

From: [Jirka Hladis](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Feedback for 11/26 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
Date: Tuesday, November 26, 2024 1:49:56 AM

Dear members of the comprehensive plan committee,

Thank you for all of your hard work, there are some great ideas in the materials presented so far. I would like to share a few thoughts related to the latest slide deck:

1. What would be the potential benefits to the community from requiring retail/commercial/office uses instead of housing in particular areas? To list a few that come to mind and possible counterarguments:

- Ensuring easy access to amenities (15 minute neighborhoods)- if we focus on first increasing population density, localized retail then automatically becomes more viable.
- Improved access to employment opportunities- we currently have a large imbalance between housing and number of jobs. It may be more effective to focus on improving cycling and transit access to surrounding communities, as well as to the large number of existing business parks that are just outside of city limits (most are within 6 miles / 30 minute bike commute of downtown). Additionally, the university already owns underutilized land that they could dedicate to technology incubators and spin off companies if they wanted to.
- Preservation of local businesses, provide opportunities for new entrepreneurs- new market rate construction is unlikely to be on the affordable side of the spectrum for any uses, but does free up space in older buildings. We cannot force private landowners to build economically nonviable retail spaces, but there may be a case for adding new city owned spaces along the lines of the farmer's market.
- Improved tax revenue- we have no local sales tax and non-residential development is unlikely to create a stronger property tax base if the assumption is that it would be economically uncompetitive with housing in the first place.

2. Instead of prescribing a specific mix of uses, are there ways to encourage building designs that can be flexibly adapted to changing needs with minimal cost and environmental impact? For example, with the right implementation of typical podium construction, one can imagine ground floor areas being reused for an evolving combination of retail, office, residential, or even parking, depending on market forces and community needs.

3. Many residents have valid concerns about the potential negative impacts of upzoning. Might it be more effective to focus on directly regulating/mitigating specific nuisances (e.g. noise, cars) rather than attempting to avoid them indirectly by restricting allowable uses?

Thank you,
Jirka Hladis