

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joe Mateer](#)
Subject: Re: Hearing on project at 3289 Janes Road
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2024 7:25:02 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Mr. Mateer:

Thank you for notifying me of the public hearing today that, unfortunately, I am not able to attend in person. One more concern I would like to add in regards to the proposed rezoning for the project at 3289 Janes Road, Arcata, is that renters tend not to be "invested" in the neighborhood or community. I am not in favor of increasing rental units in this neighborhood.

Thanks again,
[REDACTED]

On Thu, Apr 11, 2024 at 7:19 AM [REDACTED]
wrote:

To Mr. Mateer:

I own my residence at [REDACTED], Arcata. My residence is on the corner of Janes Road and Ernest Way and just within the affected rezoning area. I am against projects in my neighborhood that will increase traffic in this neighborhood. Since we purchased this residence, we have seen traffic increase to where it is difficult at times to exit Ernest Way onto Janes Road. A major contributor to this increased traffic was a change that allowed students from outside Pacific Union School's residential area to attend school there. Where, previously, many students walked to school, they are now driven in.

I am also against an increase in low income housing in this neighborhood. For one, added low income housing may increase crime or bring more criminals into the neighborhood. In addition, as a property owner, I am concerned about the reduction in property values of existing residences in the neighborhood with the increase in low income housing.

Visually, the proposed housing at 3289 Janes Road, is going to be a two story project at 27 feet in height. The current housing at the proposed project site is single story and not visible from my residence. In Arcata, at other second story housing projects where the second story contains balconies, tenants use those balconies as storage. Also, like other rental units, often the pride of ownership is not there to maintain the exterior appearance of the dwelling. If this project continues, these units will be visible from my property and by others travelling in this neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joe Mateer](#)
Subject: Comments for Public Hearing - Project Location 3289 Janes Road, Arcata
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2024 9:12:35 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Arcata, CA 95521
April 4, 2024

Planning Commission
City of Arcata
736 F Street
Arcata, CA 95521

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Two-Story Structure in Our Neighborhood

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed construction of a two-story structure in our neighborhood. As a resident and a parent of two children, I have several concerns about the potential impacts of this development on our community, particularly in terms of safety, privacy, and overall quality of life.

Firstly, the increase in traffic is a significant concern. The vicinity of the proposed site is already challenged by drivers who fail to yield to children and pedestrians, often exceeding the speed limit. Introducing a larger structure with the potential for more residents or commercial activity will only exacerbate these issues, further endangering the safety of our children and all pedestrians.

Additionally, our neighborhood roads are utilized by large freight deliveries and local flower producers. The introduction of a two-story structure could strain the existing infrastructure, leading to congestion and logistical problems that our streets are not equipped to handle.

Another critical point is the potential for setting a precedent for further similar developments. Our community values its character and the balance between homeownership and rental properties. We are concerned that an influx of rental units could lead to less well-maintained properties and increase conflicts among residents, ultimately affecting the desirability and value of our homes. The presence of more transient residency contrasts with the stable, community-focused environment we strive to maintain.

Privacy is also a significant concern. The location of the proposed structure could allow for direct lines of sight into our backyards, creating an uncomfortable and intrusive living environment. This invasion of privacy is particularly concerning for families with young children, like ours.

Given these points, I urge the Planning Commission to reconsider the approval of the proposed two-story structure. Our neighborhood is a place where safety, stability, community, and privacy are highly valued. This development threatens to compromise these pillars of our community life.

Thank you for considering our concerns. I hope that the Commission will take into account the potential negative impacts on our neighborhood and make a decision that preserves the quality and character of our community.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: Joe Mateer
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FW: Agenda Packet - Apr 18, 2024 (Thu) - Zoning Administrator 234-015-DR
Date: Monday, April 15, 2024 12:20:00 PM
Attachments: [Agenda Packet 20240418.pdf](#)
[507-291-034 Maps.pdf](#)

Good Afternoon [REDACTED]

Please find the attachment for the upcoming Zoning Administrator meeting. Please find responses to your inquiry below. I apologize in advance about the brief replies (currently on a staff report deadline).

Yes, the image you provided shows a single family dwelling unit. A demolition permit was issued by the Building Department 05/15/2023, Building Permit No. 23-1211. If the structure is still there, it is going to be demolished as the current project under review does not include the structure.

