



Public Comments
City Council Meeting
April 8, 2020

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 68.111.139.109

Email jenniferlop98@berkeley.edu

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 12

Subject READ OUT LOUD

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Jennifer Lopez

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 730 N Citrus Ave

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92027

Comments Good afternoon to all city council members and those viewing from home. I hope all are taking care of themselves during these uncertain and chaotic times. I am writing in regards to Agenda Item #12 : Annual Destruction of Police Records and Revision of Records Series Codes. In reading the agenda items and propositions from the city clerk's office, I have very valid concerns as a Escondido resident regarding transparency and accountability of the Police Department. This "destruction of police records" does not seem rational given the positionally of the police department as a state and city organization that is held to standards of honesty and trust with the community. I am opposed to the destruction of police records, but instead urge the City and the Clerk's office to find alternative ways of filing these very crucial documents that will make them accessible to the public with our destroying them. I suggest find alternative ways of organizing that would NOT dispose or "destroy" public records of the Escondido police department as it is crucial to the integrity of Escondido and the relationship within our community. In addition, I suggest finding more efficient ways in having these records available to the public instead of destroying them. I urge city council and Escondido administrators in addition to the City Clerk office to find efficient ways to keep these records existent and easily accessible. Please email me in regards to the progression of this Agenda item as I am very interested to know how the City Clerk's office, the Police Department, and City administrators are / will be responding to this very important issue regarding transparency, accountability, and the future relationships of our community and city officials.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=ea29bb35-ba8b-435c-9c5c-c5871c32ee79>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 104.177.112.58

Email aclausen07@hotmail.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # Agenda Item 13 - fee schedule

Subject Read Out Loud Homeowners fee in Old Esc Hist District

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Alexa Clausen

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 2030 Ridgecrest Place

City

State

Zip

Comments Dear Mayor McNamara and Council members: Thank you for your dedication to your offices of responsibility in this unprecedented trying times. It has come to my attention that this Council meeting will address applying fees to homeowners who are in the Old Escondido Historic District. I would like to oppose such action on the following basis: Why discourage homeowners at a time of National crisis and when there is also the threat of a morbid financial future? These fees will not benefit the City in any meaningful way, and possibly undermine the loyalty of local voters. Why apply fees to homeowners who are doing a great service to our City by purchasing historic properties? The City, Chamber of Commerce, developers and others very frequently use the Old neighborhood as a means to promote and to brand our City. Its calm and peaceful landscape entices people to visit and shop as seen in advertising, magazines and other media outlets. If this is an attempt to erode our well-known Historic District by intimidating this segment of our residential population, it is a long term planning mistake. Please consider the very recent observation of this business economist: ...so many urban places today seem vaguely the same—a blur of ...eateries and mid-rise “one plus five” apartment buildings (in which up to five stories of wood frame construction are built atop a concrete first floor). These buildings, which all look vaguely the same with their multi-shaded exterior panels that seem destined to date quickly, are now obligatory elements in densifying urban neighborhoods, as critics have observed... <https://www.citylab.com/perspective/2019/02/city-branding-traps-marketing-campaigns/582496/> Could this be Escondido? No past and no identity to brand ourselves as a special City. Respectfully submitted, Alexa Clausen

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=420d71bd-cfd2-4f42-98bc-19a702008930>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 68.8.249.110

Email bethsbooks@sbcglobal.net

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject READ OUT LOUD

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Beth Jochims

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 129 E. 6th Ave.

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments Finding the money and methods to keep up an historic home is already challenging. Please do not make it even harder and more expensive to keep our homes looking good by charging these fees.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=4afa7630-3532-45c7-a82f-4fb95de42b03>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 104.177.113.41

Email carolrea@aol.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Adoption of...User Fees

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Carol Rea

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 420 E. 7th Ave.

