th were very slick and all had the same sound and wording to them. They were **UNDOUBTABLY** fictitious letters written by the Hines Corporation and the names of the Brea "residents" and "business owners" very in favor of this horrific building proposal in our city were clearly and completely made up. It was too much of a coincidence that they all sounded the same, were way too pro-Hines to the point of being fake, and ironically could all not attend the meeting on the same night.

You are all bright people, surely you realized this. Please give consideration to the negative impact these monstrosity buildings will be on us long-time, law-abiding, tax-paying, Brea citizens will be and put our needs first over those of a greedy, money-hungry, profit-seeking corporation.

*****I would prefer my name not be shown and this letter not be printed or included in the printed packet of the Planning Commission Hearing Meeting of March 28, 2017.**

From: Dwight Manley [mailto:dmanleyinc@aol.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:14 PM

To: Harris-Neal, Lillian <lillianhn@ci.brea.ca.us>; cthupp@earthlink.net; mslj@roadrunner.com; Parker, Glenn <GlennP@ci.brea.ca.us>; stevenv@ci.brea.us; Marick, Christine <christinemarick@gmail.com>

Cc: Gallardo, Bill <BILLGA@ci.brea.ca.us>; Crabtree, David <DAVIDC@ci.brea.ca.us>; McGrade, James <james.mcgrade@ii-hpa.com>; dorothy-art@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Hines public comment

Dear City of Brea Leadership,

I am writing you of something that is of vital importance. After participating and attending the planning commission meeting two days ago, I witnessed an unmitigated hijacking of the democratic process. Due to the Hines Corporation's efforts to have all of their out of town paid consultants, as well as the now corrupted Chamber of Commerce's leadership's efforts to have letters read into the record, the planning commission summarily reduced the public comment time limit from five minutes to three. Compounding this, the commission chose to forego open discussion prior to the public's comments, depriving the public of the commissions thoughts. If the commission wisely chooses to take up to a week to formulate their thoughts and questions, why is are the actual people they are supposed to represent forced to do any differently? Are we now in a world in Brea that if one wants to silence the actual resident, you just have to pay outsiders to show up and babble about millennials?

As an example of what I did not have time to ask; Hines stated six months ago they spent \$10,000,000,000 improving the property, and now they say \$30,000,000-receipts please? They claimed six months ago that the rents would be 2500-3000, and we heard 1300-1400 at rebuttal-show us the actual pro forma rental charts they are using. Where are the sight and sound studies on the roof top pools? Show us pictures of the west side that we now hear supposedly has a window that can't be used to escape an emergency, and are too high to see down into the homes yard next door. Six months ago the Hotel had a kitchen for room service only-now there is a full restaurant and bar-how many seats, what hours of service, menu example, hours of operation? Should that not have the same scrutiny as all the existing Brea eateries have? Is a hotel lounge bar appropriate there? Hines claims \$1,600,000 annual tax revenue to Brea from this. Show me the math-the property would have to be assessed at over \$1,000,000,000 (one billion) to net that much for us. Hines lawyer claims the parking agreement with Regency is void. I detected some deception in the ladies voice, and read this as they want it to be void. Was the theater lease assumed by 24 Hour gym?

The parking for the gym/rear of Regency, which the school district has a financial interest in, should be of top priority in whatever happens with Hines-in the Hines plans, it is an afterthought.

In closing, I urge you to not let Brea democracy be corrupted by billion dollar hedge funds or paid lackeys. Put the Brea resident first, and let actual Brea citizens have their full opportunity to be heard after the commission has publicly discussed this as has been done in Brea for 100 years.

Sincerely, Dwight Manley, a Brean since 1966

From: Doug Matthews <Doctordrm@att.net>

Date: March 30, 2017 at 3:11:43 PM PDT

To: <jenniferl@cityofbrea.net>

Subject: reflections post Planning Commission meeting March 28

Ms. Lilley,

Living in Glenbrook since 1977, I never attended local civic meeting. With advent of the Hines proposal, I was drawn out of the Brea 'woodwork', attending Tuesday night's meeting. You may or may not recall, I wrote brief note to you, as well as to the other members of the Commission, about a month ago. I understand that your title is "Planner for the Project". Observing you through the course of the evening, I am still not quite sure your role in this civic drama. You spoke infrequently, though with authority, when you did. 'Serene, engaged, controlled': terms most apt capturing you from my vantage point.

