

Mads Odom

From: Colin Fiske [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 11:18 AM
To: Scott Davies; Peter Lehman; Judith Mayer; Dan Tangney; Matthew Simmons; Joel Yodowitz; Abigail Strickland
Cc: David Loya
Subject: Updated Gateway & Other General Plan Elements

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Planning Commissioners,

CRTP supports the approach developed by the Commission and the City Council to applying policies developed for the Gateway Plan citywide where they are not inherently specific to the Gateway Area. We think that the table in your staff report generally does a good job of assigning policies to the applicable General Plan element, and we support in concept the updated Gateway and Design Elements recently published on the city's website.

However, there are still a few important "clean-up" items that require attention when it comes to mobility and transportation, including:

1. **The street cross-sections and intersection concepts in the Gateway Plan should be updated per Council direction on K and 11th Streets.** The Council has voted both to remove the L-K couplet concept and to direct staff to redesign K and 11th Streets for improved bike and pedestrian safety. Design concepts and cross-sections in the Gateway Plan should therefore include traffic calming, bike/ped-oriented redesigns for these two-way, high-volume streets. This will likely also require updating the conceptual active transportation map to include, for example, Class IV bike lanes.
2. **A policy reflecting supporting improvements to K & 11th Streets should be retained in the Gateway Plan.** Your staff report suggests that Policy 7h.3, which endorses shorter pedestrian crossing distances on K & 11th Streets, should be removed because there is similar policy language elsewhere in the General Plan. However, because of the importance of redesigning K & 11th Streets for the success of the Gateway Plan, and to reflect the Council direction noted above, we recommend retaining this policy in the Gateway element and broadening it to endorse a policy of comprehensive redesign of K & 11th Streets, prioritizing bike and pedestrian modes.
3. **All minimum parking mandates should be removed to reflect previous Commission recommendations.** As we have pointed out previously, the Commission has voted to include a new policy in the General Plan calling for the elimination of all vehicular parking mandates, and recommended the same for the Gateway Plan. However, the new draft of the Gateway Plan still includes an exception for retaining parking mandates in "limited cases (e.g., hotels and other regional draws, employment centers)." There is no reason that these particular uses should be considered exceptional or required to provide more parking than a property owner deems necessary. To reflect the Commission's previous decisions and ensure internal consistency of the General Plan, this exception should be removed.

Thanks,
Colin

--

Colin Fiske (he/him)
Executive Director
Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities

Mads Odom

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 2:20 PM
To: David Loya; Scott Davies; Dan Tangney; Judith Mayer; Matthew Simmons; Peter Lehman; Joel Yodowitz; Abigail Strickland; Sarah Schaefer; Meredith Matthews; Stacy Atkins-Salazar; Alex Stillman; Kimberley White
Subject: from Fred Weis: Comments prior to the December 12 Planning Commission meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Planning Commissioners, City Council members, Community Development Director
From: Fred Weis
Subject: Comments prior to the December 12, 2023, Planning Commission meeting.

Note: There is a lot here. For items just for this meeting, read "C" first. Or skim for items in **bold** and in **bold red**. Reading this in preparation of your meeting should not take too long. Council members may want to read section "B" to acquaint themselves with some of the issues that remain in front of us.

In three sections:

- A. New articles and features on [Arcata1.com](https://arcata1.com)
- B. Overall comments
- C. This December 12, 2023, meeting: Comments on the items in the agenda packet

URL links for more info are at the end of this message.

Thank you for your continued dedication.

-- Fred Weis

A. New articles and features on [Arcata1.com](https://arcata1.com)

1. Inclusionary Housing searchable database

[The California Inclusionary Housing Programs searchable database](https://arcata1.com)

The UC Davis "Center for Regional Change" and the California Coalition for Rural Housing have created a searchable database that shows 150 Inclusionary Housing Programs, both city and County, in many areas (not all) of California. You can click on a municipality shown on the map, and all the details of that location's program are shown. You can search for, say, all the places that have 20% or more of low income (80% AMI — area median income) inclusionary housing. You can see at what level the program starts — at 5 units, 20 units, 30 units, and so forth.