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments Honorable Mayor and Council Members - I understand that the city is financially troubled and it's only getting worse, BUT charging historic homeowners \$54 - \$244 for a Certificate of Appropriateness in order to maintain their houses is just wrong. The Certificate of Appropriateness is intended to make certain that what we do to the exteriors of our historic homes maintains the historic integrity of the neighborhood and charging for them is counterproductive. I'm not sure how it would work, but homeowners should be fined for NOT getting the Certificates, instead of having to pay to abide by the ordinance. Charging a fee to place a home on the Local Historical Register also threatens Escondido's Historic Preservation Program and historic properties. Years ago, when the program was instituted, incentives to historic ownership were created that made the investment in a historic home a valued one. One of the incentives was that, if a property owner applied for and qualified to be on the Local Register, the city would provide a bronze plaque – many can be seen as you drive through Old Escondido. Along with most of the other incentives, the bronze plaques are no longer provided. Homeowners who want to show their pride in their historic homes now pay for the plaques themselves – and now the city is looking at charging them for the application, as well? That's wrong and the excessive \$1,216.90 for full cost recovery will likely discourage property owners from placing their homes on the register. While the property tax savings provided by a Mills Act contract can offset the cost of application over the years, having to come up with \$1,479 when dealing with the expenses faced while restoring a home can make it impossible to afford. Shortly after moving into their home, my neighbors had to pay tens of thousands of dollars digging up their backyard to try to find a sewer connection that had mysteriously disappeared at some point in its 100-year history. The Mills Act is intended to offset the costs of restoring and maintaining a historic home, not create additional expenses for homeowners. The benefit to the city is a contract with the homeowner that includes at least ten maintenance items that are to be taken care of over the years and the tax savings are intended to defray their expense in addition to ensuring that the work is done. In order for the community and future generations to have an opportunity to see these significant pieces of Escondido history means that we

can all share in the investment by absorbing the costs to administer them. Please do not allow these fees to be enacted.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=fab3268b-d717-4931-9704-44e26dc8a4e2>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 72.214.61.98

Email cbrooksfcc@gmail.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # R2020-29

Subject Adoption of Proposed Adjustments to City User Fees

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Clayton Brooks

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 2295 Meyers Ave

City Escondido

State California

Zip 92029

Comments While I agree the City needs to subsidize development projects and the methodology behind the Fee Study is sound, I am not confident that the indirect overhead percentages outlined in the Cost Allocation Plan will accurately reflect the support costs outlined in the study. Federal and local economies are currently in a state of flux. To quote the study, "Since the primary factor for the cost of a City's services is usually the costs of the personnel involved, tying an inflationary factor that connects more directly to the personnel costs can be suitable if there is a clear method, or current practice of obtaining said factor." Given the changes in office personal over the last month since the study was conducted, I would posit that, at the moment, there is no objective method for determining the projected cost of support costs going forward in a COVID-19 influenced environment. It does not make sense to increase user fees based on personnel metrics that will be wildly different going forward. Put another way, should the City make any changes to it's staffing in response to the pandemic, can these fee increases be expected to accurately reflect the support costs? I have no qualms about the way in which these fees are calculated, but if the GDP (or any inflationary factor for that matter) changes significantly, how viable is the data collected from this study?

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=95142ce9-5e3b-4c45-a6c7-5cf1825fc475>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 162.226.146.109

Email daleharshman@hotmail.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Read Out Loud

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Dale Harshman

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 831 S Broadway

City Escondido

State California

Zip 92025

Comments The proposed fees for historic preservation in Old Escondido are simply exorbitant. This is the oldest neighborhood in all of North County San Diego. The city has a unique neighborhood that is worthy of keeping its charming historical qualities. This is easily evidenced by the large crowds that come from far beyond Escondido to the annual Mother's Day tour of the interesting historical homes. Granting Mills Act and Historic Register status to these precious and proud homes only helps Escondido and this important central neighborhood. By the way, the neighborhood is designated CDBG -- homeowners here are certainly not the financially elite of Escondido; rather, we simply love the neighborhood and want to maintain its historical charms. Charging \$2700 to assist homeowners in maintaining their homes to the historical standards does not have a positive return on investment for the city of Escondido. Please think long term.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=c68129ff-52b1-44c2-a8d8-48a3242185bb>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 104.177.113.63

Email afghandoug@yahoo.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Read Outloud

