

On Saturday, August 2, 2014 5:36 PM, Broydo <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Jaime, Deborah, Nicole, members of the Planning Commission and all above.

A year ago a "Town of Los Altos Hills DRAFT CIRCULATION & SCENIC ROADWAYS ELEMENT 2013" was introduced and discussed, and the discussion was to be followed. However, now the goal posts were moved in the middle of the game by abandoning any reference to the above draft. So that all comments related to the above draft (mentioned in the attached documents) are of no use, since the text to which they refer is no longer mentioned. I am not aware of any discussion of the new text.

Therefore, below are my comments and proposals related to the new text. I ask that you read it and distribute to all relevant people before August 7.

Samuel Broydo

[REDACTED]
Los Altos Hills, Ca 94022

4 [REDACTED]

P.S. Jaime, thanks for keeping me informed.

On Friday, August 1, 2014 4:41 PM, Jaime McAvoy <jmcavoy@losaltoshills.ca.gov> wrote:

Greetings Commissioners and interested parties,

Please find attached the Agenda for the Los Altos Hills Planning Commission Meeting on Thursday August 7, 2014.

In addition, you will find supporting documents at the following link:

http://losaltoshills.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=3&event_id=46

Commissioner Packets will be available on the dais before close of day.

Regards,

Jaime L. McAvoy

Community Development Specialist
Town of Los Altos Hills
JMcAvoy@losaltoshills.ca.gov
650-941-7222

Jaime McAvoy

From: Broydo [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 02, 2014 5:57 PM
To: Broydo; Jaime McAvoy; jima.pc@gmail.com; jitze@couperus.org; jsmandle@hotmail.com; kavitat@comcast.net; richard.partridge@comcast.net; Debbie Pedro; Suzanne Avila; Deborah Padovan; Steve Padovan; Nicole Horvitz; Cynthia Richardson
Subject: Re: Agenda for August 7, 2014 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Sorry, I forgot to attach my input.
Here it is.

101

Comment: the word “safe” is not defined and exposes town to claims of things being unsafe.

Propose: replace “need to provide safe ways to move people” with “enable movement of people”.

104

Comment: the statement about what AB 1358 mandates is completely wrong. There are only two things that AB 1358 mandates are:

1. There has to be a discussion.
2. There has to be a plan.

There is nothing that is specifically mandated. Quite the opposite, it is emphasized repeatedly that the details and actions are completely up to the localities, as corresponding to their individual situation, needs and preferences.

The “complete streets” are not mandated, but only required to be kept in mind during the discussions. The degree to which this concept is applied, as far as specific actions are concerned, is completely in the hands of each local entity.

Bill AB 1358 is very general, it mentions public transportation, railways, military bases. It is attuned to the demands of the bicycle users in San Francisco, as represented by Leno, an Assemblyman from San Francisco. The Bill justifies the need for “complete streets”, first and foremost, to reduce the green gases emission by cars, by encouraging people to travel to work and shopping on bicycles. The Bill also mentions an added benefit of bicycling as recreational activity.

The only aspect of the transportation that applies to Los Altos Hills is transient recreational bicycling, and this is the only thing that is relevant and has to be discussed, since the only other relevant aspect, the pedestrians, is already addressed by the pathways plan.

The Bicycle traffic through Los Altos Hills is recreational and transient. We have to be patient and accommodating, but no action inconveniencing the town dwellers should be taken. No special bicycle lanes should be planned. No money should be wasted on this transient bicycle traffic.

Propose: completely rewrite 104, reflecting what 1358 really mandates, and with emphasis that it is completely up to our town to decide what to do, if anything

Goal 6

Comments: The word “safe” is not defined and should not be used. Bicycling and driving are not safe, and commitment by our town to make it safe is wrong. It exposes our town, in case of accidents or disputes, to claims of not fulfilling the promise of making things safe, whatever the interpretation of the word “safe” someone chooses to make.

It is not Town’s function to encourage bicycling. Once local bikeways are provided it is up to the families to use them. We certainly do not need to encourage more outside transit biking through out Town, to inconvenience the Town folks even more.

Propose the Goal 6 title to read: “Provide for well maintained local bikeways throughout the Town, with safety in mind”.

Propose Policy 6.1 to read: “Reduce conflicts between bicycle and automobile traffics, while avoiding an inconvenience to Town citizens.”

Propose: replace word “safe” in Policy 6.3 with “safety for”.

Comment: Such general talk in Policy 6.4 about discouraging traffic and constructing additional pathways is frivolous and imperial. We have to maintain a proper democratic society in town, not dominated by special interests.

Propose: eliminate Policy 6.4.

Comment: we have to, once and for all, stop talking about sharrows, which are suitable for San Francisco, but not for Los Altos Hills.

Propose: eliminate word “sharrows in Program 6.1 and eliminate Program 6.4

Goal 7.

Propose the title of Goal 7 to read “provide pedestrian routes in appropriate locations, with safety in mind.”

Propose : In policy 7.1 eliminate word “safe” and add “with safety in mind” at the end.

Propose: In program 7.4 eliminate words “safe and convenient”.