You can learn how to operate the searchable database in a few minutes. For quicker results, I've made a list of inclusionary programs from this database, sorted with the highest percentage of minimum affordable housing at the top, see [here](#).

2. Could Gateway's Barrel District be 100% free of cars?

Article from October 12, 2023. [Here](#) on [Arcata1.com](#)

3. Arcata's Housing Element calls for 20% affordable housing for the Gateway Plan. What happened?

Article from November 30, 2023. [Here](#) on [Arcata1.com](#)

B. Overall comments

From my point of view, there are large issues that the Commission has not adequately discussed (or has not discussed at all) that strongly affect the work you are doing now.

1. Community Benefits, Inclusionary Zoning, and the encouragement of housing production are interconnected.

There are large issues that affect all of it. One is the choice that developers have of utilizing the State density bonus law. In the words of the Community Development Director, "Project proponents [i.e. developers] will be driven by the Density Bonus provisions. And our design standards and Community Benefits programs **are unlikely to be implemented** due to waivers and concessions." (Links for more info are at the end of this message.)

Commissioner Lehman has brought this up. An inclusionary zoning proposal that has "daylight" (as it's been called) of just one unit of affordable housing will not be enough, in my view, to have a developer choose the City's guidelines rather than use the State density bonus law. David Loya's attempts to show the cost of a single affordable housing unit over a 55-year time period are just downright silly, as Commissioner Lehman has pointed out. Developers don't look at costs and profits over a 55-year period -- more appropriate is a 12- or 15-year time-frame.

If the City's Gateway Code and Community Benefits programs are to be selected (versus the State density bonus law), they have to be more attractive to the developer. Just promising speedy approval of the project is not enough. As all of you know, objective standards, ministerial review, and existing state laws will make any properly-designed project have quick approval. What more can the City offer to make development attractive? I have some ideas. We can also ask developers what they'd like to see.

The Commission may want to request a presentation from staff and subsequent discussion on how the State density bonus law can be expected to play out in the Gateway area and city-wide development. Because it affects everything you are talking about.

2. State density bonus law applies to senior housing and student housing.

I suggest that the Commission ask the Community Development Director how this operates, and how it would impact the Gateway Community Benefit program. [See State Density Bonus Housing Law — How it affects us here in Arcata](#) (September 19, 2023). Reading time, 12 minutes.

It is not just by providing low-income housing that a developer can qualify for the waivers, concessions, and incentives offered by the State density bonus law.

Arcata is required to grant a **35% density bonus for housing developments that will include at least 20% of the units for low-income college students**. Resident income levels are determined through the student's eligibility for the state's Cal Grant financial aid program. Maximum rents are established on a per bed basis, rather than for the entire apartment unit. There is also a provision for a density bonus for a "shared housing building."

I shouldn't need to point out the enormity of this consideration to our situation here in Arcata. A developer can design a building that is 20% low-income college students. Cal Poly Humboldt selects and vets the students. The students are low-income, but the housing is paid through financial aid. This can be

a lucrative arrangement for the developer -- and the developer is able to utilize the provisions of the State density bonus law.

3. Privately-owned publicly-accessed open space requirements will be avoided through density bonus law waivers.

The Gateway form-based Code calls for the creation of privately-owned publicly-accessed open space. This is a park or parklet that is created by the developer and is owned and maintained in perpetuity by the property owner. It is mandatory within a section of the Gateway area, or a 1.5% of the project cost can be paid as an in-lieu fee. I regard this as a poorly thought-out program that developers will want to avoid -- thus effectively encouraging them to utilize the State density bonus law to obtain a waiver.

See: [The Myth of "Privately-Owned Publicly-Accessible" Open Spaces](#), with over 500 views on [Arcata1.com](#)

4. The maximum parking requirement will also cause developers to utilize the State density bonus law waivers.

I have no problem with minimum parking requirements. I do think that to impose a maximum level of parking of 1 space per 4 apartment units will be seen as an impediment to development. (That is 1 per 4 units, regardless of size of the apartments.)

