

## **PVP Watch Newsletter – October 31, 2009**

### **November 3rd is Election Day.**

If history repeats itself, only 30% of Peninsula residents will vote.

That 70% don't vote is why we suffer the consequences of "Special Interest" government.

It seems some RPV Councilmen are in full panic mode. Apparently they have awakened to the reality that their favored replacement candidates, Jeff Lewis and Paul Tetreault, have apparently encountered a serious lack of voter acceptance to their campaign efforts. PVP Watch sees a number of reasons for voter apathy of Lewis and Tetreault as well as the third Planning Commissioner Knight.

That some Councilmen have not only endorsed these candidates -- but have been active in their campaigns thus signaling their preferences -- has not set well with many RPV voters. PVP Watch has observed a desire for real change rather than more of the same.

#### **Lewis, Knight and Tetreault and McMansions**

A breaking issue is the voting records of the three Planning Commissioners / Council candidates, Jeff Lewis, Paul Tetreault and Jim Knight. While all three candidates have claimed that they are against "McMansions" during the campaign, what has surfaced in the past day or so concerns a building project proposed by RPV developer Dana Ireland on Nantasket Drive adjacent to Terra-nea. Briefly readers will find that developer Ireland in 2007 wanted to build 5 residential properties on a 1.42 acre property with proposed square footage averaging 6,700 / 6,800 each. At its April 24th, 2007 meeting the Planning Commission (Item #5) approved the lot split and told Ireland he could build two homes, each nearly seven thousand square feet, on the first two of the five tiny lots. With respect to the other three homes, they indicated he needed to lower the height but signaled that houses in the 6700 square foot range would be acceptable for the other three lots. With minor adjustments to the heights, Ireland went before the City Council (May 15, 2007) with five almost seven thousand square foot homes for his acre and a half of property. The City Council soundly rejected the Planning Commission's approval of the project and sent Ireland back to the Planning Commission

While Lewis, Tetreault and Knight report they did not vote in favor of the Nantasket Drive project, City Hall records (posted below) indicate that they did vote affirmatively for the project. PVP Watch has posted five documents at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / Current Issues page.

\* A well written article written by Ashley Ratcliff in the May 17, 2007 edition of the PV News provides an excellent summary of the situation.

\* RPV Council minutes for May 15, 2007

- \* RPV Planning Commission minutes for April 24, 2007
- \* RPV Planning Commission Resolution for Ireland / Nantasket Drive property - April 24, 2007
- \* RPV Staff Report dated May 15, 2007.

A recent (2009) development is that Ireland has silhouette flags for four residential homes, each over 5000 square feet, now posted on the Nantasket Drive property and that matter will soon appear on the Planning Commission meeting agenda. This project, as currently designed, is opposed by the Sea Bluff Home Owners Association and others as incompatible with the neighborhood, obstructs existing views etc.

A troubling matter is that developer Ireland recently hosted a campaign event for candidates Lewis & Tetreault. Does anyone else besides us see a potential conflict of interest for Council candidates or Planning Commissioners accepting campaign contributions (both cash and in-kind) from persons who will be appearing before Planning Commission or Council sessions? At best one must criticize the judgment of two attorneys for accepting contributions from someone known to have pending actions before a Commission or Council of which they are a voting member. Curious: was accepting gifts from those who have pending actions before the City discussed in the August 29th \$2,000 Council ethics session?

### Pending Issues

Several items on next Wednesday's RPV Council agenda (delayed one day because Tuesday is Election Day) are interesting. Item #8 would extend the terms of certain Committee members to 2012. What do residents think of this last ditch effort by a "lame duck" Council to extend these terms rather than letting them expire as scheduled thus allowing the new Council to make their own choices and appointments? How do you rate this Council for ethics if this is approved?

Item #10 is "Select a Residential Solid Waste Provider for Service Area 1" which is most of RPV.

Readers will recall that in the October 24th Newsletter we wrote of the likelihood that the RPV Council intended to replace Waste Management with another trash hauler with little or no public debate. Sunday October 25th, Tom Long responded: "*Whatever rumors may be circulating, there has been no decision and there is no one "working to change trash hauling from Waste Management. PVP Watch is simply making this accusation up.*" The November 4th RPV Council agenda Item 10 contains a staff report recommendation to change to another trash hauler. Question; Is Tom Long not privy to what is going on at City Hall? Or, just more of his disingenuous actions and lack of respect for residents. Of course, as many are aware of Tom Long's (and other Councilmen as well) detest of PVP Watch and our efforts to keep RPV and other Peninsula residents aware of the *maneuvering* going on at RPV City Hall. One thing will be certain, the Council majority will quickly approve the proposed trash hauling project and attempt to commit RPV residents to a

questionable trash-hauling program with little or no public input to the process..... So much for transparency at RPV City Hall.

### **What RPV needs is Common Sense, Good Judgment and Fairness.**

This election is a clear opportunity for RPV voters. Are you going to vote for more of the same or are you going to vote for two candidates, Brian Campbell & Anthony Misetich who have proven business credentials and are not City Hall accomplices? Both bring proven leadership and management experience that the RPV Council so desperately needs. It is no secret that PVP Watch has long opined that the RPV Council is headed in the wrong direction and there is now an opportunity for positive change and healthy diversity. We agree with Doug Stern on one issue; this election will likely set RPV's direction for the next eight to ten years. Voters will decide; more of the same or positive change.

### **PVP Watch – Newsletter List**

A reminder to ALL PVP Watch supporters. Should you change your e-mail address, don't forget to advise PVP Watch of your new address. We suggest that pvpwatch.com be added to your computer address book to assure delivery of PVP Watch Newsletters.

### **PVP Watch – Contributions**

PVP Watch welcomes modest contributions and appreciates the many contributions received. Those desiring to contribute, please send checks to PVP Watch PO Box 7000-22, Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274. We thank those who have contributed for helping to promote PVP Watch.

### **Subscribers**

The PVP Watch e-mail list continues to grow. For those who wish their addresses removed, please send notice to [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com).

PVP Watch strives to bring current issues to [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com). Those who have topics of community interest are encouraged to bring those issues to PVP Watch.

The Editorial Committee