

**COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE ACTIONS
ON AHTF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY KEY RECOMMENDATIONS
SEPTEMBER 23, 2003**

ITEM	VOTE	NO POSITION	COMMENT & CONDITIONS (C&C)
1.a.		X (16-3-0)	
1.b.		X(16-3-0)	
2.b.i.	24-1-0 To Support CPC C&C		“Maintain the 20% allocation level with the recommendation that on a year-by-year basis, depending upon the budget situation for that year, the allocation be increased to a maximum of 35%, with the Project Area Committees for each Redevelopment Area making a formal recommendation to the Redevelopment Agency on whether the 20% allocation level should be increased or not.”
2.b.ii.	14-8-2 To Support CPC C&C		“Encourage the increased allocation of CDBG funds on an annual basis, but do not make it a requirement for the City Council to do so.”
2.b.iii.	19-3-0 To Support CPC C&C		“Re-evaluate restoring the Housing Trust Fund Commercial Fee (Linkage Fee) to its original level and report findings to the Land Use and Housing Committee for discussion.”
2.c.i.	13-10-4 Support		
2.c.ii.	13-10-4 Support		
2.c.iii.	13-10-4 Support		
2.d.i.	19-4-1 Oppose		Expressed concern that it is unlikely that the voters would support an increase for TOT if the entire increase went to affordable housing efforts.
2.d.ii.	19-4-1 Oppose		Encouraged the Council to explore this potential revenue source but concerns were expressed about whether the voters would see a nexus between imposing a car rental tax and funding affordable housing.
3.a.	19-4-1 Oppose		Expressed concern that the voters would be unlikely to support such a significant increase in property taxes. Recommend that the City Council consider other funding sources than a Parcel Tax.
3.b.	19-4-1 Oppose		
3.c.	23-0-0 Oppose		
3.d.	13-10-4 Support		
3.e.	17-2-0 To Support CPC C&C		Change to read: “The citizen task force should also develop a strategy for tax increases in conjunction with infrastructure funding.”
3.f.	18-1-0 To Support CPC C&C		Expressed concern about how the “fair share” is determined so that the fees don’t stop development, especially of new affordable housing.”
3.g.	13-10-4 Support		
4.a.	23-0-0		

**COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE ACTIONS
ON AHTF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY KEY RECOMMENDATIONS
SEPTEMBER 23, 2003**

ITEM	VOTE	NO POSITION	COMMENT & CONDITIONS (C&C)
	Oppose		
4.b.	21-3-0 To Support CPC C&C		“Substitute the following recommendation: Encourage the City to explore the development of Master Plans and/or create and apply an infill transit-oriented higher density development incorporating an affordable housing element and including direct involvement of officially recognized community planning groups.”
4.c.	18-4 Oppose		
4.d.	16-5 To Support CPC C&C		“Direct City staff to evaluate surplus public lands that are vacant or underdeveloped, but reject converting either Rose Canyon operating station or Montgomery Field into affordable housing sites. Siting housing in a location that is clearly designated as a fault zone is inappropriate (Rose Canyon). Montgomery Field is an active airport that provides a valuable service to the region and is self-supporting in terms of revenue. CPC understands that a list of “surplus public lands” that are “vacant or undeveloped” has been established by City staff and hereby requests that a copy of the list be distributed to the CPC for review.”
5.a.i.	22-0-0 Support		
5.a.ii.	13-10-4 Support		
5.a.iii.	13-10-4 Support		
5.a.iv.	13-10-4 Support		
5.b.	23-0-0 Oppose		Recommend that City staff, working with the Community Planners Committee, identify sites currently within the City where parking is a problem and, working with the impacted community planning groups, make specific recommendations to the Land Use & Housing Committee on proposed steps that could reduce the current impacts.
5.c.	21-1-0 To Support CPC C&C		Revise the recommendation by deleting the words: <i>“including maximum use of the deviation process”</i> .
5.d.	22-0-0 Oppose		Specific concerns are that a 50% density bonus for eligible projects may be too high, given the impacts to the community, and that the City does not appear to have a consistent definition of what constitutes a “transit corridor.” Simply because a project is on a bus line does not mean that a “transit corridor” exists. A “transit corridor” should provide direct access to specific public services. The City Council should establish clear criteria for what constitutes a “transit corridor” and then apply that standard to proposed projects. Refer this discussion to Land Use and Housing

**COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE ACTIONS
ON AHTF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY KEY RECOMMENDATIONS
SEPTEMBER 23, 2003**

ITEM	VOTE	NO POSITION	COMMENT & CONDITIONS (C&C)
			Committee.
5.e.	20-2-0 Oppose		
5.f.	22-0-0 To Support CPC C&C		“Process 3 would be acceptable. Recommend that there be earlier notice to community planning groups, i.e., when initially submitted to Development Services for processing.”
5.g.	20-2-0 To Support CPC C&C		“Monitor the current \$500 per unit practice and report to Land Use & Housing on a semi-annual basis.”
5.h.	13-10-4 Oppose		
5.i.	22-0-0 To Support CPC C&C		Remove the word ‘multifamily’ from the first sentence, and add the following sentence at the end: “Recommend that City staff evaluate these fees periodically and report findings to the Land Use & Housing Committee.”
5.j.	13-10-4 Support		
5.k.	13-10-4 Support		
5.l.	13-10-4 Support		
5.m.	13-10-4 Support		
6.a.	24-0-0 Oppose		Working together, the Planning Director and the Executive Director of the Housing Commission can perform this function without duplicating existing services and/or adding another layer of government.
6.b.	13-10-4 Support		Clarification on how landscape planners would be able to be reassigned based on 8.B.
6.c.	19-2-0 Support		
7.a.		X (18-1-0)	
7.b.i.	16-5-0 Support		
7.b.ii.	16-5-0 Support		
7.b.iii.	16-5-0 Support		
7.b.iv.	16-5-0 Support		
8.a.	13-10-4 Support		
8.b.i.	13-10-4 Support		
8.b.ii.	16-5 To Support		Increasing the cost of school construction is not a good way to fund the replacement of housing that is demolished in constructing new

**COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE ACTIONS
ON AHTF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY KEY RECOMMENDATIONS
SEPTEMBER 23, 2003**

ITEM	VOTE	NO POSITION	COMMENT & CONDITIONS (C&C)
	CPC C&C		schools. Explore other funding sources. Explore the development of mixed-use school sites that incorporate housing and schools, using innovative design standards.
8.c.		X (12-8-0)	Need specific advice from the City Attorney on the legal impacts of the proposal.
9.a.	13-10-4 Support		
9.b.	17-2-0 To Support CPC C&C		Conditionally support AHTF Recommendation: "CPC hereby requests that such proposed universal design concepts be distributed to all community planning groups and a formal recommendation made by CPC after input from the planning groups is received."
9.c.	13-10-4 Support		
9.d.	13-10-4 Support		
10.a.	13-8-0 Support		
10.b.	19-5-0 Oppose		"large scale" developments should not be released from obligation by payment of in-lieu fees
10.c.	13-10-4 Support		
10.d.	13-10-4 Oppose		The current ordinance provides sufficient flexibility with no changes.
10.e.	13-10-4 Support		
10.f.	13-10-4 Support		
10.g.	13-10-4 Support		