

March 3, 2022

To: General Plan Sub-Committee

Re: General Plan - Comments

We vote for Alternative A which has 30% growth in population, 20% jobs increase and 27% housing increase over the next 20 years.

We do not have the infrastructure or water to even support Alternative A since the proposed densities and heights for Residential and Mixed use have been significantly increased in each category. Low density is proposed as 39 u/a (2.4 times current density) with 3 stories, Medium density is proposed as 99 u/a (2.75 times current density) with 7 stories, and High density is proposed as 200 u/a (4 times current density) with 8 plus stories. We would like to see these proposed densities and heights decreased.

We have great concerns for water, traffic congestion and noise, lack of trees, lack of open space and parks for recreation.

We cannot support Alternative C with 52% growth or Alternative B with 40% growth.

Land-use Alternative A promotes the following:

1. Least expansion of police, fire, schools, parks, and library services since it results in the lowest population growth with Alternative A.
2. Generates the most positive annual net fiscal impacts for the City producing 13 percent more net revenue (\$989,000) than Alternative B and 56 percent more net revenue (\$2.9 million) than Alternate C.
3. Total Vehicle Miles traveled would be lowest under Alternative A with the lowest total amount of residential growth and job growth with least amount of green house gasses.

Thank you for your consideration for Alternative A.

Laurie Watanuki