You can recall the comment from the developer Steve Strombeck at the October 25, 2023, Commission meeting at which the Westwood Garden Apartments project was approved where he absolutely insisted on one parking place per 1-bedroom unit. "So we're going to make sure everybody has plenty of parking." (He also said it was "too expensive" for him to build three or four stories. His comments on parking and on building height are his own views as a developer.) Or as Councilmember Stillman put it, at the appeal to this project on January 4, 2023, "And so I think it's not a bad thing to have enough parking on site and not reduce it."

From the July 11, 2023, presentation to the Planning Commission, spoken by Urban Field Studio architect and planner Ryan Call:

"And a part of this is speculation, but I am trying to create a somewhat more reality-based set of constraints. **And so if a bank is financing the construction of an apartment building, they will want to see at least some level of parking** provided to ensure that there is a very strong value in their development."

In my opinion, the inclusion of maximum parking limitations in the Gateway Area Plan will be an impediment to the creation of housing. I support the concept behind this policy, but on a practical basis I believe that developers will attempt to bypass it -- by eliminating it with a waiver from, once again, utilizing the State density bonus law.

5. The new draft of the Gateway Area Plan.

This came out on Friday, December 8, 2023, and is designated as "v14a." It is dated December 12, 2023. It includes the **"proposed changes"** that are to be **"reviewed"** (past tense verb) by the Commission at your December 12 meeting. In other words, it includes changes that at the time of the draft plan's release **had yet to occur**.

The initial draft of the Gateway Area Plan came from Planwest. Subsequent drafts were submitted with modifications coming from the Planning Commission and the Committees. This draft comes to us in anticipation of what you, the Commission, is **expected** to decide.

Because of this expectation on what the Community Development Director determined the Commission was going to decide, and the warping of the passage of time as expressed by the verb tenses of language on the cover of the draft and in correspondence to the public, this v14 draft will now be known as "The Bogus Draft." The public looks forward to its replacement by a real draft.

As the December 8 e-mail message from the Community Development Director put it:

"This version 14 revision **retains only those policies that apply specifically to the Gateway Area.** The policies that may apply in other areas of the City for specific development types or in specified districts **were removed from the Gateway Area Plan and added** to other Elements."

Well, those policies certainly have not been added to other Elements yet. Isn't the Planning Commission that makes the decision on which items are to be added -- and which are to be revised or re-worded?

As Commissioner Lehman pointed out at the November 18, 2023, joint study session, there are Gateway Area Plan policies in the list that the Community Development Director designated as "similar" to General Plan policies -- that in fact are not the same. And to discard a Gateway Area Plan policy as being "similar" is not the right way to handle this.

The agenda packet for the Commission's December 12 meeting says:

"Staff recommends the Commission make a recommendation on **which policies in the draft Gateway Area Plan** should be enacted citywide, which should be deleted, and **which should remain in the Gateway Area Plan.**"

But here the Community Development Director himself has determined what the Planning Commission was expected to do -- prior to the Commission doing this.

This is not the first time that the Community Development Director has done this. The June 27, 2023, Commission meeting also had a case where Staff pre-empted the Commission's decisions and wrote in the staff report what was expected that the Commission would decide -- before you made those decisions. The Community Development Director said:

"And what we've done here at the staff level, as we had mentioned in the staff report [Note: This is not mentioned in the staff report], is that, based on conversations that you've had previously, **we've inserted what we expect you're going to say**, as a Commission -- that you concur with staff on this issue, for example. And so these are in your packet as Item I [Attachment I]. You will be able to, um -- What the staff report asked you to do is to come back to this table and verify: **Do you as a Commission agree that you concur with staff on this item?** [No, the staff report does not ask this -- David Loya is confusing Attachment I with Table 2, the summary. See Page 6 in the staff report.] And for the items that don't have anything, where do you land. Because we only made this "Concur with staff" sort of lead in on areas **where staff felt pretty confident** based on discussions that you've had, the decisions that you've already made over the last several months."

