



AGENDA NO: CS-1, CS-2, CS-3, CS-4, CS-5, CS-6

MEETING DATE: February 14, 2023

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL FOR
PUBLIC REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

Dana Swanson

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED] >
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2023 3:55 PM
To: Carla Wixom; Laurel Barton; Jennifer Ford; Zara Landrum; Cyndee Edwards
Cc: Dana Swanson; Chris Neumeyer; Scott Collins; Scot Graham
Subject: closed session comments

CAUTION: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear City Council:

CS-1. It is difficult to tell from the too general description--Toro Lane--which part of the Lane is being referred to, and therefore, difficult to decide what comment to make.

Is this item related to the part of Toro Lane that is in front of the 9 houses next to the parking lot that are subject to the assessment district? The City maintains the landscaping for this part of the Lane, so we must already have an easement; maybe it is not wide enough?

OR

Is this item related to the part of Toro Lane that is in front of the house just south of the assessment district on the north side of No Name Creek? This homeowner was given permission in the early 2000s to build permanent structures on the City right of way, which was against code at the time and should not have been allowed.

OR

Is this item related to the part of Toro Lane that is in front of the 2 Frye houses just as you turn onto Toro Lane from Yerba Buena? I raised this as a potential problem when the Frye's got their permits. I don't know what the final decision was at the time, i.e. did the City trade some right of way for some of their property?

CS-2. It has been several years since this development was first proposed, i.e. that someone would build a convention center or large hotel on these lots at the behest of the City. Rather than negotiate terms and conditions at this time, it should be brought to a public discussion, i.e. goal setting time, to clarify if this still fits within the goals of the City Council and the community. It never fit within the goals of the community. In addition, the public should know what concessions and giveaways, i.e. the chessboard, parking, the City is considering in order to make this project happen.

CS-3 and CS-4. Did these leases go out to bid? If not, why not?

CS-5 and CS-6. Can I assume it will be disclosed to the public what steps the City Council is taking for both positions? I believe the process is fair game for public disclosure.

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz