

Subject: Support for Comp Plan
Attachments: 17. Jaskiewicz Comp Plan Ch 4-5.pdf

From: Adam Jaskiewicz
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:46 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>
Subject: Support for Comp Plan

Hello Planning Commissioners,
(cc, City Council)

I'm again not able to attend tonight, so I am writing with my thoughts.

I would like to start by reiterating my support for the general direction of the Comprehensive Plan so far, the high level goal of increasing housing supply and choice across the city, and eliminating exclusionary single-family zoning. I would also like to express my appreciation for all of you in the face of so much fear, uncertainty, doubt, and misinformation being spread in our community.

I wrote to you last week about Chapters 4 and 5, and I just wanted to quickly restate my main points on Chapter 5, since you are still discussing it this week.

****Low-rise Residential****

Please eliminate the restriction of neighborhood commercial uses to “corners, collectors, or arterials”. I don't see a need for this restriction; in fact, Jefferson Market, a widely cited example of what we want to see, would not fit this restriction.

****Transition****

Transition should allow for more height (not just “low- and mid-rise buildings”). I think it's appropriate to have this more moderate limit where Transition is a narrow strip along a corridor surrounded by Low-Rise Residential, like Miller, but where Transition is a large, contiguous area surrounded by University or Hub, such as near Five Corners or Beekman, more height should be allowed.

I covered these in more detail in my previous email from last week: <https://a2gov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14121380&GUID=503C396D-BCA5-4346-AD72-93800C9AD239>

Thank you,
Adam Jaskiewicz (he/his)
4th Ward

Subject:

Comp Plan Ch. 4-5

From: Adam Jaskiewicz**Sent:** Monday, April 28, 2025 8:14 PM**To:** Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>**Cc:** City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>**Subject:** Comp Plan Ch. 4-5

Dear Planning Staff and Commissioners,
(cc, City Council)

I'm not going to be able to attend tomorrow's Planning Commission meeting, so I am writing to you with my comments on this week's assignment, Chapter 5. I'm also including a comment on the Infrastructure section of Chapter 4 that you didn't quite get through last week. I hope you will take the time to consider my suggestions.

Also, I attended the Open House last week at the Westgate Library. It was a well-run session and I had a lot of interesting conversations with staff, commissioners, and members of the community. I look forward to future engagement sessions as you continue to collect our feedback!

****Chapter 4, Goal 9****

As I mentioned in my public comment last week, the Transition corridors and hub areas are our most dangerous streets. We need to slow cars to non-fatal speeds, reduce conflicts, and encourage mode-shift away from cars. Goal 9 can help us accomplish that, but I don't think Vision Zero is being emphasized enough in these discussions. Granted, this is a transportation issue, not so much land use, and I recognize that the Moving Together Toward Vision Zero plan is not being replaced by this plan. However, they are so intertwined that I think we need to find a way to more clearly emphasize this alignment.

This is an equity issue, as we are hoping to house a lot of people along these corridors. Traffic violence, noise pollution, and air pollution (even EVs create particulate pollution from tire and brake wear) disproportionately affect people living along high-traffic corridors. We need to find a way to mitigate this.

As for Chapter 5, there are a few things I want to mention:

****Low-Rise Residential District****

Your draft of course still mentions a four story height limit in Low-Rise Residential. I know that City Council has requested that you to change this to "feature a limitation of height to 35 feet, allowing for three stories". My concern is that 35 feet may not allow for three full stories depending on the context of a building. I would like to see a wording that would allow for something like a stacked triplex, with the bottom unit at ground level, rather than a sunken "garden level". I'm not sure what precise height limit would accomplish that while preventing four story buildings (or perhaps something other than a height limit could prevent the fourth story), but

it seems like 35 feet is perhaps a little skimpy. At-grade units are far more accessible than units where a resident needs to go down half a flight of stairs, and elevators aren't particularly economical in three story buildings.

Furthermore, I would like to see form-based standards used to limit density rather than unit-density limits. I think capping the number of units incentivizes fewer, larger units to maximize the total number of bedrooms. Being more flexible about unit count can encourage a mix of unit sizes including more two- and three-bedroom units ideal for families. And form-based standards that limit the overall size/massing of the building envelope will be a sufficient cap on density while ensuring buildings fit their surroundings.

I would also like to see the language limiting neighborhood commercial uses to "corners, collectors, or arterials" eliminated. I expect such businesses will be more common in those prime locations, but I don't see a reason for this limit. Even the example shown, Jefferson Market, is not on a "corner, collector, or arterial".

****Transition District****

Regarding the Transition district, it seems like this is being used for two somewhat distinct types of Transition areas. Much of this district takes the form of narrow strips along major corridors, surrounded by Low Rise Residential, whereas other areas are deeper, more contiguous swaths that are adjacent to Hub, Flex, University-owned areas, or parks.

While I think it is quite appropriate to limit heights in the narrow corridor strips to low- and mid-rise buildings (perhaps 5-6 stories) when they are close to Low-Rise Residential districts, I think the larger contiguous blocks should not be limited to "low- to mid-rise buildings" as contemplated here. I don't want to see areas where we already have taller buildings getting built, such as Beekman on Broadway or Five Corners, be placed in a land-use category that would make those buildings non-conforming and ban similar buildings. I think that Transition should have additional height steps that would allow taller buildings (perhaps not quite as tall as Hub districts) when sufficiently far from Low-Rise Residential, just as TC1 does today.

Again, keeping a more moderate height limit near Low-Rise Residential is appropriate.

Thank you,
Adam Jaskiewicz (he/his)
1430 Las Vegas Dr.
Ward 4