For those of the newer Commissioners who find this pre-empting of their decisions to be offensive behavior, you may want to read or watch the video of the June 27, 2022, Planning Commission meeting, at which the Community Development Director attempted to convince the Commission that it would be okay for the Gateway plan and presumably the General Plan Update would be adopted and the EIR Complete — **before the Form-Based Code would be before the Planning Commission.** Fortunately, the Planning Commission would not accept that level of nonsense. The article on this, with a video, transcription, and many pulled quotes, is [here](#). It's a long article, but is navigated easily with a Table of Contents.

The new version of the Gateway Area Plan had the "Map Book" removed -- to be a separate document. In v12a, that was on pages 85 to 96. These were "high level" maps that showed the theoretical street design, but without regard to reality. The maps were "high level" for two years, and there has yet to be an attempt to bring these conceptual maps into accordance with what could actually happen. **"Conceptual maps" are okay, but the roads and parking shown on them could not ever possibly be built, then that is not a valid conceptual map.** Could we please have a "by when" as to when we can see actually valid, sufficiently-realistic maps?

Particularly important to the Commission is map 10-f, previously on page 90 (96 on the PDF) of version v12a. This conceptual map shows **the main entrance into the Barrel District** as being on 5th Street and crossing the L Street Corridor and K Street. That means the vehicles from the potential build-out of 1,300 apartments would be crossing the linear park. My view is that the entrance/outlet for the Barrel District would better placed right onto Samoa Boulevard with a traffic light. What is now 5th Street between K and L would

become an open bike/pedestrian walkway -- not a woonerf, as it would not have to be shared with cars. The entrance for bikes/pedestrians into the Barrel District would continue along 5th Street to the west of L.

Because of the size of the potential development in the Barrel District, this is not a matter that can remain in a conceptual stage. **The Commission should determine the mobility pattern for the eastern vehicular entrance to the Barrel District.**

Also noted is the numerous errors and needs for updating in the Gateway Plan continue, after two years. The very first page after the cover in this Gateway Area Plan document shows a photograph that is not a photo of the Gateway area. Neither are the photos of Arcata on pages 19, 31, 46, 53, 64, 65. If these were "locating" photos they would be acceptable, but they are not.

The final page of text, page 87, shows Implementation and phasing -- the time-frame involved. This page shows the Gateway Zoning Code as being completed in 2023, the Community Benefits program as being completed in 2023, Resident Relocation Assistance completed in 2024, and the Public Open Space Acquisition Program as being completed in 2025. What is the Public Open Space Acquisition Program?

Of great importance to the public perception of what this Gateway Area Plan is, the "Streetscape" chapter's "Image 3" on page 76 does not reflect reality. This page continues to be misleading and false, on both graphics and text. It should be based on actual distances and scale as found in the Gateway form-based code. Among the issues on this page:

- Shows a building with a deep stepback of approximately 14 feet after the 3rd story. Gateway area stepbacks are just 8 feet and are after the 4th story. Thus, a far more "gentle" building design is depicted than what would be constructed.
The v12a draft showed a 21-foot stepback after the 4th story on a 7-story building.
- Shows a 4-story building. Gateway area buildings can be 4, 5, 6, and 7 stories.
- Shows a sidewalk that is perhaps 24 feet wide. This is unreasonable except for possibly new streets of the Barrel District. Atypical for Gateway streetscapes.
- "Setback upper floors to ensure sunlight access to street below." Not true. An 8-foot stepback above the 4th story does not in any way "ensure sunlight access" to the street. That building design **ensures shadow on the street.**
- **"Provide sufficient on-street parking to minimize off-street parking." Not true.** Not on 8th or 9th or K Streets for certain. Likely other streets will see great reductions in parking also.
- Property line not in correct location. This has been the case on this diagram for two years.

Here is the cover of the v14a draft. The inset at the upper right corner was added as an explanation.

12/12/23 DRAFT V14a Gateway

The PDF for this 12/12/23 draft is dated 12/8/2023, 10:36 AM
It was notified to the public on 12/8/23 at 1:44 PM.
As written on the cover:

"This version also includes **proposed** changes
reviewed by the Planning Commission on
December 12, 2023."

