

From: [Joel Yodowitz](#)
To: [David Loya](#)
Cc: [Scott Davies](#)
Subject: General Plan comments - Public Facilities and Infrastructure Element
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 5:36:52 PM

David,

Following up the General Plan comments I briefly discussed with you before the PC meeting last Tuesday, I suggest that in the Public Facilities and Infrastructure Element, the following policy be modified (my edit is in italics and underlined):

“PF-5b **Coordination with private and specialized education providers.** The City *may* accommodate providers of private, vocational and specialized education . . .”

I also suggest the following new policy:

PF-? **Development of early childhood and pre-kindergarten education facilities.** The City shall encourage the development of both public and private early childhood and pre-kindergarten education facilities.

Thanks.

Joel

To: Planning Commission; D. Loya

From: Judith Mayer

For: Future reference during consideration of Land Use Code amendments & Coastal Element /
Local Coastal Program update

Date: Include in Feb. 27, 2024 m Planning Commission meeting packet

At the Commission's February 13 meeting, I was not allowed to suggest the following limited set of changes to the December 2023 draft General Plan. These concerns may come up in the Commission's future consideration of land use and zoning changes, possibly in the City Council's consideration of the Plan and Code, and in the Plan's and Code's future implementation. While I'm not asking the Commission to reconsider these suggestions now, I'd like to go on record with these suggestions for when these concerns arise in the future.

1. **LU-1n Samoa Blvd and South G employment center as an industrial hub for Arcata** (p. 2-10): Concern: Commission discussions of coastal development policies to date fall far short of enthusiastically supporting increased development in hazard-prone areas, while the City wishes to avoid premature disinvestment in areas south of Samoa. Encouraging and incentives for new industry and intensified development south of Samoa Blvd will locate additional development in a tsunami and flood risk area, and create a new constituency likely to pressure the City to protect this vulnerable area against flooding for longer than a general public interest should support. Suggested language: "*Samoa Blvd and South G Street employment and industries: The City shall support industrial land uses south of Samoa Blvd only to the extent that they are not threatened by sea level rise or seismic hazards, and that they do not increase vulnerability of people, property, or ecosystem to those hazards.*" (The draft Plan's language is: "... industrial uses shall be encouraged to relocate and expand within the Adaptation Zone boundary of this area as described in the City's Local Coastal Program.")
2. **LU-1y Form-based design standards** (p. 2-12): Suggested language "... *the City shall develop form-based design standards that are appropriate for each Infill Opportunity Zone.*" The signal to develop form-based standards for an area should be its designation as an Infill Opportunity Zone, or even the C-M designation, NOT simply a proposal for high density housing. Be explicit that each area's design standards will be appropriate to each unique area, above and beyond city-wide standards.
3. **Table LU-2 Residential Land Use Classifications (p. 2-15)** *Don't limit Planned Developments to only Medium-density Residential development*, as the Table indicates, and Suggested change: **LU-7 Consider revising ~~or removing~~ Planned Development overlays.** Planned Development overlays are among the few remaining tools that give the City discretion to avoid over-building and to retain open spaces and human scales within large sites where land owners wish to maximize profits by over-building, including on already-developed sites, to the detriment especially of current residents.
4. **Policy LU-6 Ag & Natural Resource Lands** (p. 2-21 ++). Suggested language regarding A-E Ag Exclusive designation: "... *Agricultural and aquacultural product processing facilities for products originating outside of Arcata, ~~or~~ which are essentially industrial, ~~or~~ require large-scale industrial buildings over 10,000 square feet, ~~or~~ any structure longer than 100 feet, ~~or~~ higher than 45 feet are not appropriate for the A-E zone.*" This will help retain the ag production and greenbelt views that the A-E zone is intended to protect while permitting reasonable construction of barns, greenhouses, and non-

industrial processing. (The draft policy's use of "and" instead of "or" limits its ability to prevent inappropriate industrial overdevelopment of Arcata's A-E lands and greenbelts.)

5. **LU-9 Consider rezoning for mixed use & more housing in R-L zones in walking distance of Plaza & Cal Poly.** (Bayview, Sunset) and **HP-4 Neighborhood Conservation Areas** (p. 5-26): Suggested language: *"Rezoning of or in a Neighborhood Conservation Zone must include location-specific design standards that recognize and address that recognize and protect key aspects of the neighborhood's unique and historic character."*
6. **CM-5e Pedestrian pathways and multi-use trails, 7** (p. 2-64): "In general, ~~do not reduce~~ ~~retain the current~~ total linear feet of Class I trails within the City, even if current facilities must be realigned or relocated to other routes..." This language was lifted from the GAP. But City-wide, the Plan *should indicate* that we aspire to add MORE Class I trails between 2024 and 2045. (Peter Lehman's Feb. 13 suggested language indicate a process to do this.) Standards, subsidiary plans, or the LUC should indicate *the limited circumstances in which the City would allow a developer to move a bike trail, and specify how a developer would need to "... demonstrate removal or relocation of Class I trail sections would improve active transportation access and connectivity."* **PR-2d Community health in parkland planning** (p. 3-41) and **PR-2e Trail improvements** (p. 3-42): The Plan should note that the L Street Linear Park will be part of the Arcata Rail with Trail Corridor and the Great Redwood Trail.
7. **D-8c Value of Benefits** (p. 5-16): Suggested language: *"Ensure that the additional intensity allowed is appropriately calibrated to the value to the community of the ~~community~~ benefits provided. High-~~community-value~~ ~~cost~~ benefits should allow for a greater increase in ~~allowed~~ intensity than low-~~community-value~~ ~~cost~~ benefits." (Do not refer to high-cost or low-cost benefits! The "points" a benefit provides should depend on the benefit's relative value to the community, not their cost to the developer.)*