Inexperienced in local public matters, I was eager for this meeting, given import/impact portended. From the start, I was struck by the phalanx of Brea Place supporters, filling the auditorium seats. Daunting. With relatively few of us sporting red shirts, indicating loyal opposition, it seemed that we were the David -- a motley crew of locals, enjoined only by central passion for Brea, otherwise, having no cohesive organization or 'game plan' -- dwarfed by the Hines Goliath. (Certainly brings to mind, George Washington's impossible circumstance in New York, summer of 1776, chronicled especially well by historian Joseph Ellis.)

If there had been a Vin Skully or Dick Enberg to call, it would have seemed a contest with each side having its momentum moments, as it played out. Now, the 'suits' (Brea Place) rock. Then, the 'rag tags' roll, an ebb and flow. Exhausting. Well, for me, especially having to stand for the first 2 hours. As the 11 p.m. hour neared, it seemed that most were growing weary.

A couple of reflections:

This was my first such experience. It is likely that input that I would want -- had it already been introduced or considered, e.g. February 28. Tuesday night, Hine's began with overview of their work across the land, wending to Orange County in their discussion, assisted by power point graphics. Glory's of Hines rang. For me, it was a minor clang. I will accept that they are a ubiquitous presence across our great land. I had no idea of the number of developments just in Orange County, either extant or in planning stages, as in Brea. I found this intriguing, more than compelling, however. For an instance, they invited us to consider their 'success' in Irvine. A close friend of mine, a physical scientist, who works in Irvine and lives in Tustin, rues the development that Hine's praised. At coffee, yesterday, he smiled, shaking his head, when I shared my experience from Tuesday night in Council chambers; from his perspective, Irvine, especially, but also Tustin, has become a nightmare, barely fit for human habitation and (his view again) the city fathers are 'crooks'. He referred to developments such as Hines.

The proposed buildings, themselves: I would hate to be a tenant in such an apartment or condo. Thinking of new condo developments in Brea, how dreadful traipsing across the grounds from garage to living unit, with groceries or arm load of purchased goods. Then, take those steep steps. (No thanks, here.) Unpleasant in days the sun shines. Miserable in the rain.

my realities in this town that I love and where I have lived so long...I was not going to speak. After all, everyone seemed to be getting tired, not just me. Besides, and holy cow! People were reading from script that they had prepared beforehand. I had nothing in my hands to share. Just fuming thoughts in my head. That is when an experience from long ago emerged from my memory. And so, I shared a parcel of that memory, slimmest of moments from that visit to Universal Studios, then, newly opened. A tram tour of the studio, was the occasion. At one point, the tram took us down a lovely street, reminding me of those in posh San Marino. I think that it was 'Elm' Street. The tram slowly coursed under the umbrella of tree arbor, providing shade from withering sun that day, gliding past magnificent homes, that could only be called mansions, on either side. At the end of the long block, the tram turned, continuing on its course. And here the point, the shock. Those were no mansions. Rather, they were elaborate facades, make believe structures held up by long metal poles, disguised from the Elm Street view.

The point, thus far, Hines 'Brea Place' has been oodles of attractive promise, without fulfillment. The presentation strikes me as about as genuine as my Collier Encyclopedia marketing pitch when I was young undergrad and sales trainee, i.e. 'bad means to good ends makes for bad ends' or so my seminary professor would stammer years later...'Meretricious', a word that comes to mind, though, more the phrase, 'all that glitters is not...'

Ms. Lilley, I thank you, again, for 'hearing me out'. I believe that this missive will be rightly place with those in the 'skeptical' file, when it comes to Brea Place. I wish I had more open mind. Alas, I shudder.

Sincerely,

Doug Matthews, Ph.D.

doctordrm@att.net
Brea, CA (Glenbrook)

P.S. Count me with those who have not heard anything from Hines, nothing beyond the original glossy brochure (sent before Christmas?).

From: William Madden <williamdmadden@me.com>

Date: April 2, 2017 at 9:00:24 PM PDT

To: "Crabtree, David" <DAVIDC@ci.brea.ca.us>

Subject: Letter to Planning Commission

David:

Attached is the full text of my testimony before the Planning Commission meeting on March 28. Please pass it to the commissioners.