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Douglas Collier

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 638 S. Juniper Street

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments My wife and I have owned the Old Bandy House for 25 years. We have spent that time restoring this old beauty and making it our family home. All the mechanicals (electrical, plumbing, etc.) have been replaced and modernized. Those items are not the main costs to this home. Keeping the integrity of the historic nature of this home is the expense. Nothing is purchased at the "big box" store. Lumber dimensions have changed since 1891. Grade of lumber has changed. Everything we have restored has to be milled, to include all the detail work. Nothing is on the shelf at the local home improvement store. Being a wood structure, this home needs constant care, maintenance and repairs. The proposed additional costs to maintain these homes would create only negative out comes to the Historic District, the "Jewel" of the City. 1. Homeowners would simply not comply. Example: We just had our home painted at a cost of \$20,000.00. After paying that I think it is ridiculous that I would have to pay a fee to the City to maintain that investment. 2. Repairs and maintenance just will not be done., Thus, the decline of the aesthetics to the district. The fees, just another word for taxes, are just plainly getting out of control. I just recently inquired about getting a variance for building a garage. I was advised that just to have it reviewed would be about \$4,000.00. Just to be reviewed with no guarantees of approval. That is nearly 25% of the cost for the build. I can't afford the fee, so no garage is in the future for this house, therefore cars will continue to be parked on the street. Once the word gets out that the Historical District requires all these extra "fees" just to maintain a home, the City's Jewel will fail and fall into disrepair. It is as simple as the old Police theory, "The Broken Window".

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=e690c65f-3264-4c7b-9944-4ac5a9043b75>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 76.216.172.217

Email ishcow@yahoo.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject READ ALOUD HISTORIC REGISTER APPLICATION FEES

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Errol

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 2630 LAS PALMAS AVE

City ESCONDIDO

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments Although I am a retired planning professor who taught development and a preservation and a commissioner of the city's historic properties, I am writing this as an individual concerned citizen. I view proposed new fees for city historic register applications as an ill advised disincentive to preserve our city's historic heritage. Most apply for this to gain benefits in support of preserving the original historic real estate provided by the Mills Act. Confirming this status is discretionary by the city. To post a large fee without even knowing if the Mills Act support will be available to the property owner is a gamble. The intent of the Mills Act was to preserve California's dwindling heritage which is being swallowed by in fill redevelopment. I advise that you do not tax efforts to preserve our heritage by imposing a substantial financial barrier to accessing the property owners support available in the Mills Act. The application fee runs contrary to this intent. Should you disagree and feel that city cost must be extracted for this purpose please consider a fee that is paid to city treasury over a number of years by property owners that are successful in qualifying for the city conferred status. Respectfully, Errol Cowan, PhD

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=43f30103-e0c7-41ee-884e-afe753c11cbe>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 107.223.10.95

Email frank.miller2010@hotmail.com

Council Meeting Date April 8, 2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Read out loud

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Frank Miller

Escondido Resident False

Street Address 605 East 5th Avenue

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments I am a fixed-low-income senior and the proud owner of a 1941 Mediterranean Revival house in Old Escondido. I oppose the very large proposed fees for CoAs, Mills Act and local registration as being counter-productive: this is not a wealthy neighborhood, and such huge fees punish residents who are already struggling to keep the neighborhood viable. These immense fees are particularly inappropriate because of the pandemic and economic struggles that Old Escondido property owners now face. If Old Escondido slips into neglect and decay with plunging property values--which it could because of bureaucratic dis-incentives--it will be a huge tax loss for the city and will aggravate the statewide housing shortage. Thank you for considering my concerns.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=3cb596ed-2f29-49c2-b383-ddc62c48c7bf>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 161.209.96.1

Email jbritton@sdge.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Adoption of Proposed Changes to City User Fees

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Joe Britton

Escondido Resident False

Street Address

City

State

Zip

Comments I am writing on behalf of San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) to protest a fee increase proposed in conjunction with the adoption of Item 13 on the Escondido City Council meeting agenda for 4/8/20. Adopting the increase for Encroachment Permit – TCP Review and Inspection as proposed would result in a significant increase in permit costs for critical work to ensure SDG&E continues to deliver safe and reliable energy to the residents of Escondido. Last year, SDG&E pulled about 320 permits from the City of Escondido. The proposed fee increase will lead to about a 60% jump in our permit costs in the City of Escondido based on 2019 volume. These are costs that will unfairly burden ratepayers at a time when they can least afford it and will have a direct negative impact on other businesses with planned projects in the City. Increasing the fee could also negatively impact future 20A undergrounding projects. I respectfully request reconsidering the rate structure to make it more equitable for utilities and businesses working to improve infrastructure in the City of Escondido. Thank you.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=472c7228-5a75-4455-af0b-7932d4ce7931>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 68.111.207.24

Email tracibass@coldwellbanker.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Read Out Load

