

Subject: CLUP

From: Ralph McKee
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 12:51 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>
Subject: CLUP

I am writing to oppose approval of the CLUP. While the CLUP expresses lofty goals - affordability, sustainability, and equity - it will not even come close to achieving them. Instead, it amounts to a knowing deception aimed at folks who desperately want to believe the CLUP will indeed achieve those goals. And in the context of other recent moves by the city regime - moving \$5.2M of affordable housing \$ to the general fund, the sale of the Kline's lot with no provision for the use of the sale proceeds for affordable housing, and the blocking of the AACLT's program for affordable housing - it is the epitome of hypocrisy.

Affordability: The CLUP and you as its authors have acknowledged that at best the densification promoted by the CLUP will, in the short and mid term, merely slow housing price increases. Yet you and your supporters constantly tout affordability as a talking point, and, judging by public comments here and many social media posts, you have managed to convince many housing-challenged folks that it will make a major difference in their situations, when in fact it will not help them one iota in finding housing here they can afford. The problems are obvious: we have little vacant land, cost of existing housing here and construction is high, and relatively expensive housing is profitable, so replacement of housing with denser housing will just result in expensive units.

Yes, some of your talking points are true in the abstract. For example, a Seattle study shows spreading land costs across more units makes for cheaper prices, and replacing houses there with quadplexes resulted in 4 units priced the same as the houses they replaced. But that will not happen here. I listened to a podcast interview of the study author. In Seattle, "cheap" houses cost \$800k. Developers are buying them, knocking them down, and building quadplexes sold at \$800k/unit. Sounds great. But look closer. Each unit cost \$200k, so building costs + profit = \$600k. Apply that here in A2. Buy a \$400k house, knock it down, and sell triplex units for \$133k purchase price + \$600k (building cost + profit) = \$733k. Is this a good result? Only for folks who are in the \$700k price range.

So the recent comments by Brett Lenart at the AARP event (and zillions of similar comments) are IMO quite deceptive. He lamented his colleague's struggle to afford housing in A2, and touted the CLUP as part of the solution. Really? Wouldn't she be better off trying to cobble together \$425k to outbid the speculators on that \$400k house?

And your blocking the AACLT's ability to build affordable housing, and Brett Lenart's comment that changes in the regulations need to wait until the CLUP is adopted are brutally hypocritical given the constant bending the rules and ignoring the current plan when approving big developments. And after all the vitriol spewed by supporters of the current regime re the 2018 loss of the \$5M for affordable housing contemplated by the Core Spaces proposal back then (looking at you, Commissioner Adams), where is the angst re selling the Kline's lot for \$17M with ZERO provision for using the \$ for affordable housing? Not a peep so far, and 3 regular regime supporters dutifully supported the sale at council. Hey, CM/Commissioner Disch, not even a mention of the inconsistency? The Kline's lot was prioritized by the former council (those that some of you call "the antis" and "the party of no") for affordable housing, which was reiterated by hundreds of residents during the SI debacle. Affordable housing? Lip service only. Total hypocrisy.

Sustainability: There is virtually nothing in the CLUP re the massive carbon released by demolition and building new housing, and no comparison with the carbon saved by getting commuters off the road, yet the latter is touted as a huge reason to densify. Look closer: how many commuters would densification get off the road? Start with this: where does the 80,000 commuter number come from? How old is it? Does it reflect the large number of folks now working from home? Then consider this: very few commuters can afford the \$700k price range, or rents of \$2000 and up. And of those, what percentage would, for various reasons, prefer to live outside the city limits? You spent almost \$1M and two years on the draft CLUP, without any real analysis of the factors determining whether and how much carbon would be saved by getting commuters off the road via densification, yet you constantly say that densification would materially help that goal. Sustainability won't happen without affordability, and the CLUP won't make housing affordable here.

I'll leave to others discussion of other flaws in the CLUP - bad data, "let's leave [all the major provisions and much of the map, STRs, etc.] to zoning" (maybe the furor will die down by then), failure to address the solar panel issue, failure to deal with natural features appropriately, etc. etc. The CLUP has many major flaws and will not come close to achieving the goals set. And duping the housing challenged into believing it will is the height of deception and hypocrisy.