I have mixed feeling about the development. While I believe the project has merit and a project here has the potential for good City growth, in my opinion it's size and impacts have not been adequately addressed particularly with respect to traffic. For those of us living here it is difficult to accept the finding of the traffic study. When we cannot access our homes from St. College or exit our tracts due to traffic queuing at the Lambert and St. College intersection, the descriptions of LOS of C reduced to D does not reflect our experiences.

At the end of the day, a 30 % reduction in project size would better reflect the transition from suburban to urban and the character of Brea.

Thanks,

Bill

March 28, 2017

Chairman McGrade, Vice Chair Willis,
Members of the Planning Commission:

I would like to preface my remarks by acknowledging that the traffic studies in the Addendum do in fact take into consideration pedestrian traffic at the Birch and State College intersection. For those who know me, I am always in favor and supportive of pedestrians and walking.

Hines has responded to some of my and my neighbors concerns while retaining their overall plan for the project. The reduction in the initial height of the north building facing the Tracks (a tiering of the structure with three floors rising to 5), and a subsequent reduction in the number of total units (c. 285 in Building B and 747 in total) is positive. Overall, however, I am disappointed we have not been able to move the project to a more appropriate size configuration (a 30% reduction) that would more closely reflect the character of Brea.

The promise of screening by planting trees along the Avocado St. side of the Tracks to reduce the visual impact to our homes is also welcome. I suggest this be continued to the east side of State College on the north side of the Tracks.

The construction of a turning pocket for south-bound vehicles at St. College and Birch will improve traffic flow for vehicles turning right. Likewise the elimination of a traffic signal at the south driveway on St. College will reduce potential impacts there as well as a right-in and right-out restriction for vehicles entering or departing the project. However, being unable to turn left (north) onto St. College from that driveway will likely force drivers to make a U-turn at the St. College and Birch intersection to travel north to access the 57 Freeway. This will slow traffic at this intersection. This has been addressed in the Addendum.

The east turning pocket on Birch that provides a left turn into the Hines property at Pei Wei is too small (4-5 vehicles) for project traffic and will block east-bound through traffic on Birch when waiting for the light. Traffic eastbound on Birch will be limited to only one lane if the number of vehicles waiting to turn is exceeded. Further traffic delays on Birch would likely discourage residents from accessing the Downtown, Marketplace, and Civic Center. This has also not been addressed in the Addendum.

Otherwise, the benefits from the addition of an adaptive traffic control system from Lambert and St. College to St. College and Imperial are speculative with are have yet to be determined. The examples shown by Hines' traffic consultant appear to be of roadways that do not mirror the seasonal mall traffic or episodic traffic flows due to freeway congestion and subsequent driver avoidance that impact our surface streets.

to the this report, people who live within 500 feet of freeways suffer from a higher rate of asthma, pre-term births, and a growing list of other health problems

Air quality has a significant impact on human health in so far as it ranks higher as a cause of mortality than alcohol and obesity. As more information accrues on the harmful effects of poor air quality, cities and other agencies need to consider monitoring (both indoor and outdoor) so as to take into consideration air quality in project siting and traffic patterns (see LA Times 3/6/17 and 3/25/17 re health and housing - risks to residents living near freeways).

I would suggest that a long-term monitoring program be instituted by the City to examine the areal extent of CO (and by extension other vehicle exhaust gases) in and around residences within 500 feet of these hot spots. This would be the first step in developing guidelines and changes in building standards and design, project siting, retrofitting of windows in older homes that can not be opened, physical barriers, tree planting, and installing air filtration in impacted homes.

Brea needs to confront and take steps to mitigate these significant impacts to ensure a quality of life for all residents.

Sincerely yours,

Bill Madden
830 Avocado St.
Brea, CA 92821
714-256-1982

From: Jacquelyn Guss [jicqlynguss@icloud.com]

Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 4:08 PM

To: Hupp, Cecilia; Simonoff, Marty; Vargas, Steven; Parker, Glenn; Marick, Christine

Subject: Hines Project

Dear Madam Mayor and City Council Members,

This is just a quick note from a very concerned resident of Brea for the last 52 years. My husband and I live on the inside corner of Avocado and Woodland Avenue and we and our neighbors on both sides of State College are absolutely opposed to the Hines Project at Market Place. You've heard from most of us why - increased traffic, increased pollution, heavy density, inadequate parking, loss of daylight (the buildings are too tall), loss of privacy, an institutional rather than residential appearance, the need for a current EIR, etc. - but I would like to emphasize one particular issue that hasn't been mentioned much, and that is THE DEVALUATION OF PROPERTY VALUES.