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Traci Bass

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 608 S Grape St

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments I have lived in the Old Esc Historic District for the last 9 years, and I have found that this little neighborhood is really a very close community. Proud of what we stand for, old fashioned, clean, safe, nice neighborhood. One of the ways we are able to keep our neighborhood looking good and holding its value is my having the Historic portion of homes within the boundaries. We encourage home owners to register their homes and to apply for the Mills Act. It is a bit of a pain to do this but it has its benefits. It will be a hard sell to ask a new person coming into the neighborhood to plunk out \$4000 to have their home listed on the register and get it on the Mills Act. Without the additional properties coming on to the register the area will start to lose its charm and home values. Please don't start charging for procedures that we have always had for free. The city employees get a good salary, benefits and retirement plan for the work they perform in doing these tasks. Thank you for voting NO on 13.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=41272d78-c637-41f5-b077-519a3bc04a14>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 162.201.149.116

Email kevin@clutternomore.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # Unknown

Subject Fees to be charged to residents of OEHD for exterior repairs

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Kevin & Lynn Hall

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 1821 Seco Glen

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92026

Comments We are NOT in favor of the proposed increase of charges to do any exterior work on homes in the Old Escondido Historic District. We are a past resident for over 5 years of the district and OEHD Board, serving for 3 years, It has been apparent that the district has been treated like a step-child to include the area east of Juniper on Grand Ave. Please do not add an additional burden to the residents of the Historic District. Thank you for your time.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=efd3316d-59ca-474a-bf0f-835626e28b79>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 173.114.246.143

Email kevinemclin@gmail.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject READ OUT LOUD

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Kevin McLin

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 622 S Maple

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments Council Members, When my wife and I purchased our home in the historic district just a couple years ago it was due to the historic district nature. The attraction to us was to restore one of the distressed homes. We were willing to make this commitment and take on a distressed property as the city has made the commitment to the public by offering permits and the additional ability to file for the mills act. The supportive nature is what lead to the decision to take on this challenge. A significant change in the permit process would represent a major change to the effort to restore and preserve the historic district. I implore you to not charge us to maintain our home and to restore these one of a kind homes throughout this unique community. As we become more familiar with our neighbors we have met other young couples within the community that share the same views. I hope that the council will continue to support the ongoing restoration and improvement of this unique part of the town.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=c2da8c36-57d7-4516-a1db-99414a6aa5f5>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 173.114.246.143

Email mclinlaura@gmail.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Read Aloud

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Laura McLin

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 622 South Maple Street

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments Good evening Council members, My name is Laura McLin and I am a resident of Escondido's downtown historic district. In fact, I have lived in Escondido all of my life. Growing up, my family would regularly drive through the quaint and cozy historic homes to visit my grandparents who resided on the corner of 13th and Juniper. It never failed that we would comment with awe or a longing to know the joy of purchasing, restoring, and living life in a one-of-a-kind home such as those found in the historic district. As an adult, I am overjoyed to say that one of these rare gems is my own. It has been my passion to bring life back into my beautiful Spanish-inspired home and rejuvenate the neighborhood, sentiments that are shared by both myself and my surrounding friends and neighbors. The adoption of a proposed change to City user fees, Item 13, will place a considerable strain on the historic districts' homeowner community to make any vision a reality. Increased or new fees will undoubtedly cause many in the community to halt or cancel restorative plans. I urge the Council to vote in opposition of Item 13 and bring these truly unique homes back to their former glory.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=2b88765b-28dd-45e9-bfd6-3eaa6863c7e5>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 68.111.211.131

Email lisaarc@gmail.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject READ OUT LOUD

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Lisa Arcularius Walker

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 115 E 6th Ave

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments I am the current President of the Old Escondido Historic District and have sat on the board since 2016. Since 2010, I have been a homeowner of a 1922 California bungalow that I share with my young family of 4. We love our home, our street, and neighbors. We are very much DIYers. One, because we like that type of work, but two, because our very limited budget calls for it. Despite not having a Mills Act designation, we save what we can to make needed repairs and upkeep so that our home can maintain it's good shape. Sure, our neighborhood has some grand homes, but the vast majority are very modest. Please keep in mind the reasons why the Old Escondido neighborhood qualifies for CDBG funding. We are a low to moderate income area. Imposing additional fees on top of projects that are already a stretch to complete will only hinder the efforts to save our heritage... Escondido heritage. I know this must be important to the city since you, and other local organizations, use images from our neighborhood to promote the city. I believe this is the third time that fees have been brought up for these applications, at least for certificates of appropriateness. However, the reasons against fees remain the same. So, why is this up for consideration yet again? It is in the city's best interest to help us promote preservation of the Old Escondido Historic District. Help, don't deter, our residents with already limited budgets keep up their homes. Please vote to keep certificates of appropriateness fee free and go back to the drawing board for Mills Act fees; they are far too high.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=580f1099-13e0-45c3-ac4a-16832088fb04>