How could the Planning Commission have "reviewed"
this draft – dated December 8th – when their meeting
did not take place until December 12th?

This version incorporates the Planning
Commission's recommendation of July
11, 2023, with changes accepted, along with
City Council direction. This version also
includes proposed changes reviewed by the
Planning Commission on December 12,
2023.

C. This December 12, 2023, meeting: Comments on the items in the agenda packet

The Community Benefit program

1. **While I support the concept of a Community Benefit program, I continue to believe that how it is currently designed will not work in giving us the results that have been stated as being desired.**
2. The table in "Attachment B. Working Draft Community Benefits Program" in the agenda packet shows the Community Benefits, the rank, the value, and the points.
3. I added two columns to this table:
 1. The likelihood of that benefit actually being used by a developer. My opinion.
 2. If a developer wanted to get points to construct a taller building, what's the easiest way to get points.
4. Many of the benefits listed are commendable as goals. But (in my view) they are unlikely to be used. I'm not saying you should removed them, or that they will "never" be used. Only that it is not likely.
5. As some examples of benefits unlikely to be used other than once or twice, if at all.
 1. Dedicate >10,000 s.f. to City for public open space.
 2. 100% Affordable Units. If a developer is going to do this, they'll get more payback by using the State density bonus law.
 3. Special Needs Housing 100%. Same as above.
 4. Project provides >50 FTE Jobs. Commendable, but we're building housing here, not office or manufacturing space. Not likely.
 5. >50% of units are for-sale owner occupied. While theoretically possible, for-sale owner-occupied housing is not attractive to a developer. The draft plan offers 2 points. There are easier ways to get 2 points.

6. Inclusionary Units are for-sale owner occupied. For 1 point. Not likely -- too costly for the developer.
7. And more.
6. At the other end of the scale are benefits that are things that a developer might be inclined to do anyway. Getting points for these is a low-cost bonus for the developer.
 1. On-site enclosed and secure bike parking and storage in excess of 50% above the minimum. A good thing, good for the tenants. An easy 2 points.
 2. Minimum 1,500 sq. ft. of ground-floor street-facing space for a resident-serving commercial uses. If there's going to be a restaurant there anyway, then this is an easy 3 points. **Note: Resident-serving commercial uses as identified in code (convenience store, restaurant, etc. has to be defined.** Without a definition, this is vague.
 3. Mix of unit sizes. Again, if a developer was going to do this anyway, it is an easy 3 points. If the developer were not going to do this, i.e. a whole building of one-bedroom apartments, then the 3 points wouldn't offer enough to change.
 4. Exceeds the minimum building energy efficiency by 15%. If the developer is inclined, this is an easy 2 points.
 5. Application submitted prior to July 1, 2027. If a builder is ready to build, then this is 3 easy points.
 6. Electric car chargers. 2 points. **Public car chargers are a money-making operation.** If a developer wants to do this, the return on investment is around 20-35% -- very healthy. Note that the car charging spaces allocation versus parking space allocation situation needs to be spelled out.
7. If I were a developer and needed points, I would get them in this order:
 1. Public car chargers. 2 points.
 2. On-site secured bike parking. 2 points. Now I have enough points for a 5-story building.
 3. 1,500 sq.ft. of ground-floor neighborhood-serving commercial space. 3 points. Now I have enough points for a 7-story building.
 4. Mix of unit sizes. 3 points.
 5. Exceed energy specs by 15%. 2 points.
 6. Apply for permitting within 3 years, by July 2027. If I'm going to be taking action, then that's 3 points.
8. The point is that it will not take much for people to get 3 points for four stories, 4 points for 5 stories, etc.
9. Can we get some guidelines on who and how is involved in determining that we have enough of something, and then remove the benefit? Such as: Enough public car charging stations, or enough special needs housing.
10. Has the Commission considered talking with a few local developers, to see what they think of this Community Benefits approach?
11. Has the Commission considered hiring an outside consultant who would be able to provide advice on how to create a program that attracts developers -- and that is more attractive than utilizing the State density bonus law?
12. Certain benefits are so narrow in their focus that they can only be used on certain very specific parcels. Is this okay, legally and code-wise? Examples:
 1. Project provides >50 FTE Jobs -- probably limited to the parcel sizes of the Barrel district.
 2. Daylight and restore segments of Jolly Giant Creek -- by definition, only applicable on small number of parcels.
 3. Dedicate >10,000 s.f. to City for public open space. That's 1/4 acre -- which property owners can reasonably do that?
 4. Conservation easements. Again, a good thing, but only available on selective parcels.
13. In my view, many items that really were community benefits have been dropped from the list. I'm not talking about such things as building-wide wi-fi and an exercise room, that you determined were more beneficial to the building's tenants, and, in turn, could be an amenity that could bring higher rents. The Commission spent many, many hours discussing the Community Benefit program.
14. The previous benefits chart gave 5 points (equivalent to 2 now) for "On-site public open space with an improvement cost equal to or exceeding 1.5% of total project construction costs." The benefit now is 1 point.

