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Heather Fargo
Location:  
Submitted At:  3:59pm 04-23-20

Under the I-5 Citation project please add improvements to the fence that is constantly being cut by homeless who camp behind the homes that back up to the soundwall. A road alone won't reduce this problem. (visible from W. El Camino at I-5 off ramp). thank you
Annette Emery
Location:  
Submitted At: 6:42pm 04-23-20

Planning by its very nature, takes time to complete. With this time of staying indoors, it is difficult to focus on planning going out in the wider neighborhood. I live in a neighborhood (River Gardens between Garden Highway and West El Camino) that has seen a flurry of new houses go up. I realize that housing is needed but none of the houses reflect the character of the neighborhood. Also, all are selling for more than $350,000 and many are inhabited by more than one family due to the cost. I would appreciate putting off changes to the Planning Entitlement Process until the neighbors have a chance to get together and look at the effect of the Planning Process on our and surrounding neighborhoods. Thank you.

Heather Fargo
Location:  
Submitted At: 3:50pm 04-23-20

I strongly urge the Planning and Design Commission to defer a decision on this item until a time when the public can participate actively in the meeting. This is a major change to how the citizens of Sacramento have helped to plan their city. This new process would be a big loss of input and influence by Sacramento residents and their elected city council members on development in their districts and city wide. Streamlining of planning decisions should not be done by excluding public participation. thank you. Heather Fargo

Jackie Whitelam
Location:  
Submitted At: 11:43pm 04-22-20

Jackie Whitelam
Location:  
Submitted At: 8:44pm 04-07-20

I know this action is the culmination of a thorough process that has sought to ensure multiple public policy goals are met. With clear design guidelines in place, I am generally comfortable with the delegation of hearings to the staff and Director levels. However, I suggest that the skills we are all developing in participating in on-line meetings be used to make the Directors meetings more accessible to the public and; that an on-going process to monitor and report compliance with design guidelines be effected.

Deborah Condon
Location:  
Submitted At: 5:13pm 04-22-20

I support the streamlining. Sacramento needs to meet its State target for infill and housing construction. We are in both a climate and housing crisis. Streamlining is more necessary than ever as we as a City come out of the COVID19 pandemic and need to restart and build quickly to jump start the economy. The streamlining proposal provides public access through opened hearings. It includes enhanced notification and an appeal process. Many of the processes were proven to work in Portland. Lets go forward with an improved and expedient permitting process.
Many of these comments of opposition are well intentioned, but nevertheless misinformed. If you read through the staff report, this streamlining effort is removing burdensome red tape that is preventing many projects that are good for the city from getting built due to a few loud voices in the community. If you read the staff report, it clearly states that the affected planning project types will still be heard at a public hearing, though smaller, members of the public are still allowed to comment and influence the project. Projects can always be appealed to planning commission if necessary. Not only are we in a housing crisis, but we may be slipping into a period of economic recession as a result of this COVID crisis, so this streamlining effort is essential for Sacramento’s resiliency and economic growth.

Do not approve this anti-democratic ordinance, or you will be removed from office democratically!

It seems incredibly dangerous to remove or reduce the public oversight and impetus on Sacramento’s development projects. The reduction of public participation, and the inequitable access of ability to respond when citizens have concerns for a project is not how you build a "world class city" it’s the makings for building a "playground for the rich". We want our voices to easily be heard.

I am opposed to any streamlining of the planning process. Without proper transparency this would not be a democratic process. Many district 2 neighborhoods may not have internet access or know about e comments. I urge you to hold this item until more constituents can access and participate in this matter. I urge the alcohol portion should not be in the streamlining process it should stay with the planning commission.

No streamlining the planning process! Let the voices be heard.

Absolutely oppose this!! This should not be on this agenda at this time. Our democratic process is still in place and deserves public scrutiny.

“Streamlining” must not mean removal from public scrutiny. This will remove public comment and disallow the democratic process by withholding information from the general public.

Please consider holding this item until more neighbors can participate in the discussion. Many district 2 and other area neighbors do not have sufficient internet access and may not even know about the e-comment ability. I would also request that the alcohol portion be removed from this streamlining process and that all approvals
remain at the planning commission level. Thank you