

## **Public Comments and Responses from the Land Inventory Workshop**

Comments received at the 10/20/05 land inventory workshop are transcribed below. Responses to the comments are shown in italics.

I don't trust the inventory

*You can help us make it more accurate by providing site specific comments through our interactive web based land inventory ([www.planupdate.org](http://www.planupdate.org))*

I appreciate the effort that the county has shown in updating the land inventory

What are the specific problems that the HCD has with the housing element?

*The County is having difficulty meeting the low and very low income housing need*

We haven't seen any new information tonight. We disagree with the County's numbers. We've provided you with information that shows the inventory is inaccurate.

*The update incorporated many of the modifications you have suggested.*

Hookups in City of Eureka – 30 right now?

*30 is not an accurate number for the Eureka sewer system. The range they are giving us at the moment is up to 1,500 units can be served by the existing sewage disposal collection system. There are specific pump station constraints which may be short-term limiting factors for some parcels, but the City and HCSD have placed the highest priority on taking interim corrective actions, and construction of the Martin Slough interceptor is expected in 2007. While our zoning development capacity substantially exceeds today's sewer capacity, based on personnel communication with City and HCSD personnel and our building rates, we don't expect sewer to be constraining through the balance of the 2008 planning horizon.*

Eureka Community Plan Area: development potential in the Eureka Area is shown as 593 units, but we think it's 300 units maximum

HCD estimated hookups in Shelter Cove = 250. Your estimate is 600 units, which is wrong.

*We are not aware of any correspondence from HCD that pegs the infrastructure capacity in Shelter Cove at 250 units. Their sewer system is new and can be expanded as needed, and they are licensed for 990 water connections, which about 600 are currently unused. Assuming a (high) build-out rate of 30 units per year, Shelter Cove building will be unconstrained through the planning horizon.*

The County is short on the multifamily housing inventory for properties zoned R-4.

*The land inventory update revealed a tight supply of multifamily zoned properties, and affirms the importance of direction by the Board of Supervisors for Planning staff to bring forward as part of the General Plan Update an array of alternatives to address the housing needs for lower income persons, including alternatives to place in the land inventory additional properties zoned for multifamily use*

A residential density of at least 20 units per acre is needed in order for affordable housing projects to pencil out.

*We recognize that affordable multi-family housing usually requires parcel sizes of at least an acre, and that simply looking at total development potential is not sufficient. We have made site specific revisions with this land inventory update and taken into account parcel size in calculating development potential for affordable housing in RM areas.*

We need rezoning to put more multifamily properties on-line for affordable housing development

We need a study session on affordable housing policies and programs – How does November work?

*We'll partner with you to make that happen.*

14 units per acre is the maximum density allowed outside the coastal zone; it should be higher. The Coastal Zone allows 30 units per acre, so even though there are more hurdles, apartments can be easier to

build in the long run. Need more multifamily zone properties in inventory – Only infill sites are available now, they're hard to develop

*There are areas in the inland portion of the County that allow 30 units per acre as well.*

Low income housing – why do they have to live in urban areas?

*It is difficult to develop affordable housing unless you're achieving densities of 10 units per acre or more, which can only happen in urban areas.*

Why can't we convert agriculture lands for residential uses? What happens if you can't meet your housing element fair share numbers – will you let us develop the resource lands? Outside the Community Plan Areas.

*The Board of Supervisors directed our office to develop an alternative development pattern scenario that considers converting some resource lands close to or adjacent to existing developed areas in the Urban Study Areas. In adopting the 1995 Eureka Community Plan, nearly 1,000 acres of resource lands were planned and are now zoned for residential development. The service providers are busy constructing the sewer infrastructure for it.*

Half of our quota is for low and very low income and you need infrastructure to serve this

*The County is taking a leadership role coordinating service districts and cities to deliver the necessary infrastructure improvements.*

Can we stay on task here?

The cities have not been accommodating their fair share, *not* the County. We shouldn't expand our developed areas into the resource lands.