We know for certain that these negative influences are in direct correlation with decreases in existing property values. In our last couple of refinancings there is a clause stating that due to our close proximity to the 57 Freeway and its associated noise and pollution, our property is devalued by 10%. Is that what we can all expect if the Hines Project is approved by the Planning Commission? Another devaluation? How much this time? 10%? 15%? More?

It has been rumored that if the Planning Commission approves the Hines Project tomorrow night that there is no recourse for the residents of Brea, and that there is no need for City Council approval. Somehow, I can't believe this is all true. The residents of Santa Monica successfully defeated a Hines Project for many of the same reasons, after it was approved by their Planning Commission, through a referendum.

There will be another standing-room-only crowd tomorrow evening at the Planning Commission meeting. It is our sincere desire, in the best interest of the future of our beautiful city, that good judgement will be exercised, and at the very least, the Hines Project at Market Place will be recommended for further study.

Most sincerely,
Jacquelyn and Robert Guss
303 Woodland Avenue
Brea, CA 92821
714-883-7093

Sent from my iPhone
Jacquelyn Guss

Hosozawa, Carrie

From: Teri SCHULTZ <spddmnss@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 9:11 AM
To: Hosozawa, Carrie
Subject: Fw: Development in Brea.

I had planned on reading this at the last commission meeting but it was mostly expressed by the many speakers that night, but did want to send this to your attention.

The development we are debating here today represents a scenario that is being contested throughout the developing world. The exponential growth of the population is a serious problem that no one appears to be ready or willing to address. The policy of growth mandated by the government which is said to be necessary to ensure a strong economy, in this case, needs to be reevaluated, taking in to consideration the exponential rate at which the population is increasing.

The city of Brea has been pursuing development at an alarming rate and has disregarded the negative impact it is having on quality of life of its current residents. This unchecked development is occurring everywhere, not just here in Brea. Development is not necessary at the same scale and frequency as it was 30 years ago. The old mentality of growth is archaic and even dangerous. It doesn't take in depth observations to see that the development in Southern California and throughout the world has reached a critical point and needs to be severely reduced or even suspended. Look at any freeway, highway or street, at any time of the day or night. The level of congestion speaks for itself. We have reached the maximum level of capacity that should logically be allowed.

When considering development we must also take into consideration the resources and infrastructure needed to support it. Electricity, water, sewage treatment and disposal, pollution, schools and traffic impacts are just a few of the more critical areas of concern. These areas are touched upon but never in a realistic and honest way. Let's be honest, our resources are being taxed to their limit. Our infrastructure is crumbling. Space for our kids in a classroom or just open space in general are disappearing at an alarming rate.

It is time for a change. Somewhere, at sometime, someone's going to have to say "enough is enough". Why not let it be right here, right now and let it be us who starts this new trend.

Brea is a progressive city. Why not set the example for the rest of the world. Why not use the knowledge and intelligence we have gained from the past to create a new way to approach responsible controlled development.

Currently Developers see any piece of open land as a piece of land that must be developed. Their only real consideration is money. There is never any meaningful thought as to the impacts it will have on the people who live and work in the effected areas. Take control of the land by any means and fill it with as many paying body's per square foot as possible. Their tactics for obtaining permission to develop are virtually always suspect and questionable. The results have for the most part always been the same. The developers win out. But not without the duplicity of the governing municipality's. We need to change that. We need to have the outcome be decided by the local residents and the only way for that to have a chance is with transparency

of the process, timely and thorough notification to the public and a unified organization of resistance to unwarranted and unwanted development. This is not happening here and appears to be the results of a standard tactical processes implemented by the developers. This is a process that fails to properly notify all of the local residents in a timely manner and usually supplies them with insufficient, inaccurate and misleading information about the projects real impacts.