The subject property is zoned and planned Residential Medium Density. The project is developing four base dwelling units according to the 7.26 to 15 dwelling units per acre. Three additional State accessory dwelling units are proposed according to Government Code section 65852.2.(e). Both the State and City have policies to increase housing for our community members.

We do not know who American Hospital Management is. We have no regulatory authority to know or question the owner. Although I did hear from the agent they are associated with Mad River Hospital, however this has not been verified as it is not part of our review authority.

Yes, the attachment does include a site plan, floor plan, building elevations and landscape plan. The project meets all the zoning development standards (yard setbacks, building height and site coverage). They are requesting a parking exception as the parallel parking space shown on their site plan is not considered a legitimate parking space. Four parking spaces are typically required. The Action, if adopted would reduce the standard to three on-site parking spaces (one van accessible, one standard, and one electric vehicle space).

The project does not include a regulatory agreement (recorded document that limits a dwelling unit rental rate or income of tenant) for affordable housing.

Included is an attachment with some mapping of the area.

There are no current land use or building permit applications for Mad River Hospital. Recommend you contact them for any plans they may have.

The solar improvements were permitted by CA Housing and Community Development – Mobile Home Park Division.

Let me know if you have any follow up comments or questions. Take Care and Be Well.

Joe Mateer, Senior Planner
City of Arcata – Community Development Department
707-825-2139 / jmateer@cityofarcata.org
www.cityofarcata.org

The City of Arcata acknowledges that the lands we are located on are the unceded ancestral lands of the Wiyot tribe. The land that Arcata rests on is known in the Wiyot language as Goudi'ni, meaning "over in the woods" or "among the redwoods." Past actions by local, State and Federal governments removed the Wiyot and other Indigenous peoples from the land and threatened to destroy their cultural practices. The City of Arcata acknowledges the Wiyot community, their elders both past and present, as well as future generations. This Acknowledgment seeks to aid in dismantling the legacy narratives of settler colonialism.

Accessory Dwelling Unit's, the ultimate infill, add housing for our community's artists, teachers, health care providers, public safety personnel, food and service staff, farmers, parents, children, neighbors, friends and (you fill in the blank).

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 9:12 PM

To: Joe Mateer <jmateer@cityofarcata.org>

Subject: Re: FW: Agenda Packet - Apr 18, 2024 (Thu) - Zoning Administrator 234-015-DR

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

dear joe, a few questions about the proposed building site, and since i have your ear, some other CDD/zoning/building questions related to lazy j and neighborhood.

1.. on my way home i stopped at the site to view it.

fyi: the proposed building site under discussion is a lot is located behind an existing house which sits on janes road/ct as pictured in link below.

<https://www.redfin.com/CA/Arcata/3289-Janes-Rd-95521/home/116304214>

am i right in imagining that this proposed building site is a lot which is part of the property of the still existing front house? is this proposed development under the aegis of the recently loosened state building code which was put in place to ease building of mother-in-law units? and which are being taken advantage of by developers to build multi-unit apt buildings such as this?

<https://calmatters.org/commentary/2021/11/california-housing-crisis-political-bonta-initiative/>

is this proposed building plan looked on with favor to meet housing quotas and avoid builders remedy

<https://calmatters.org/housing/2023/06/california-builders-remedy/>

2. who is american hospital management company? where are they based? googled it, got info below but may have nothing to do with this group. does group have any link to mad river hospital (ownership)?

<https://www.linkedin.com/company/american-hospital->

[management-company](#)

American Hospital Management Corp

American Hospital Management Corporation operates as a non-profit organization. The Company offers acute care, physical therapy, general medical, surgical, and radiological services. American Hospital Management serves communities in the United States.

3. there were no attachments with your em, just info about the agenda. please resend to me.
does this missing attachment include drawings of proposed building plan for examination and comment by concerned neighbors,? (part of agenda packet for public view??).... lazy j residents who live on chestnut, just the other side of fence, have a vital interest in the lay out of the buildings, how close to fence, windows, impinging on their privacy etc.
4. are there any affordable units in this housing plan?
- 5 i am very interested in an electronic and also hard copy of lots owned by hospital, several adjoining lazy j, which have proposed building plans. additionally, i would like a drawing which shows where the mental health center is being built.
6. is it true that the solar farm built on the lazy j property adjoining (101) bypassed all local city and county zoning/regulations by the corporation going straight to the state for permitting??

many thanks in advance for your answers to these questions. [REDACTED]

On Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 12:35 PM Joe Mateer <jmateer@cityofarcata.org> wrote:

[REDACTED]

The Action (attachment A) includes exhibit 3 with the City's mapped property report as well as the site plan. The subject parcel is the first property on the left as you turn into Janes Court off of Janes Road. It is currently vacant as the single family residence was demolished a couple years ago. It is possible the street view has the house still there. The subject property does have street frontage on both Janes Road and Court. Hope this helps you navigate the location.

