

From: Lee Fagot
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 3:16 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Joel Paulson; Jennifer Armer; Laurel Prevetti
Subject: Please post for Planning Commission to review.

Melanie, Jeff, Kylie, Katheryn, Steve, Reza and Emily,

Thank you, Commissioners and Town Staff, for the commitment to both the process and the final product you are working on for our Community. The long, and LATE, hours you are all putting in is appreciated, as well as the discussions where you each listen to the other's views on issues and work to find compromise - true democracy.

Following last night's (5/28) discussion on changes being proposed to the Density Ranges to achieve the Targeted Housing Element numbers, plus the decade following, a few suggestions:

- When considering changes to the Density Range in the proposed numbers, by Land Use Designations (Pg 182, of Draft 2040GP and Final EIR), please also link the Maximum Height because this too will have a significant impact on the sites being considered. For example, with no units in the Public, Open Space or Agriculture, why change the Max Height from 0 to 30 or 35 feet. Leave at 0, please, to demonstrate consistency.
- And, in Low Density, Medium and High Density Residential Designations, the Draft proposal is more than doubling the Density Range. Please continue to review, keep the densities as close to the current Range to realize the goals (more on goals below) and do NOT increase the Heights in those sites, as the Draft indicates, going up by 50% to 45Ft., just in High Density, for example. That truly changes the character of these "sights and sites" to change the character of our Town, in a negative way. We do not want tenements or row houses as you see in metro areas of our Eastern US cities. "Row" housing is not a good solution. I lived in one once...NO THANK YOU. I could not tell the difference between my street and the next two on the same block.
- Increasing some housing in Mixed Use makes sense, but not at 45 ft heights. Just 35ft.
- Limit Office Professional to 30 unites and Service Professional could move the Density Range to 20 unites per acre from 0, but no more as you pursue the real target for the 20 year plan.
- Please stay focused on the goal of 1993 (next RHNA allocation starting next year), plus a 10% buffer and recognize that the number can be adjusted when the 5 year reviews are done in our General Plan. Trying to forecast 20 years of housing and speculating (guessing) what Sacramento and ABAG (in the next cycle) will demand of us, is far too risky. Remember, too, that developers will then be able to build "by right and without local control" if the Town adopts targets that go beyond reasonable expectations of REAL town growth/demand or to appeal to current reasonable developers. Note that we are seeing declining populations, an aging in place populations and NOT just because of land costs, but folks preference for other lifestyles (less marriages, children, etc), town character and scenery.
- The current average residents per housing unit is 2.4 folks, and the significant population increase projected with the far too aggressive housing unit proposals will have a deleterious effect on VHT, infrastructure, cost to Town Budget, etc. Lets be realistic and focus accordingly.

- Remember why folks moved here, and why they want to stay. This is a pleasant and accommodating community. Lets be accommodating, but do NOT change the real ambiance and character of Los Gatos

Thank you, and keep up your good work for all of us.

Lee Fagot, resident for more than 26 years.