

Subject: Suggestions for implementation matrix

From: Kirk Westphal

Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 10:29 AM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Subject: Suggestions for implementation matrix

Commission:

Please find comments on the implementation matrix below. I tried to incorporate items from your previous Work Plans. I highlighted major themes as well as items that appear to contradict your prior directives to the consultant.

Regards,
Kirk Westphal

1.1

- Strike the item calling for regulation of 4BR+ buildings. This seems to contradict strategies
- to encourage co-ops and rooming houses in 1.4. Handle with form/hybrid zoning rules instead.

1.2

- Development of pre-approved plans and design requirements for infill:
- change from “intermediate term” to “near term.” There is a clear community concern about neighborhood infill aesthetics.

1.3

- [It's unclear whether these apply to
- *subsidized*
- affordable housing or *market rate*
- affordable housing. Exercise caution for any attempts to preserve market rate affordable housing (i.e., stop it from redeveloping) or invest in sustainability goals (e.g. insulation) in market rate affordable housing as these do not ensure long-term preservation
- of affordability. Focus investments on subsidized housing and tenant assistance.]

1.5

- Consider specifying
- *residential vacancy rates*
- as a metric for how to evolve zoning changes and expedite city approval processes.

3.2

- Insert language about
- improving access to and
- usability of existing
- parks. Some parks are underused due to a lack of trails
- and entrances, despite the city owning land or easements between private parcels (eg on cul de sacs) for this purpose.
- From your Work Plan, insert language here about requiring pedestrian

- access between private parcels or between private parcels and parks.

5.3

- Strike italicized: “Encourage a wide-range of businesses by offering
- flexibility in land use and regulations *in*
- *key locations*.” This seems to imply subdividing the Transition
- district.
- Strike italicized: “Ensure that zoning allow businesses that maintain
- a variety of *automobile-based*
- *and transit/multi-modal oriented business models in retail*
- *corridors*” as *this contradicts*
- *the goals of TC1. This is a problematic repeated suggestion from the consultant.*

6.2

- Strike the italicized part of “Promote additional downtown-like
- development by retrofitting car-oriented shopping centers like Briarwood
- *to increase their mix of uses and walkability*
- *over time.*”
- *CPC has consistently stated*
- *that*
- *shopping centers should*
- *redevelop in total, not incrementally.* Incremental change
- in Arborland, Maple Village, and Westgate means the renewal of 30- or 40-year leases. (Briarwood is a lost cause because of the missed opportunity to re-plan it in total, so it could warrant a different strategy about how to manage the remainder of the parcels.)
- Like 5.3 above, this is a problematic repeating theme.

8.1

- “Citizen’s Academy” has changed its name to “Community Academy.”

9.3

- Change “Support a shift in transportation modes, away from vehicular
- use” to “Support comfortable walking and biking facilities”
- *From your Work Plan,*
- *specify “parking maximums” (and “parking unbundling and cash-out” from a former Work Plan)* within “implement new policies to better align parking supply and demand relative to costs,” and change to “near term.” Residential parking unbundling in particular
- could result in significant savings for renters in the near term without a lot of complexity.

10.2

- Add: “Create an inspection protocol to ensure that water retention/detention
- facilities are performing as expected and that required trees are in good condition.”