Let me know if you have any follow up comments or questions. Take Care and Be Well.

Joe Mateer, Senior Planner
City of Arcata – Community Development Department
707-825-2139 / jmateer@cityofarcata.org
www.cityofarcata.org

The City of Arcata acknowledges that the lands we are located on are the unceded ancestral lands of the Wiyot tribe. The land that Arcata rests on is known in the Wiyot language as Goudi'ni, meaning "over in the woods" or "among the redwoods." Past actions by local, State and Federal

governments removed the Wiyot and other Indigenous peoples from the land and threatened to destroy their cultural practices. The City of Arcata acknowledges the Wiyot community, their elders both past and present, as well as future generations. This Acknowledgment seeks to aid in dismantling the legacy narratives of settler colonialism.

Accessory Dwelling Unit's, the ultimate infill, add housing for our community's artists, teachers, health care providers, public safety personnel, food and service staff, farmers, parents, children, neighbors, friends and (you fill in the blank).

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 12:28 PM

To: Joe Mateer <jmateer@cityofarcata.org>

Subject: Re: FW: Agenda Packet - Apr 18, 2024 (Thu) - Zoning Administrator 234-015-DR

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

thanks for the em. i already have the agenda packet. what about a map as i requested and the question i had regarding the location of this parcel. when i googled the address it showed a real estate listing with picture of a house on janes rd with an enclosed porch .. it backs onto chestnut av in lazy j...is this actually the property where they plan to build?

On Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 12:06 PM Joe Mateer <jmateer@cityofarcata.org> wrote:

[REDACTED]

I received your voicemail message. Here is the information regarding the project you were interested in.

Please find the attached Zoning Administrator Agenda and Staff Report packet for the item near you. The item was continued to April 18, 2024, at 9:00 am. You can participate in the meeting remotely by following the telecommunication directions on the agenda.

Let me know if you have any follow up comments or questions. Take Care and Be Well.

Joe Mateer, Senior Planner

City of Arcata – Community Development Department
707-825-2139 / jmateer@cityofarcata.org
www.cityofarcata.org

The City of Arcata acknowledges that the lands we are located on are the unceded ancestral lands of the Wiyot tribe. The land that Arcata rests on is known in the Wiyot language as Goudi'ni, meaning "over in the woods" or "among the redwoods." Past actions by local, State and Federal governments removed the Wiyot and other Indigenous peoples from the land and threatened to destroy their cultural practices. The City of Arcata acknowledges the Wiyot community, their elders both past and present, as well as future generations. This Acknowledgment seeks to aid in dismantling the legacy narratives of settler colonialism.

Accessory Dwelling Unit's, the ultimate infill, add housing for our community's artists, teachers, health care providers, public safety personnel, food and service staff, farmers, parents, children, neighbors, friends and (you fill in the blank).

From: Joe Mateer <NoReply@IQM2.com>

Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 8:23 AM

Subject: Agenda Packet - Apr 18, 2024 (Thu) - Zoning Administrator

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please see the attached Agenda Packet document for the following meeting:

Zoning Administrator
Regular Meeting
Thursday, April 18, 2024 9:00 AM
736 F Street, Arcata, CA 95521

[Download PDF Agenda Packet](#) | [View Web Agenda Packet](#)

Document Modified: 4/11/2024 3:20 PM

If you no longer wish to be included in this distribution list you can remove yourself through the meeting web portal or reply to this message.

From: Joe Mateer
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [Jennifer Dart](#)
Subject: FW: Agenda Packet - Apr 18, 2024 (Thu) - Zoning Administrator 234-015-DR
Date: Friday, April 12, 2024 12:05:00 PM
Attachments: [Agenda Packet.pdf](#)

[REDACTED]
Good Morning: Nice meeting you yesterday. And thanks for joining us for our meeting. Here is the information regarding the project you were interested in.

