



Janine A. Roeth <j9roeth@gmail.com>

Zoning changes at 7/23/24 Planning Commission Meeting

1 message

Janine, Santa Cruz YIMBY <j9discuss@gmail.com>

Tue, Jul 23, 2024 at 4:07 PM

To: planningcommission@ci.capitola.ca.us

Hello

Below are my comments sent late yesterday to Director Herlihy about zoning changes being discussed this evening. I apologize for sending them so close to the meeting. I will be there for public comment and can touch on them.

Thank you for all the time you have put into these zoning changes.

Janine

Sent from Mobile

Thank you for all the work that has gone into the package that will be reviewed by the Planning Commission on Tuesday. I have spent time reviewing the past Planning Commission meetings and I appreciate the discussions with a goal to enable more housing, including more objective standards, streamlining the permit processes and adjusting other development standards such as density in residential zones.

The background, consultations and effort you have put into these zoning changes is commendable.

Here are my specific comments on your proposed zoning changes **discussed in past Planning Commission meetings and due up tomorrow evening**. I will send this to the Planning Commission tomorrow, and can speak to it during public comment.

Lot Consolidation - 17.20.040.K; 17.24.030.J

- You are proposing a height increase to 35'. This is equivalent to your RM-H zone and could realistically support 3 stories of residential. In the MU-N zone, this isn't enough when you consider the increased height of a non-residential ground floor. You should consider additional height that allows non-residential ground floor in the MU-N zone.
- Increased height and lot coverage are two of the several strategies you identified in the Housing Element. Are you still considering other actions, e.g. ministerial approval or tax incentives?

Parking - Table 17.76-2 -

- Requiring 2 units for over 751+sq ft in Multifamily is quite high. Your Single Family uses 1500+ sq ft as the threshold for 2 units.
- I know you had the conversation about bedrooms vs. sq footage, we recommend doing it by bedroom count as the City of Santa Cruz, County, and Watsonville all do.
- I also note that the Planning Commission on 2/16/24 recommended removal of covered parking so that one remaining "1 covered" should be removed from the Single Family 1501+ sq ft leaving it at 2 spaces.

Design Review Process - 17.120

- You have not modified the design review criteria of 17.120.070. Much of this criteria is subjective. How does it relate to 17.82 Objective Standards for Multifamily Dwellings?
- When does 17.82 Objective Standards for Multifamily Dwellings get invoked? It is not included in the process of 17.120. Only the design criteria of 17.120.070 is referenced.
- You have added the Development and Design Review Committee to the Design Review Process, 17.120. As

mentioned and discussed at the May 2nd meeting, this adds discretionary review (and more time and cost) to a project. Many of the commissioners (and you) talked about objective standards and a lighter, quicker process, so you should work towards objective standards to eliminate this committee.

Referral of Applications to Planning Commission - 17.112.090

- Why would something that doesn't require the Planning Commission review need to go to the Planning Commission?

ADUs - 17.44.090 C and 17.74

- We support the addition of a CDP waiver for Accessory Dwelling Units in the coastal zone
- See below for comments on the Coastal Zone Overlay

Corner Duplex - Table 17.16-1 -

- Proposed change to R1 zoning for duplex on corner lots. Much of the justification in the 2/16/24 meeting was that the restrictions or allowance of SB9 don't apply to this additional approach to R1 development. Another approach would be to revisit the SB9 and remove limitations like the 1200 sq ft which is not in the law.

Related but not on the agenda for July 23rd

We wanted to highlight that your Coastal Overlay Zone also should be made more objective. *17.44.130 Findings for Approval* are highly subjective which adds discretionary review (and time and cost) to a project. This potentially undermines your incentives or processes to streamline housing development. The County is looking to do a review of their LCP in Program H-3G in the County's Housing Element which Capitola should track and emulate.

Thanks again,
Janine