

PPCC Executive Committee MND Considerations

Factors Considered by the EC in Deciding to Act on an Emergency Basis

to Submit PPCC Comments on the Palisades Village Project MND

The Palisades Historical Society's request for postponement of a vote on Motion #2 at PPCC's February 25, 2016 meeting prevented the Board from voting on the motion prior to the City's deadline for submission of comments. Given the impossibility of a Board vote on the matter prior to the deadline and broad-based expression of community support for the project evident to the Executive Committee, the only course of action available to the Executive Committee to present the community's sentiment on the MND to the City was to take emergency action under Article V, Sec. 3(B) of PPCC's bylaws. The following factors were considered by the Executive Committee prior to taking action to authorize a letter in support of the City's adoption of the MND:

1. The vast majority of comments by Board members at our meetings and in communications with the EC have been positive.
2. The majority of comments by the public have been positive.
3. The negative comments by the public have been almost entirely with respect to considerations outside the scope of the MND. Examples: alcohol sales, nature of stores, design concerns, etc.
4. Many of the negative comments by the public that were within the scope of the MND were refuted on a factual basis or were addressed by promises or assertions of the applicant. For example the validity of the timing of traffic counts, parking by employees offsite, etc.
5. The negative comments within the scope of the MND that were potentially valid have been fully expressed to the City by those who have these concerns. Examples: issues about parking adequacy, traffic, etc. These considerations are part of the City record and were either considered by the City and rejected or will be considered by the City and addressed.
6. The majority of critical comments by the public have been accompanied by declarations of support for the project. This means that critics of certain aspects of the project nonetheless support the overall project and wish to see the development proceed. Key opponents have expressed support for the project in general.
7. Based upon statements of Board members expressed at meetings and in communications with the Executive Committee it appears that approximately 19 of 22 members of the Board eligible to vote support Motion #2 (86% of Board members, > 2/3).
8. Numerous Board members have communicated to the Chair and other EC members that they wish for the EC to take a position on behalf of the Community Council so that PPCC's voice will be heard on the MND issue.

9. Based upon conversations with our neighbors we have no reason to doubt CD-11's observation that approximately 90% of comments have been supportive of the project.

10. The MND is a technical document that does not assert that there will be no negative impacts, only that the impacts will be fully or partially mitigated to the extent that the result will be insignificant. Careful consideration of the issues by the VPLUC and its experts has concluded that the City's methodology was appropriate and its conclusions were warranted given the regulatory framework that applies to such projects.

11. Project critics acknowledge that the developer has engaged in productive dialogue with neighbors and taken many steps to address local concerns and the developer has pledged to continue to do so.

February 29, 2016