Please find the attached Zoning Administrator Agenda and Staff Report packet for the item near you. The item was continued to April 18, 2024, at 9:00 am. You can participate in the meeting remotely by following the telecommunication directions on the agenda.

Let me know if you have any follow up comments or questions. Take Care and Be Well.

Joe Mateer, Senior Planner
City of Arcata – Community Development Department
707-825-2139 / jmateer@cityofarcata.org
www.cityofarcata.org

The City of Arcata acknowledges that the lands we are located on are the unceded ancestral lands of the Wiyot tribe. The land that Arcata rests on is known in the Wiyot language as Goudi'ni, meaning "over in the woods" or "among the redwoods." Past actions by local, State and Federal governments removed the Wiyot and other Indigenous peoples from the land and threatened to destroy their cultural practices. The City of Arcata acknowledges the Wiyot community, their elders both past and present, as well as future generations. This Acknowledgment seeks to aid in dismantling the legacy narratives of settler colonialism.

Accessory Dwelling Unit's, the ultimate infill, add housing for our community's artists, teachers, health care providers, public safety personnel, food and service staff, farmers, parents, children, neighbors, friends and (you fill in the blank).

From: Joe Mateer <NoReply@IQM2.com>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 8:23 AM
Subject: Agenda Packet - Apr 18, 2024 (Thu) - Zoning Administrator

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please see the attached Agenda Packet document for the following meeting:

Zoning Administrator
Regular Meeting
Thursday, April 18, 2024 9:00 AM
736 F Street, Arcata, CA 95521

[Download PDF Agenda Packet](#) | [View Web Agenda Packet](#)

Document Modified: 4/11/2024 3:20 PM

If you no longer wish to be included in this distribution list you can remove yourself through the meeting web portal or reply to this message.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joe Mateer](#)
Subject: Our concerns regarding proposed development (No. 234-015-DR-MUP)
Date: Monday, April 22, 2024 7:29:29 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Zoning Administrator, CDD, City of Arcata

From: [REDACTED], Lazy J residents

Re: Multi-Family Residential Development located in 3289 Janes Court, Arcata; File No. 234-015-DR-MUP

Our Concerns: We're aware of the need for housing, especially for hospital work force, so we're **not** entirely opposed to this development, but we would like to see it scaled back to a single-story structure to fit in with the surrounding single-family homes. This would help to safeguard the neighbors' privacy, access to sunlight (for some), and sense of safety for their kids or grandkids.

[Note: We refer to "them" or "their" because, for the most part, it won't impact us much personally, as we live on Percheron Lane, which is further away (although some disturbance from the construction still may impact us). But we have neighbors and friends we care for deeply, so we're mainly speaking out for them.]

We also request further mitigations to account for the significant and cumulative impacts of noise, increased traffic, light pollution, climate impacts, and potential toxins in the soils (from mills or pesticides?), or possible asbestos and/or lead contamination from the old house that is to be torn down. Also, there may well be cultural artifacts on these grounds as there was formerly a Wiyot settlement on the Mad River that ran through this area at some point in the past. You absolutely need to consult with the Wiyot Tribe before going ahead with this project.

Cumulatively, these are significant impacts that can affect the peace and well being of some of the most vulnerable people in our community (our elders), many of whom have significant issues with regard to their health and mental well being, which I will go into further below.

To sum up (although we're far from done), the cumulative impacts from this project will place a significant burden on an already vulnerable population of elders. We believe that this rises to a significant level of impacts that it triggers the need for a full environmental impact report.

Consequently, we strongly urge you to do a full EIR for this project.

Of course, we're **not** experts on CEQA by any means, but my mom and I did attend a workshop via Zoom on CEQA basics by CEQA expert and land use attorney Jason Holder a few years ago. We took careful notes. From what Mr. Holder said, there is a very low threshold for requiring an EIR. If there's a fair argument that a project may have a significant impact (or the cumulative effects from that project), then an EIR is required by law.

The benefit of an EIR to the community is invaluable, as ordinary people don't often feel like

they have the power to "fight city hall." But with an EIR, mitigations are required by law to address significant impacts, which planners and developers typically resist, often to the detriment of community members, to rush projects through. Also, if there is a reduced size alternative, one must choose the environmentally superior alternative. In this case, a single-story structure fits in better with the surrounding buildings and environment, would offer more privacy and would be faster to build, causing less distress to the already vulnerable residents living nearby.

