

OAK PARK RAC Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 12, 2008 – 6:30PM

Oak Park Community Center, Meeting Room A
3524 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard

Call to Order – 6:30 p.m.

Roll Call: Present: Davis; Lackey; Johnson; Kivel; Meng; Taylor; Thomas;
Absent: Mercado

Discussion / Action Reports

Staff reports include oral presentations and those recommending receive and file.

1. Approval of Minutes for February 13, 2008

Motion: James Taylor/2nd Rose Thomas – The minutes of the 2/13/2008 meeting were approved without comments.

2. Quality of Life Project

Review and comment presented by Matt Hertel, Associate Planner SHRA and Kris Wimberly, Area 3 Neighborhood Resource Coordinator. The list of Quality of Life projects were presented with a map with locations identified and the proposed projects noted on the map. Kris W. explained the identified projects. The request for allocation of an additional \$60,000 of Oak Park tax exempt bond funds to the program would be used for additional project areas included. Kris explained that although there were several line item projects not included, the list of eligible projects submitted would exceed the originally allocated amount. Questions from the RAC Board members and public followed: Kivel: RE Curb cuts /ADA – are there other funds available for this; if so can it be leveraged in the future: M Hertel responded that the City Department of Transportation has certain criteria to meet their ADA compliance requirements and would research the process. M Meng asked who would gain property when an alley abatement project was completed: Kris W. explained that it varied with regard to the method of the survey of the properties and would be looked at individually. M Meng asked if the requests for projects were broken down by area; Kris indicated that it was a case by case review and not specific to area. R Thomas asked to be included in the record that she believed that the QOL projects were stated to be in the south O.P. area. A request from C. Mc Keithern was asked to know if the original QOL action was recorded and if so, she would like to hear the original recording. Also commented that the QOL “grant” was supposed to go to South Oak Park – and she’s been saying this until she was blue in the face – she wants to hear the tapes to see what we said and feels it should all go to south O.P. and as it is south O.P. is getting a small bit. 30 years of not getting anything - has been providing support for (speed) bumps but nothing seems to be getting done. Also no traffic control – signs was requested by only got painted speed limits on the streets – feels under represented with regard to south O.P. improvements. Staff indicated that they would verify if the RAC/PAC meetings were recorded and if they were archived or not. R.Emslie commented that he felt that 43% is going to ADA and not quality of life; feels that curb-cuts should be done by the City. MOTION: T JOHNSON / 2ND M LACKEY to approve additional funding with amendment of this recommendation to include the need to address the south O.P. issues. Role call: In Favor: Davis, Lackey, Johnson, Kivel, Meng, Taylor; Opposed: Thomas (Reason – None)

3. Donner Field Development

Rachel Iskow, E.D. of SMHA presented the project proposed for the Donner School Field. Staff recommended approval of the Donner Field Development project which includes the development of 20 single family homes and the disposition of the Redevelopment Agency of Sacramento land.

Questions and comments were fielded by the E.D. ; J Taylor – if you own one can you hand it down; Yes it's a land lease; M Meng asked what the contingency plan was if they don't sell – The E.D. indicated that they were confident that they would sell – even if it required adjustment in the selling price. J. Taylor has the land trust existed in the past and worked before: the response was not in this area, but around the country. R. Emslie commented that the project does not make economic sense – 1.4 million for the project is excessive. C. McKeithern commented in other places, why would you buy a home on land that you don't own – what are you going to do with these when they are done? It doesn't make sense. Mark Rentz commented on the economics of the project – consider that viability of the project when wells Fargo has committed to the project – and they have the responsibility to do their due-diligence. C. McKeithern commented that the deal should not be like the Regents Development deal and we should require a deposit. Christine indicated that the land will not transfer until construction permits are in place.

4. 36th Street Rezone, P07-089

Review and Comment. Presented by: Matt Hertel, Associate Planner, SHRA. Questions and Comments were: M Meng – does this fit the design review for the area? Yes R. Emslie commented that the builder was checking out the meetings but he isn't here tonight. Check out Temple and 34th Street – it looks bad – designed of a cube – sucks. C McKeithern has the same argument (as Emslie) and to have too many houses on a lot – it doesn't make sense to do this on a small lot – this needs to stop (in the neighborhood).

5. MLK Shell Addition & Alcohol Sales SP, P08-025

Review and Comment. Presented by Matt Hertel, Associate Planner, SHRA Comments and questions: R. Thomas was concerned with the alcohol sales and their license. T. Johnson asked what the quantity of calls were at this location. Kris W. indicated that the location was in compliance and that the usual conditions are going to be placed on the license. R. Emslie commented that ABC department should be held accountable. C. McKeithern commented – if they are selling already we should not allow them to expand the building and increase the volume of liquor any more. S. Ballestero commented that he was concerned that the Shell would stop selling gas.

6. Redevelopment Updates for the Sacramento Oak Park Redevelopment Area

Presented by Matt Hertel, Associate Planner, and Celia Yniguez, Redevelopment Manager, SHRA and the Chair person discussed the ground rules / protocol on agenda presentation and response. The discussion for next month will center on respect toward one another at the meeting for both the public and board members and to set example for the new members. Comments by C. McKeithern commented how many new people are coming on – Response out of 7 openings there were 10 under consideration.

7. Public Comments - Matters Not on the Agenda LR. Roberts submitted a request to speak on the subject of SHRA funding certain business – as welfare for the rich. She had 3 examples of this CADA – teardown and build up; SHRA; IMAX subsidy – The money for the Broadway property to St. Hope – does not support that as they are going to have a non-union occupant (Fresh n Easy).

8. Committee Comments-Ideas, Questions, and Announcements
none

Adjournment – Motion by R. Thomas; Seconded by J Taylor