

Subject: Monroe Public Comment City Planning 8-5
Attachments: Monroe Public Comment 8-5-24.docx

From: Gregory Monroe
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: Monroe Public Comment City Planning 8-5

Please see attached. Thank you!

Attention City Planning Commission and City Planners,

For residents who wish to follow along and provide feedback on City Planning's Future Land Use Recommendations and Areas to Amend, I'd like to better understand the memo written by Planning Managers Lenart and Bennett—particularly as it relates to current moderately dense residential areas, many of which are zoned R3 and R4, that are incongruously zoned Transition in the Current Draft of the Comprehensive Plan—and the Options laid out in the memo.

I agree that these areas do not feel appropriate for Transition District zoning. I would like to better understand how City Planning distinguishes between Option A, *"Expand and/or tier the Residential Land Use Category,"* and Option C, *"Create a New Land Use Category."*

To me, the differences between these two options ultimately come down to the details and implementation, and my comments are based solely on my reading and understanding of the memo, so it's possible I am misunderstanding.

My primary concern with Option A is that it appears to leave the entire Residential category open to interpretation, without specific language to guide or constrain how it is—or will be—applied. That seems to directly undermine the July 2025 City Council resolution, which called for triplex maximum by right and a three-story height cap in Residential. More importantly, it may disregard the many residents who have expressed valid concerns about how additional density and structure heights—beyond the City Council limits—could negatively impact their experience of the neighborhoods they call home.

I recognize that the Comprehensive Plan is intended to be forward-looking and aspirational, and that it should allow flexibility for future decision-making. However, I don't believe it should intentionally introduce categories that are broadly open to interpretation, especially in areas that are already zoned residential and have clearly defined development parameters.

While I don't assume this is the intent of City Planning, Option A—particularly without stronger limiting language—risks opening the door to upzoning residential neighborhoods beyond the current established thresholds or at the very least disputes further down the road. Introducing tiers within the Residential category could help address these concerns, and I am advocating for that. But I request that those tiers are clearly defined, transparently mapped, and enforceable. Without that clarity, I'm concerned we risk trading a known structure for one that is more ambiguous, easier to exploit and harder for city planners and residents to follow or respond to.

Option A in the Memo: "For example, the category could call for implementation via zoning district(s) that limit housing to a maximum of triplexes in some areas (perhaps traditional

R1 and R2 areas) and other zoning district(s) that provide greater housing quantity through greater physical potential, without unit count limitations in other geographies (perhaps traditional R3 and R4 areas)."

One aspect in particular of Option A that I would like to respond to is "*without count limitations in other geographies (perhaps traditional R3 and R4).*" R3 and R4 do have count limitations in place today. Those limits already allow for moderate to high density, and in many of the areas under discussion, current development remains below those existing caps—leaving reasonable room for growth. I believe those existing zoning rules should be preserved and respected.

Thank you for your time and consideration.