The following "chapters are arguments that bolster and support our claim that there are or could be significant impacts to this project that require a full EIR.

The Wiyot Tribe have rights and real ownership of these lands:

I spoke with a neighbor who fought against the first iteration of this project over a decade ago (I wasn't a resident then). She said the deal fell apart because there was some dispute over who really owns the land. I don't know if that's the actual reason, and she didn't seem to know for sure, but she thought it might be the Wiyot Tribe or the Indian Health Service that had asserted their rights.

So I tried to contact Mad River Properties, the company that claims to own the property, but didn't succeed in getting a response (the number in the phone book is for a different company with the same name). The company (Mad River Properties) appears to be so secretive and inaccessible that I was suspicious. Why are they flying so low under the radar that you can't find anyone to speak to?

However I did manage to speak with Mad River Hospital administrator David Neal, who was a bit cagey about the hospital's plans. But he did reveal that the owner of Mad River Hospital, Mr. Shaw, has stock in the company that owns the site and the fields/horse pastures surrounding the Lazy J.

Regardless of who owns the land (and by all rights, it should belong to the Wiyot Tribe), there's a real possibility that cultural artifacts may be discovered there, since the Mad River once ran through the land in and around the Lazy J, and the Wiyot once had major settlements along the Mad River. (As I understand, it was one of three major settlements, along with the Eel River and Tuluwat Island on Humboldt Bay.)

Considering this historical fact, you absolutely need to consult with the Wiyot Tribe beforehand to get their input and to allow for any additional oversight that they may want or require to assure that their traditional lands and cultural artifacts are respected. (We've seen from the sad examples of certain developers, like that Schneider fellow, how little regard and respect they have for tribal concerns, so please don't leave it to developers!) Please consult with the Wiyot before you break ground! Considering that this is their ancestral territory, that's the least you can do. I assume that we (Arcatans) don't do the land acknowledgement at council meetings for no reason other than to be performative. Land back is the trend now (or at least don't steal land that doesn't belong to us!). It's about time Arcata stepped up to make this happen.

Noise, Traffic and Air Quality:

We are living between two exceedingly busy thoroughfares, i.e. a major highway (101) and

Janes Road. The noise and traffic levels are already excessive. Just as a neighbor informed you in a letter, it's difficult to exit Janes Court or the Lazy J Park at peak hours of traffic. When the school lets out at 2:30 to 3:30 pm, it's near impossible to exit. Undoubtedly, the construction will add to the noise and traffic, not to mention the extra cars from new tenants when it's done. We would like to see mitigations to lessen the noise level during and after construction. The decibel level in this area is already too high! Perhaps you could lower the speed level, especially near Janes Court and the Lazy J, put in speed bumps or other traffic calming measures. Also, limiting the hours of day for construction would go a long way to ease our minds.

Between these two major thoroughfares, we are already breathing in a great deal of pollution from car emissions. Do we need more cars and parking spaces to further contribute to the load of traffic polluting our air? (We could probably live with two or three extra parking spaces for a one-story structure but not more than that. (Less is better!)) Also, will the hospital staff be coming and going throughout the night, disturbing people's sleep?

This leads into the discussion about climate change.

Climate Change Impacts:

The increase in traffic, along with the comings and goings of more cars, combined with the particulate matter from the annual fire season, with its increase in length and intensity, will compound

the cumulative impacts of climate change. Have these cumulative impacts been addressed in the staff report? I don't believe so, moreover it's easy to punch holes in the report which is pretty vague and full of generalizations to begin with. (It doesn't really specify in detail how the City will address the various impacts.)

To quote the **findings in the Staff Report**, "Environmental Review Findings," item e):

"Furthermore, approval of the project would not result in any significant impacts relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality" **are either false or misleading**. There's no way to predict how many cars will come in or how often their comings and goings. If these are medical staff, they may have odd hours causing them to leave and enter at odd hours. As one letter writer noted, it is already difficult for cars to exit Janes Court at peak times for traffic. As noted previously, there are two major roads on either side of the Lazy J and Janes Court. There is already a high level of congestion and pollutants from the exhaust of car engines that is poisoning us. Numerous studies have demonstrated that the pollution from car emissions is detrimental to vulnerable populations like children and the elderly. (Note: Pacific Union School is about a quarter of a mile from the site, and the Lazy J is right over the fence.)

