

New eComment for Planning Commission Hybrid Meeting 8/15/23

Carolyn Petty submitted a new eComment.

Meeting: Planning Commission Hybrid Meeting 8/15/23

Item: a. REPORT 23-0481 STUDY SESSION TO DISCUSS HOUSING ELEMENT RELATED GENERAL PLAN MAP CHANGE (GPA 23-01), ZONING MAP CHANGE (ZC 23-01) AND ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT (TA 23-02), TO EFFECTUATE PROGRAMS IN THE HOUSING ELEMENT (Community Development Director Carrie Tai)

eComment: As you know, Plan Hermosa represents thousands of hours of work and community input. The community NEVER approved or recommended the entire corridor of Aviation to become mixed use. Nor did we approve mixed use in the commercial corridors. Only the Aviation/Prospect entrance corridors were approved for mixed use. The fact that staff is blithely recommending this change indicates they have no idea that mixed use was extensively discussed, and Plan Hermosa represents the will of the community. Sweeping changes, such as rezoning entire corridors is something which should be taken very seriously, and not simply changed in a meeting. There should be a series of community meetings in which the ramifications of rezoning entire corridors is discussed, with vision boards showing what a wall of mixed use would actually look like. Once people see this, it is doubtful the community would be on board. By the way, this should be noticed to the entire community, in plain English so people are clear as to what is being proposed – as opposed to an email with links to hundreds of pages. What is even more disturbing is a proposal to modify zoning without specified height limits. The PF zone, as proposed, has no height limits and Ms. Tai indicated that this was to give the city flexibility to decide height on a project by project basis. All that accomplishes is creating a situation in which the community continuously has to be on offense, watching every meeting, getting ready to push back when staff proposes a building higher than 35'. Why should this burden be placed on the community? Nothing should be higher than 30' or 35'. This should not be circumvented with a new zoning designation. 17.39.030 Minimum density – I think everyone, whether they are a lawyer or not, can read that language and know that this is a mandate, not a suggestion, for residential dwelling units, as per the HE overlay. It doesn't matter what staff says, it is an easy read. If someone owns property in the HE overlay, they are mandated to provide housing as stipulated in the HE property listing. The exclusions are permitted only at the will of the city. Of course the city can then deny a project in the HE overlay that excludes housing, merely by indicating "sorry, we don't have any other residential dwelling units identified that can replace yours, so your project will not be approved without housing because we are subject to the RHNA numbers". Land value recapture should never be approved. It is simply "cap and trade" for housing and will only further stratify housing costs. This is basic economics, and quite frankly, is so shocking I cannot believe anyone would agree to this. Just because a handful of affordable units are adding to housing stock doesn't mean that everyone else should be forced into paying another \$100k or \$150k more for a property, subsidizing the lower priced properties. By the way, cost of construction directly flows to rents, so if rental properties are being built, that cost will be added to the cost of rent. Ask renters in our city if they think that is a good idea. The answer will be "no way", don't do anything that will result in higher costs for renters. 17.42.100 Affordable housing density bonus and incentive program. B. State Affordable Housing Density Bonus. 1. Density Bonus. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65915, the city shall grant a density bonus in the following amounts over the otherwise allowable maximum residential density permitted by this chapter and the general plan... Why? The State of CA is already

imposing onerous mandates, why are giving up even more? This is the time to pull that back. 3. Calculation. of Density Bonus. Where is the rest of this sentence? Perhaps this is an error, but the community should be able to clearly see calculations of density bonuses, not be forced to start looking up codes at the state level. 5. Lot Consolidation Bonus. [MOVED FROM 17.42.170 – MINOR CHANGES. This should be retracted. Why should we give even more to developers? Ask anyone in our community if they support developer giveaways and the answer will be a resounding NO. I appreciate that this planning commission has been thoughtful when reviewing staff reports, and you come to the meetings prepared and knowledgeable. Thank you.