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 68.7.158.213

Email Hanlonmarion1@gmail.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Fees for Mills Act

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Marion Hanlon

Escondido Resident False

Street Address 603 E 5th Ave

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments It is hard enough for members of this community to save up for repairs and upkeep on their wonderful historic home. I believe it would be a disservice to our community by providing a detriment and making it more burdensome on the home owner to keep their homes beautiful. Please remember this neighborhood is a cherished asset to Escondido in general. It has been a showcase for Escondido for years. Council members please reconsider your position and vote to oppose all of these fees on the home owners of Old Escondido. Please read my comments aloud. Thank you Marion Hanlon

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=07f2200d-846f-4eb5-807c-0bb35aef032f>

Hello Everyone,

I hope you're finding an up side to this time when we're all confined.

Regarding item 13: It's my understanding that the OE Certificate of Appropriateness is considered a 'user fee', and that you're considering raising it significantly.

Since city's raise fees to bring in more revenue, I think in this case it would be self defeating.

---1-This certificate is required proof of permission for OE residents to proceed with required/needed maintenance on the exterior of their homes. We all know why this is required. BUT, it's also already hard to get compliance.

---2-Higher fees will reduce compliance and result in less maintenance being done.

---3-Less maintenance results in a less appealing neighborhood, and lower property values.

---4-Lower property values mean lower property tax revenue.

---5-Neglected property near town reflects a low level of healthy pride a city takes in its quality of life, including the quality of its 'main street' cafés and retail shops...resulting in fewer visitors...less revenue.

In other words, poorly maintained properties negatively effect the WHOLE town.

SO.....

INSTEAD of asking more of those who want to make the effort and put out the cost to take responsible care of their homes, thus supporting the whole community, the whole town financially, ----Why not give the significant fees to LANDLORDS who own property in Escondido and NEGLECT it to the point of shabbiness?

Their apparently indifferent neglect also invites drug trafficking and worse into otherwise great neighborhoods....even in OE, two doors down Hickory from me! Even on Fig St @4 blocks away. Landlords who allow such neglect are a hidden cost to the WHOLE town.

There are many.

Their neglect brings property values and tax revenue down. It also adds to the dangers and demands placed on our police force.

----It's time to hold these land lords accountable and require THEM to share the cost of their neglect, rather than charge higher fees to those who want to do their part.

---In the case of OE specifically, the city could also consider fining those who simply ignore the appropriate ways to handle property maintenance in that neighborhood.

Thank you!!

Sincerely,

Sharon Sanders

Sent from my iPhone

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 68.111.207.24

Email tracibass@coldwellbanker.com

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 13

Subject Read Out Load

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Traci Bass

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 608 S Grape St

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92025

Comments I have lived in the Old Esc Historic District for the last 9 years, and I have found that this little neighborhood is really a very close community. Proud of what we stand for, old fashioned, clean, safe, nice neighborhood. One of the ways we are able to keep our neighborhood looking good and holding its value is my having the Historic portion of homes within the boundaries. We encourage home owners to register their homes and to apply for the Mills Act. It is a bit of a pain to do this but it has its benefits. It will be a hard sell to ask a new person coming into the neighborhood to plunk out \$4000 to have their home listed on the register and get it on the Mills Act. Without the additional properties coming on to the register the area will start to lose its charm and home values. Please don't start charging for procedures that we have always had for free. The city employees get a good salary, benefits and retirement plan for the work they perform in doing these tasks. Thank you for voting NO on 13.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=41272d78-c637-41f5-b077-519a3bc04a14>

Just sending a note that I think we should be doing some serious relief for residents on foreclosures/evictions during COVID-19. I'm strongly in favor of doing something at least as good as San Marcos did. I know the state is giving some relief, but we want this town to come out of this whole, not with half our people on the streets.