Some evidence of this is the environmental impact report being used. It is not representative of the current time and did not originally include residential zoning considerations which completely changes the scope of the project. A new current comprehensive report is needed and should be demanded. The way in which they are trying to manipulate this outdated report is very possibly illegal. Why would they resurrect an EIR report 14 yrs old that never had 750 residential spaces packed in it. Why do they try to cover the fact that there is no room for the new residents vehicles with this so called "Shared parking proposal?"

Because they do not want the EIR to reflect the real facts which are, this project will definitely and severely impact the environment in a negative way and that there is no room for them to park, and if there is no room to park then there is no reason to build.

The EIR and parking issues are only two of many reasons, some of which have been voiced here, that validate the reasons for stopping this project and any further similar projects.

It is the maximum density residential buildings that are creating the real problems of over crowding. It is the maximum density residential property which was never part of the original EIR that is the reason they are trying to shoehorn into place a 14 year old modified EIR. I believe their suspicious strategy violates legal statutes and guidelines set forth in the procedural process of obtaining EIR's. I am certain it violates moral and ethical ones.

This project and its negative impacts are not right for the local residents. It not right for the people of Brea in general. You represent the residents of this city and are supposed to protect the the interests of it's people. Do the right thing and put a stop to this unwanted project.

Thank you.

David Schultz
920 Ethelinda Way
Brea, CA 92821

Hosozawa, Carrie

From: David SCHULTZ <96ssimpala@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 9:07 AM
To: Hosozawa, Carrie
Subject: [!Spam]Brea Place.

After attending the last two meetings discussing the potential Brea Place development I came away with a sense of astonishment at just how deceptive and untruthful the representatives of The Hines company were. A list of these deceptions follows.

First the issue of the amount of vehicles said to be added to reflect the new apartment complex tenants. It is likely to be from a low estimate of 750 to a more realistic number of 1000 to 1500. This does not include the retail owners, employees and customers which must add at least 100+ more cars. The hotel overflow the other retail from the mall and guests of the apartment tenants add even more. The statement from the Hines representative stating that there were from 100 to 300 "extra" parking spaces available is ridiculous. The shared parking structure said to be able to handle all overflow parking based on the mythical best case scenarios presented by Hines is underestimated by hundreds of cars. Hoping tenants will not have two or possibly more cars per unit is not realistic considering current realities such as the fact that currently most residences have many more occupants than they are designed for.

Second the presumption (by Hines) that adding from 750 to 1500+ vehicles into a traffic scenario, that is already at maximum capacity, will not only not negatively affect traffic but will reduce congestion by 25 to 50 percent by simply changing traffic light timing and squeezing in one or two turning lanes without widening the streets a flat out lie. Hines is making statements as if they are facts when in reality they are unfounded and mathematically impossible. Also the scenarios they are using as comparisons are nothing near the reality of this specific project and environment present today. Verify the revenue projections especially the property tax revenue as Orange County is a disproportionate county so how much would the City of Brea receive? Was the \$1.6M projection the total cost to the developer not what the City of Brea would see in their coffers to offset the increase to city services such as public safety including impacts to emergency services. Look at impacts to emergency responders with the added congestion, this project would put lives at stake do they have the resources to meet this increased demand. If you allow the introduction of that many vehicles into the already overburdened traffic situation we currently have it would be extremely irresponsible and detrimental to us all. Most importantly the impact which will most assuredly happen will be irreversible if you allow this project to proceed or proceed without severely reducing the residential spaces proposed. If you were to put single family homes on the same footprint as the apartment building the numbers equate like so. 750 units, 750 to 1500+ cars, 750 to 1500+ people. Or 10 to 15 +- single family homes, 20 to 30+ cars, 20 to 50+ people. A much more realistic and manageable scenario. Remember these factors, water, electricity, traffic, schools, pollution, impact in general on our infrastructure. The current proposed project is untenable and just wrong minded in every way.

Please think this proposal through carefully and logically. Consider the wants and needs of the residents of this city over the need for money of the developers and most importantly weigh the questionable statements made by Hines to confirm the truth or falsity of their assertions and act accordingly with regards to any false or misleading statements. You represent the people of Brea and are here to protect us and our interests. Do the moral and ethical "right thing". Thank you. Sincerely Teri and Dave Schultz. Long time Brea residents.
Sent from my iPhone