As CEQA attorney Jeffrey Holder pointed out, climate science has made it into CEQA law quite a bit. For instance, there may be cumulatively considerable impacts during fire season. When the pollution from vehicle emissions and construction sites combines with the particulate matter from fires, this can have cumulatively considerable impacts.

City Staff seems to have an answer (or comeback) to every impact, but are you taking into account the cumulative impacts smoke and particulate matter during fire season, combined with vehicle and construction site emissions? These would be significant and cumulative environmental impacts, and I don't see anything in the staff report that suggests you have even begun to address this.

We have all lived through the smoke and ash of the fire season when the wind is blowing the wrong way. Why isn't the City addressing this obvious omission?

Additional Concerns (potential pollutants):

We have additional concerns regarding the potential for excessive dust or toxins in the soil getting stirred up (either from pesticides in the soil like Roundup, etc, or from the residue of lumbar yards), asbestos or lead from the old house that's slated to be torn down, that cumulatively could be significant impacts that may trigger the need for a full environmental impact report. As Jason Holder mentioned, there is a very low threshold to require a full EIR by law. Even if there is one significant impact, it triggers the need for an EIR. I believe there's more than one cause for concern, but the climate change issue (with fire season and particulate matter) is the most salient.

Protect our Vulnerable Seniors!:

There are vulnerable seniors in our park living close by the proposed development, many of whom who are living out their last days. Must they spend it being exposed to the high decibel noise, traffic, dust and contaminants of construction while grieving and coming to terms with the loss of their health, mobility and loved ones?

Take [REDACTED] for example. He's a veteran who lives just over the fence from the proposed development on Quarter Way. He's in his nineties and was a caregiver for his wife until recently when she entered Hospice Care. He's living alone now, but he visits her every day whenever he can. He has his own health concerns, and is grieving over his dying wife who barely recognizes him. Do you really care if he has to spend his final days, not only grieving for loss of his lifetime companion, but also dealing with the excessive noise from machinery, extra traffic, dust and pollution, disturbing his peace of mind in the final years of his life?

Well perhaps not, but how about we stroll a couple of doors down from [REDACTED]? His neighbor is a good friend of ours who had a fourth-stage cancer diagnosis and miraculously went into remission for a brief period, but the cancer has come roaring back recently. You know her because she used to work for the City and she is one of our dearest friends. Imagine undergoing radiation and chemotherapy treatment while dealing with all the dust, noise and contaminants being dredged up from the soil across the fence? From sun up to sun down? She has allergies to boot that make it hard for her to breathe. Would that be a nice way to live out your final days? Is that what you would wish on her, your former colleague?

I don't know how you judge whether something is a significant impact, but if it causes suffering for human beings, to me that is a significant impact that should be taken into consideration.

These aren't the only two people who would suffer by far. There are other elders in our park living near the site who are dependent on oxygen tanks in order to breathe. Some neighbors have heart ailments, diabetes, and other ailments. Some are undergoing cancer treatment like our friend. Others have recently lost their closest partner.

Should they be subjected to the constant noise and pollution dredged up from this construction site? I suppose there's no way around it, because whatever we want, this project is going through. But at the very least, you could minimize their stress by scaling it down to a single

story (so it happens more quickly), and curtailing the hours of operation, as well as the level of dust, traffic and noise on the site to the extent possible. Please go further than you normally would to mitigate their distress, I beseech you!

Even if you can't scale down the project, here's an example of what you could do to mitigate the impacts on our most vulnerable residents. Most elderly folks eat earlier and go to bed earlier than younger people. Many eat dinner around 6pm and are in bed by 9pm, like my mom. If construction stops at 7pm, that bleeds into their dinner hour and only allows them a couple of hours of peace in the entire day before bedtime. If you could cut the hours allowed for construction back to 6pm, that would at least give them three hours to enjoy their dinner and a bit more peace. Is that too much to ask?

That's a minor mitigation, but would be most appreciated. You could do even more to help our most vulnerable seniors by scaling back on the project. If you could make it a single-story building instead of a two story, the construction would go faster, be completed sooner, and the most vulnerable neighbors would be spared the prolonged stress of construction noise, etc, that seemingly takes forever to complete - and maybe their whole lives (since they don't have much time left).