Thanks,

Cassie

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 68.111.139.109

Email jenniferlop98@berkeley.edu

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 17

Subject READ OUT LOUD

Position In Favor

First and Last Name Jennifer Lopez

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 730 N Citrus Ave

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92027

Comments Good afternoon to all city council members and those viewing from home. I hope everyone is taking care of themselves and their loved ones during this uncertain and tumultuous times. I am writing in support of the eviction moratorium in compliance with the Governor's decision in addition to other cities in our county. COVID-19, a global epidemic that has affected everyone deserves to be taken very seriously for our collective wellbeing. There is no business as usual and we have to be mindful of the very real impacts people in our community are facing. Many Escondido residents have lost their jobs and sources of income, creating financial burdens that they may have already been facing. Some Escondido residents do not qualify for state benefits or resources therefore it is extremely crucial for the Escondido local government to comply with the eviction moratorium and find alternative ways in supporting all Escondido community. In addition to passing the eviction moratorium, how will you all communicate to all residents that this is an option, thinking about non-English speaking community members who are most affected? Although an eviction moratorium is a step in the right direction, I urge the Escondido city council and mayor to find more ways to support the local community in these trying times. What is the Escondido local government and administrators doing to support their residents? How can local funds and budgets be altered to respond to the urgent and immediate need of community members?

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=ba321693-2770-450c-b611-edf797a55913>

Joanne Tenney

joannetenney@hotmail.com

I'm writing to ask the city council to consider eviction, foreclosure, mortgage and rent relief during the COVID 19 crisis.

FROM: Craig Benedetto – NAIOP San Diego

Michael McSweeney – BIA San Diego

RE: April 8, 2020 Public Hearing - Temporary Eviction Moratorium Ordinance

On behalf of NAIOP San Diego, the commercial real estate development association, the Building Industry Association of San Diego and the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Diego, we'd like to offer the following comments to augment our earlier written correspondence.

We appreciate the concerns of tenants, and the desire to protect those most directly impacted by this crisis. The key is to make sure that the economic situation isn't compounded by ordinances that might have good intentions but make the situation worse.

Please remember, this is a system, where rent is paid to cover debt, service contracts AND taxes. Without rent, the system can fail.

Commercial property owners aren't looking to evict tenants in normal times. They are certainly not doing so now. And, in fact, can't. Yesterday, the California Judicial Council announced all civil actions, including unlawful detainer actions will be suspended for 90 days following the end of the health crisis. So, taken in conjunction with the Governor's orders on residential, local action isn't necessary.

That said, if the Council decides to move forward, we believe the draft ordinance contains some provisions which are potentially injurious to commercial property owners and would respectfully request amendment.

First, the provision to notify property owners for up to 10 days after rent is due is too long and creates a significant communication gap for property owners to make both accommodations to the tenant, as well as address their payments to vendors, like security and sanitation workers, as well as lenders, where loan payments are due.

The staff report notes that the Governor's announcement regarding bank loans helps property owners. While helpful, the "deal" does not cover all banks, and, most importantly, did NOT cover commercial loans. As a result, property owners are being asked to shoulder the disproportionate share of the burden.

In short, we believe accommodation for the front-end notification can be made due to the date of this hearing, and the retroactive nature of this resolution, but to make it consistent with virtually all local ordinances adopted to date, we'd recommend that notification be required to be made before or on the date rent is due and no later.

Second, similarly, the allowance for up to 10 days to provide proof of hardship is too long for property owners to address their obligations for payments due to their vendors and lenders. Most other jurisdictions are requiring 1 week. We'd recommend no more than 1 week or 7 days to provide this information rather than 10 days, as proposed.

Third, there is no reference to payment of rent due if the tenant decides to move out. Most other jurisdictions refer to this and we'd recommend this ordinance be amended to include language to that says all rent is due when the tenant moves out so it is clear that move out does not remove the obligation to pay rent that was due.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

Craig Benedetto

NAIOP San Diego

craigb@calstrat.com

M: (619) 980-8032.

Michael McSweeney

BIA San Diego

mmcsweeney@biasandiego.org

M: (619) 884-5354

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/agenda-position.aspx>

From IP Address: 76.27.44.244

Email civics@robroy.cc

Council Meeting Date 4/8/2020

Agenda # 17

Subject Local Emergency Proclamation

Position In Favor

First and Last Name Robroy Fawcett

Escondido Resident True

Street Address 1576 Katella Way

City Escondido

State CA

Zip 92027

Comments On March 17th, a day after the City Manager signed a local emergency proclamation due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the City noticed a 45-day CEQA comment and review period running from March 20th to May 5th for redeveloping the Palomar Medical Center Downtown Campus, which project would include tearing down the currently operating hospital located on the campus. Local and regional libraries are currently closed, and the public does not have access to technical and legal resources for preparing comments. I request that the currently running CEQA period be terminated, and notice for a new 45-day period be given at a future date after the declared emergency ends.

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=134a6cbb-401f-476d-9b86-6ffd409ae1e8>