*The county has been absorbing the cities' fair share requirements by issuing building permits above the number required according to our fair share housing needs.*

We have trouble with the Urban Studies Area Report: can't understand the numbers in it.

*We can sit down with you and explain the numbers in the report.*

Don't want to see development go into our resource area

What does the 3,717 number mean? If I find that your numbers don't meet our numbers, how will you review these comments? If the owner interest agrees with the County, do you accept it? OR if it doesn't, do you ignore?

*We will use the best available data and best practices, including site visits in evaluating comments on the land inventory.*

What about infrastructure constraints – Who pays for these? Infrastructure constraints are limiting development.

*The County is playing a lead role in developing alternative financing mechanisms for infrastructure maintenance and expansion. We will be developing a set of alternatives for the Board of Supervisors to consider with the General Plan Update.*

When we've tried to annex into the water district, you said "No".

*The area you were proposing for annexation into the Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District along Old Arcata Road has problems with sewage disposal systems, there are serious transportation safety hazards, and we've received a significant amount of public comment that we should keep that area from being developed a higher densities in order to maintain a separation between the cities of Eureka and Arcata.*

What is the planning horizon for the land inventory?

*2008*

How would we check the numbers in your inventory? Can we check it parcel by parcel?

Yes, *the interactive web-based inventory provides a mechanism for property owners to review the assigned development potential and to provide feedback on it.*

Are you saying that we will have 300 hookups (units) in 3 years when the city says 30 hookups?  
*(see previous comments)*

Chuck Nelson's property off of Briarwood Circle – development potential #s may be wrong based on site specific information  
*We'll check into it and update the inventory as appropriate.*

Sesame Street off of Ridgewood – You are counting more lands past a parcel that may never be developed – is there an island effect?  
*(see previous comment)*

You need to look at your commercial lands for High Density Residential  
*With the 2003 Housing Element implementation, the County made changes to the zoning ordinance and general plan to allow apartments above commercial uses.*

The local housing market has grown out of reach to many, and I have a hard time recruiting workers  
Your presentation was just “spin” that did not address a lot of the issues. Looking at the decrease in development potential numbers is proof that the county has “fudged the numbers” and why should anyone believe anything that the county tells them

*The workshop began with a detailed description of how the numbers have been refined through a number of steps, including the mapping of physical and non-physical constraints on parcels in areas planned for growth. The number of units estimated that could be built out on vacant and underdeveloped lands has shrunk from 7,988 submitted in the 2004 Housing Element, to 3,717 for this year based on new information received since then. It seems illogical to argue both that the land inventory is inaccurate due to site specific constraints, and since the inventory was changed, that's proof it is still inaccurate.*

HELP's concerns center on a lack of infrastructure planning, and the county's failure to take up the task of supporting the number of units it says is possible. Called the meeting a waste of time, and no help  
Asked the County to “get real”.

*If you have any specific information that indicates the inventory is not accurate, we will evaluate the evidence and modify the inventory as appropriate.*

Members of HELP and others indicated that they had supplied that information repeatedly  
*Many of the changes in the inventory up to this point respond to the information HELP has provided.*

County need to consider the political and other hurdles that exist to developing the sites that they have asserted are developable. Cites Cutten as an example  
*It is beyond the scope of the land inventory to assess a reduction in development potential due to politics.*

County needs to recognize the existing hurdles to development and incorporate realistic numbers into the plan  
*The inventory is realistic as it considers many factors in calculating development potential.*

If infrastructure such as roads is not provided by county, and developers do not bear the full costs, then areas will not be developed.  
*In other parts of the State, developers are paying more than 20 times the development impact fees currently assessed locally. Impact fees will be one of the alternative financing mechanisms to pay for infrastructure needed to support development that will be presented to the Board of Supervisors with the General Plan Update.*

Preventing development is “in all fairness” probably what the county wants.

*The number of permitted residential development projects have increased over the past five years and the time it takes to process permits has decreased over that same time period, despite the increased workload. The evidence shows the County is supportive of meeting it's fair share of the housing need.*