

From: Ralph McKee <rmckee2258@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 11:21 AM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Cc: Dohoney Jr., Milton <MDohoney@a2gov.org>; Briggs, Erica <EBriggs@a2gov.org>; Ramlawi, Ali <ARamlawi@a2gov.org>

Subject: TC1

I am writing to express my continued disappointment re your handling of both the process and substance re the proposed TC1 rezoning. To start, I have no illusions. Based on 1) how the Briarwood TC1 rezoning was passed with no modifications expressed by anyone not ideologically aligned with you, and 2) how your ORC recently flatly rejected the staff report (re the current iteration of TC1) which suggested considering some modifications suggested by members of the public, it's a virtual certainty that you and city council will pass the current version with no changes. I write simply to 1) show readers online some of the incongruities in your handling of TC1, and 2) to request a modicum of intellectual honesty and respect for the public.

While the public engagement thus far appears robust at first blush, there were and are flaws. First, the increased height limits, which are the most important change for many residents, are not adequately described. While the "interactive map" provides useful data when it works (it doesn't on my MacBook), in a matter this important, the city should provide residents with a parcel-by-parcel map with a key showing the current height limit and the changed height limit. This would probably have taken a staff person perhaps a half day and eliminated ambiguities. Also, it would be useful to know whether the buffer will be measured to parcel lines or proposed building envelopes (in other words, if a parcel is 80' from a residential parcel, thus seemingly limiting height to 75', but the building proposed on it is 300' from the residential parcel, is 120' height allowed?). Residents shouldn't have to read the fine print of the ordinance and/or guess how this criteria would be applied.

The above criticism applies to the mixed use criteria too (100' from a corner). Why not a parcel map highlighting the portions of the parcels which would be required to have mixed use? Why force the public to figure it out with a map to scale and rulers?

And the response of Comm. Sauve to some of these and related questions on a NextDoor thread is illuminating. She said, essentially, "I'm not going to do your homework". When I called her out for her rude comment, she responded by 1) accusing me of being rude, 2) making the excuse that being on CPC is a time-consuming volunteer job, and 3) saying, in essence, that her psyche doesn't include politeness. All in all, a nice attitude. Sort of like the Transportation Commission member who said last year, in response to a public comment, "why should we listen to uninformed [in his view] residents when we have [presumably] knowledgeable staff engineers"? Frankly, people with these attitudes shouldn't be in positions of power.

On to the substance. As to the height limits, Brian Chambers provided you with research suggesting 4-story buildings are better suited to transit corridors than taller buildings. Ken Garber also recently provided you with data re the major carbon emission problems re buildings over 4 stories. These are two citizens who often do the homework. Of course, I don't expect you to actually consider that, despite your naked assertion that TC1 would help achieve our A2Zero sustainability goals (without requiring or even incentivizing ANY "green building" measures). I expect your response will be, essentially, additional housing will get commuters

out of cars. Well, how about asking Ms. Stultz to do a rough-cut analysis of what is actually the net gain by getting a commuter out of his/her car via tearing down buildings and putting up buildings which will produce much more carbon emissions to construct and also to operate than a 4-story building? Here I expect your answer to be: "we're the Planning Commission and we know best"; this attitude has unfortunately dominated city administration for years.

Next, applying TC1 to the West Stadium corridor has been touted as an elixir which will magically enhance and/or create mixed-use neighborhoods. However, common sense and recent local real estate history would suggest that not only is the "20-minute walkable neighborhood" a fantasy here, but also that rezoning to TC1 will be significantly counter-productive to that goal. First, the obvious: unlike the Briarwood area, there are very few vacant or residential parcels in this district. Therefore, every new large residential building is almost certain to replace one or, more likely, several, current businesses. Next, retail, particularly small local retail, is currently stressed and will likely remain that way; Amazon and big box retail is not going away anytime soon. And I believe the real estate pros on CPC will not dispute my assertion that projections for hi-end large-scale residential developments will often show a much bigger return on investment, both in terms of absolute dollars and percentages, than mom-and-pop retail. These 3 points make an almost "perfect storm" for incentivizing property owners to sell to developers looking for big profits via replacing business tenants with residential tenants in multi-story buildings.

The response I have heard from many TC1 proponents, you included, is that the large-scale residential buildings will have significant ground floor retail. Recent local history emphatically says the opposite: Lowertown, the George, the Standard, the Foundry, the Yard (that replaced the businesses in S. Main Market), the South U buildings, etc. How many examples do you need? If you don't require mixed use, it won't happen, period. And requiring it just on corners is not sufficient; there are dozens of businesses that could potentially be replaced by residential buildings that would not be subject to the "corner" requirement.

Another obvious point: this will make yet another "by-right" situation, so even if a truly awful development is proposed, you will have to approve it. And your legal team will likely cave if there's an attempt to "fix" problems later via changing the zoning; remember the scare tactics Postema used re the Foundry.

The bottom line is this: despite the points made above, I know you and city council are going to vote to approve TC1 with virtually no requirements or incentives, which in my view is akin to employing the laissez-faire capitalism I finally managed to disabuse my then-GOP parents of in the early 1980s. "Progressive"?? Right. And there will be no tweaks, despite Ms. DiLeo's genuine attempt to engage with the public, unless of course someone like Kirk Westphal or Scott Trudeau from the A2 Wonkers page (or whatever it's called now) makes a suggestion.

But please quit misleading the public with the affordability/sustainability/mixed use mantra, unless you actually provide some supporting evidence or at least some coherent and persuasive thought.