We're just asking you to recognize that this is an exceedingly vulnerable population, and to take the necessary steps to protect them. As I mentioned, many of them are in their final years and suffer from severe ailments. Please do what you can to ease their final months or years. Imagine that your ailing mother or father lived in close proximity to this site. What lengths would you go to to alleviate the harm to their well being? Please consider it and do that!

While my mom and I are doing remarkably well health wise, many of our friends and neighbors are not! (We care deeply for them, and so should you!) So please exercise compassion in your final determination. Don't be like a mindless bureaucrat ramming a project through because it benefits your developer friends or your grand design for the City. There are real people involved who will suffer! Please keep that in mind. If you have anything like a heart and a soul, you won't neglect to consider the most vulnerable folks - our elders. Please do whatever you can to minimize the impacts on them. Thank you!

Public Participation is not being encouraged or honored:

I have spoken with several neighbors living on or near Chestnut Way and neighbors nearby. None had received any notice of the meeting on April 18th nor the meeting on the 24th. My mother and I were the first and only people to inform them. This is a dereliction of duty to inform the people who will be most impacted and shut out their voices. I have to conclude that you don't care to hear from the public, and that your main concern is that this project sails through without our input. It's fairly easy to predict that you will shoot down all our concerns and approve this project with very minor or no mitigations. So I'm probably wasting my time writing to you, but I care about my neighbors and that's the only reason I'm doing this.

Respectfully,



Arcata resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [David Loya](#); [Karen Diemer](#)
Subject: Studies on particulate matter in construction sites
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 1:22:39 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi David,

At the Zoning Administrator hearing tomorrow, I will make reference to the following fairly recent meta-studies (2023 & 2024) concerning the health impacts of particulate matter in construction sites, not just to workers, but to nearby residents. Short-term exposure to particulate matter based on various conditions (stage of building, etc) may "cause respiratory irritation and exacerbate lung diseases, while long-term exposure may lead to reduced lung function, cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, and even premature death."

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-023-26494-4>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352710224002766>

Considering the cumulative impacts of particulate matter from the construction site, the highway and Janes Road, both of which are heavily trafficked, and what studies have revealed, you can't really argue that the impacts would be insignificant. Also, when you factor in particulate matter pollution during fire season, and the tribal practice in the off-fire season, which is to burn the excess vegetation to prevent fires (the smoke often wafts over the fence towards us from the Potawot burns), these are significant impacts that should trigger a full Environmental Impact Report, and the cumulative impacts of this particulate matter should be monitored during the construction phase. This is especially true when it concerns a community of vulnerable seniors, many of whom have serious health issues, and some who use oxygen tanks to breath.

I would like to remind you that CEQA attorney Jeffrey Holder has said that there is a very low threshold for requiring an Environmental Impact Report. He said that if there is even **one** significant impact, it triggers the need for a full EIR (not a mitigated negative declaration). We would appreciate and expect the City to fulfill its duty of care to safeguard the health and well being of all the residents of Arcata - in this case, the seniors in the Lazy J, as well that of our neighbors.

Thank you for your attention.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]
Arcata resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joe Mateer](#)
Subject: Zoning Meeting regarding 3289 Janes Road
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 9:14:22 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello again Mr. Mateer:

Thank you for continuing to send me the updated zoning meeting reports. I will not be in attendance at the April 24th zoning meeting. I do not see this apartment complex as a "good neighbor" complex. I am requesting two things today.

First, that the City of Arcata recognize that the majority of residences in the vicinity of this project are single story, single family residences. The project's plans allude to townhouses and apartments in our neighborhood. Where are these structures? Please address to which apartments and townhouses the City is recognizing in relation to this project at 3289 Janes Road.

Second, I want the City of Arcata to recognize that should every tenant of the proposed seven unit apartment complex at 3289 Janes Road own at least one vehicle, the under planned for off street parking, now set at four vehicles, will force the on street parking for these tenant's vehicles onto the streets fronting the nearby single family, single story residences.

As stated at the previous zoning meeting, the cul de sac where this project is located is already overburdened with on street parking. Please note that on Monday, April 22, 2024 at 6pm, there were 8 vehicles parked on the street, within the cul de sac where the 3289 Janes Road structure will exist..