15. The staff report concludes the section on Community Benefits with the statement:
 "But it ensures a simple program that achieves projects that reflect the community values."
 I regard this as a statement of Staff's opinion, and not as fact. In my view, this Community Benefits program is missing elements to achieve the community values.

 In the public input sessions about the community benefits, the overwhelming number-one benefit of leading importance was the creation of owner-occupied home-ownership. That was by far the first. Number two was affordable housing.
 I don't see either of these as emphasized in this list of community benefits. They are there, but insufficiently promoted.
16. I believe the unintended result of these Community Benefit program policies will be the construction of 3-story buildings. That is not the intention of what we are trying to do.

Which Gateway Policies are transferred to the General Plan

1. As noted in section B, item 5, above in this message, the new draft of the Gateway Area Plan already has had the policies in the matrix in the agenda packet for this meeting removed from the draft. In other words, the Planning Commission has not ruled on which policies they want to see retained in the Gateway Area Plan and which they want to see in the General Plan, and the Gateway Area Plan document has already been changed.
2. The direction of the City Council was to see which Gateway-developed policies would be suitable for inclusion in the General Plan. The actual wording of the motion is: DIRECTING THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO LOOK THROUGH ITS POLICIES AND SEE WHICH ONES COULD BE APPLICABLE TO THE GENERAL PLAN.
3. I took this to mean a "look at one at a time" discussion, not a wholesale "they are all good" determination.
4. As Commissioner Lehman pointed out at the November 18, 2023, joint study session, there are Gateway Area Plan policies in the list that the Community Development Director designated as "similar" to General Plan policies -- that in fact are not the same. And to discard a Gateway Area Plan policy because it is said to be "similar" is not the right way to handle this.
5. To adequately look at which policies are "similar" the full text of both the GAP policy and the GP policy should be displayed side-by-side, so they can be read and evaluated. As Commissioner Lehman showed, there can be small differences in wording that have a large effect on how a policy is executed.
6. **It is clear from this December 12 matrix that the wording has not been gone over carefully.** The word "Gateway" has been removed in most (but not all) instances. The phrase "Plan area" is there more than two dozen times. There are many details of the policies that do not have the appearance of having been sufficiently looked at.
7. **IMPORTANT: Many policies that were a distinct and noted part of the Gateway Area Plan are now marked for deletion. These need to be looked at on a one-at-a-time basis.**

There are 26 policies that are marked for deletion, either because they are considered to be similar to other General Plan policies or because they are not now needed. Here are some examples of different types and explanations for deletions.

1. 3a. New Units. Plan for approximately 500 new residential units in the Gateway Area in the next 20 years, recognizing the full buildout potential in the Area is close to 3,500 units, as shown in Table 5.
Opinion: This should be specified and looked at. It has been a contentious policy since the start of the first Gateway draft plan. It appears that the Community Development Director wants to delete items that are controversial. This is simply wrong.
2. 5b. Creamery District. Continue to use existing placemaking and naming of the Creamery District in City mapping.
Opinion: The explanation is "Not necessary, No proposal to remove District name." Just

because there is no current proposal to remove the name of the Creamery District, why should it not actually say "Continue to use existing placemaking and naming..." ?

