

**Subject:** Draft CLUP

---

**From:** Ralph McKee  
**Sent:** Friday, February 13, 2026 11:27 AM  
**To:** Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>  
**Subject:** Draft CLUP

I am writing re the draft Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).

The process was severely flawed and so is the final draft. First, while council approved spending \$ on promo postcards, they chose not to contact residents that way and did not conduct neighborhood meetings until the process was well underway. Many residents did not know about the process early on, and many still do not.

Next, the first year of the process was misleading, because the focus was on “gentle density” and a 35’ height limit in residential areas. Mr. Lenart later revealed CPC desired significantly more density and height. Since, despite much pushback from residents and even council, the CPC has only grudgingly given a little ground.

CPC and allies tried to deflect criticism of the CLUP via saying “public comments are still open” and “don’t worry, we’ll protect neighborhoods during the zoning process”. But CPC comments during the discussion of the Dean project rezoning belie that. Those comments and rezoning vote treated the DRAFT CLUP as a “done deal”. After that, why should anyone think CPC takes public comments seriously, or that they will during later rezonings?

The CLUP is based on questionable data re estimates of commuters moving into A2 despite the high prices and rents, and the availability of cheaper housing developed within short commuter distances. Staff and CPC failed to engage with regional partners. Further, without affordability - not enhanced by this plan, sustainability goals will not be reached. And the CLUP fails to examine metrics of potential savings of commuter exhaust emissions versus the massive emissions from demolition and building.

Staff and CPC have grudgingly acknowledged that the plan will enhance affordability very little, if at all, in the short and mid-term. Yet staff, CPC and allies have suggested that triplexes will enhance affordability, ignoring the reality that triplexes will inevitably cost more than the house they necessarily replace (A2 has little vacant land), and will likely worsen it by losing many of the most affordable existing housing via teardowns. Ironically, the draft acknowledges the displacement/gentrification potential, but incentivizes it, without even any attempt to limit or mitigate that potential. And the upscale housing enabled by the CLUP will not help lower-income folks at all.

Similarly, the draft acknowledges the vulnerability of small businesses to be displaced by the changes contemplated by the plan, and says that steps should be taken to mitigate or minimize that, but doesn’t make a single recommendation of those steps.

The CLUP fails to properly address possible alternatives - on the demand side, cajoling UM to slow growth, encouraging remote work, incentives to take in roommates, limiting advertising used to entice wealthy folks moving here, and on the supply side, coops, townhomes, tiny homes, etc.

The CLUP fails to address major issues like the effect on solar panels and the tree canopy, and infrastructure constraints. It fails to decide 17 areas (transition or residential). Despite significant debate, it dodges issues that are NOT “details”: height limits, setbacks, lot combinations, etc. Leaving these for future zoning discussions is a cop-out; it appears that CPC and council hope the furor dies down.

The expansion of transition zones in draft 3 and draft 4 would result in entire neighborhoods being vulnerable to mid rise apartments. Parcels in the widened zones aren’t adjacent to “residential areas” because they are all in transition zones now. Some of these widened zone contain the most moderately priced homes in A2. This is counterproductive to affordability.

The messaging re draft 4 makes much of a new section re STRs. But the new language is just as wishy-washy/vague as the prior language. You had 2 years to study this problem but did nothing, and have regularly granted re-zonings allowing STRs in formerly restricted areas. If you think more study is needed, you should recommend a moratorium on changes that would allow STRs in formerly restricted areas, and the plan should recommend severely restricting STRs.

Finally, the lip service given by CPC and council re affordability is belied by recent actions. The reasons for denial of the some of the recent requests by the AACLT were questionable. And recent changes to the zoning code resulted in loss of many affordable units, for example in the building replacing the credit union on William. Even worse, the decision to sell the Kline’s lot without committing proceeds to affordable housing is the epitome of hypocrisy. This lot was widely expected to result in hundreds of affordable units. Instead, it will just be upscale housing and proceeds squandered in a growing bureaucracy. And the plan does not even mention this height of hypocrisy.

The CLUP should be jettisoned, started over, and done right.