Thank you for your time,

[REDACTED]

Arcata, CA 95521

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joe Mateer](#)
Subject: 3289 Janes Rd
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 12:03:59 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Planning Commission
City of Arcata
736 F St
Arcata, CA 95521

Note: This public comment was not available for inclusion in the public testimony at the Zoning Administrator's Public Hearing - April 24, 2024. The commentor did provide oral testimony at the public hearing. Joe Mateer, Senior Planner

Subject: 3289 Janes Ct proposed 2 story structure

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing in opposition to the current plan for a 2 story, 7 unit apartment complex, totaling 12 bedrooms from the current 2 bedrooms on the property. I request that the structure being planned, be a single story building, for the following reasons.

Under **Environmental**, pg 5, item E, there will be a **significant** increase in traffic on the Cul-de-sac with the addition of 6 more apartments and parking lot access away from Janes Rd, in the bulb of the cul-de-sac. All traffic entering Janes Ct will have to drive the whole Cul-de-sac to get to the on site parking lot or to parking on the northside of Janes court.

Exhibit 1 page 6, is inaccurate. The last sentences in #1 is not correct.

- The parcel is **not a vacant lot**. Currently, there is a single story, 2 bedroom home on the lot.
- There is ONE **two story** home within a quarter mile. ONE, the rest all are single story homes.
- "Design review is conducted to assure that new construction, modifications or alterations of noteworthy structures, and significant changes to other structures are **harmonious with the existing character of the neighborhood.**"

Here are my concerns

- A two story Structure height of 27ft does not conform with the current neighborhood single story structures. **"The proposed in-fill development has greater building height and massing than the surrounding residential structures"**, per findings pg 6, 3rd paragraph.
- Two story structure, invades the privacy of the homes and residences to the north at Lazy J.
- Cul-de-sac parking is limited, and parking on Janes Rd is unsafe.

- Tenants may use the Right of way for parking on the northside of property when no street parking is available.
- **SPEED.** Janes Rd should be 25 mph from the roundabout through town, not 35mph.
- If there are the 7 proposed units, Traffic will not be “low volume of vehicles“. I disagree with this statement. **A Condition of Approval is included to narrow the small parking lot driveway width from 25 feet to 20 feet or less. This condition is supported by the low volume of vehicles entering and existing the on-site parking area. The slightly narrower driveway width decreases the area people are exposed to vehicles entering or exiting the parking area ”** Notice the shrubs on the east side of the property line? Not a good sight line for drivers exiting the proposed lot.
- NO Trees being planted on the Janes Rd border as it will block the line of sight to the north.

I request that a single story structure be built on the parcel so the property conforms to the surrounding homes in the neighborhood. I hope that the Commission will take into account the potential negative impacts on our neighborhood and make a decision that preserves the quality and character of our community.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature.

To: Zoning Administrator, CDD, City of Arcata

April 22, 2024

From: Concerned and Affected Lazy J Residents

Re: Multi-Family Residential Development located on 3289 Janes Court, Arcata; File No. 234-015-DR-MUP

Rec'd @
Public Hearing 04/24/24
Joe Mateo

We, the undersigned, are tax-paying Lazy J homeowner-residents (mostly) living on or near Chestnut Way, which adjoins the project. We object to a two story building development on these grounds:

1. A two-story building is out of proportion to and taller than almost all the buildings of the neighborhood.
2. A two-story building will loom over the other homes, compromise our privacy, and block our sunlight.
3. We have concerns about light pollution from the outdoor security lighting.
4. We have additional concerns regarding increased noise, traffic, dust, potential toxins in the soil or asbestos from the old house, climate impacts, tribal cultural artifacts, etc, that cumulatively could be significant impacts that may necessitate a full Environmental Impact Report. We strongly urge you to require a full EIR for this project.

1. Name (Print): Gary Blickenstaff

Signature: [Redacted]

Address: Gary Blickenstaff
[Redacted] Chestnut Way
Arcata, CA 95521

2. Name (Print): Carla Earla Pankiewicz

Signature: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted] Chestnut Way

3. Name (Print): Margaret Hoagland

Signature: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted] Chestnut Way

4. Name (Print): Nancy E Pelletier

Signature: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted] Percheron Lane Arcata, CA

5. Name (Print): Lisa R. Pelletier

Signature: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted] Percheron Ln. Arcata

Re: Multi-family residential development at 3289 Janes Court, Arcata, File No. 234-015-DR-MUP

6. Name (Print): Linda Medoff

Signature: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Appalosa Ln, Arcata

7. Name (Print): _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

8. Name (Print): _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

9. Name (Print): _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

10. Name (Print): _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____