Opinion: This may be a minor issue, but I believe it is necessary. **This was specifically requested by Creamery District representatives, and it was discussed by the Planning Commission.**

3. 9f. Solar Shading. Ensure new development minimizes solar shading to surrounding properties.

This is said to be the same as D-1e. It is not the same as D-1e. Here's D-1e:

"D-1e Promote energy efficiency and solar access. Site and building design shall emphasize energy efficiency, solar orientation and consider shading of adjacent structures, balancing development needs with solar access."

9f says " Ensure new development minimizes solar shading..."

D-1e says "...consider shading of adjacent structures, balancing development needs with solar access."

Those are two very different policies.

4. **There are dozens more examples. Each one needs to be looked at individually.**

8. "D-8b Housing Production Emphasis. Ensure that the available community benefits emphasize and support the City's goal of maximizing housing production."

Is that the goal? To maximize housing production? What – maximize no matter what?

Opinion: This is a poorly-written policy. Maximizing housing production is not what we are doing here - not at the expense of human-need considerations.

9. "D-8c Ensure that the additional intensity allowed is appropriately calibrated to the value of the community benefits provided. **High-cost benefits should allow for a greater increase in allowed intensity than low-cost benefits.**

That is not being done in the draft community benefits now.

10. "D-8d **Owner-Occupied Affordable Housing as a Community Amenity.** Encourage new home ownership opportunities affordable to households of all income levels. Include deed-restricted affordable opportunities for low- and moderate-income households. Encourage a range of ownership opportunities including condominiums, townhouses, and other alternative ownership models. Provide strong incentives through community benefits program for owner occupancy."

"Include" is stated as a requirement. That is not the case.

"Provide strong incentives" – I disagree that we are seeing this in the Gateway area.

Additional Clean-up

1. This item is not on the agenda, in any way, shape, or form.
As such, it cannot be discussed at tonight's Planning Commission meeting.

2023 PC Annual Report and Authorizing the Chair to Present the Report to the City Council

1. It seems that in the past this report was written by the Commission Chair. This report has the semblance of having been written by the Community Development Director.

Can we establish who wrote this report?

If it was co-written by the Chair and Staff, let me tell you: It sounds like it was written by Staff.

2. This report is scheduled to be presented to the City Council on January 3, 2024. I'm going to make the suggestion that you delay the presentation until at least the following Council meeting, so the Commission has enough time to go over this report.
3. What you want to do with this report is of course up to you.

Links

The California Inclusionary Housing Programs searchable database

arcata1.com/calif-inclusionary-housing-database

A list of Inclusionary Housing Programs in California

arcata1.com/list-inclusionary-housing-programs

State Density Bonus Housing Law — How it affects us here in Arcata

arcata1.com/density-bonus-law-affects-us-in-arcata

Could Gateway's Barrel District be 100% free of cars?

arcata1.com/could-gateways-barrel-district-free-of-cars

Arcata's Housing Element calls for 20% affordable housing for the Gateway Plan. What happened?

arcata1.com/housing-element-says-20-percent-affordable-housing-for-gateway

State Density Bonus Housing Law — How it affects us here in Arcata

arcata1.com/density-bonus-law-affects-us-in-arcata

The Myth of "Privately-Owned Publicly-Accessible" Open Spaces

arcata1.com/the-myth-of-privately-owned-publicly-accessible-open-spaces

Gateway Parking: 48 Drivers = 6 parking spaces

arcata1.com/gateway-parking-48-drivers-6-spaces

No Parking in the Gateway area? Banks may be unwilling to provide financing

arcata1.com/no-parking-bank-financing

Gateway Density and Feasibility Study -- Code Site Tests

arcata1.com/density-and-feasibility-urban-field-studio-7-11-2023

Planning Commission meeting: July 26, 2022 -- Obfuscation and Gobbledygook

arcata1.com/transcript-and-video-planning-commission-meeting-july-26-2022