

**Verbal Public Comments  
General Plan Update  
Preliminary Hearing Draft  
Planning Commission Hearing 3/15/07 – Group 1**

<b>Index #</b>	<b>Synopsis of comments received during Planning Commission meeting</b>
<b>V17</b>	Julie Williams, Northern California Association of Home Builders (NCHB): Concerned about not being heard or reflected in the record. Memories fade, so if you wait ‘till the end, will we be remembered? CEQA needs to include existing plan policies. Policy implications need to be thought through. We want a vote on keeping the public comment period open for all chapters.
<b>V18</b>	Jim Furtado, NCHB: Read letter from NCHB. Dismayed at lack of staff response reflecting comments of NCHB. We want our comments to be considered. We had more than 70 of them on Group 1.
<b>V19</b>	Debbie Provolt: When you do finalize the guiding principles, take your time. They should be more responsive to property rights. Staff’s recommendations don’t consider them adequately.
<b>V20</b>	Charles Ciancio: Public comment gets lost, staff is biased. Questions about process. When will the final wording be complete? Zoning violation penalties. It’s a misdemeanor. You’re passing a lot of ordinances that can result in misdemeanors, so consider them well.
<b>V21</b>	Kay Backer: HELP: Who are the decision makers here? Staff seems to be overreaching their role as advisors. HELP was formed because many people were ignored, and that seems to be continuing here. Staff seems to be dictating the time you can debate these issues. CEQA doesn’t limit your ability to come back and review something again. You need that flexibility to deal with inconsistencies. Some staff report comments are not factual.
<b>V22</b>	Hannah Klapsaddle: It’s important to keep Alternatives A, B & C distinct. Don’t make Alternative B look like C. Keep “quality of life” in the guiding principles. Would like to protect open space and encourage higher density development.
<b>V23</b>	Ben Shepherd: All 3 Alternatives would encourage development in existing serviced areas, but the character of the County is more rural, so you would be changing the character of the County. Development in newer subdivisions don’t have yards, which is a loss. We need to allow for larger lots. Make language specific and clear. P. 1-3 “efficient” use of services. Not sure what that word means. P. 1-6 Restrictions on resource lands. Far too specific for guiding principle. #8 add minimize cost of housing. Not sure what “walkable communities” means or “supports a healthy lifestyle”. “Sustainable” is another term I’m not sure about. Housing Element should be redone and not a part of this plan. Reduction of lots outside community planning areas – see above comments. “Full public participation” will that require a Planning Commission hearing?
<b>V24</b>	Virginia Graziani: Supports Healthy Humboldt, Alternative A. Housing affordability is a problem here and in other parts of the State. If we’re really concerned about affordable housing for working families, I don’t see how that can be addressed without increasing density. Redway project had a lot of opposition because it was high density, but it was built out and the developers did a good job. Everyone wants a large lot, but we need to proceed carefully because large lots create more environmental impacts than smaller lots. And they won’t address affordable housing. Some people believe agricultural lands aren’t viable, but there’s an organic dairy conference going on because we’ve got so many farmers interested, and because it will make their land viable for agricultural use.
<b>V25</b>	Ken Poletski: Humboldt Association of Realtors (HAR): It’s difficult to understand what changes are proposed. Not sure about putting the chapters down as they are and just looking at them at the end of the process. We’ve spent a lot of time on our response. We’re not so happy about staff’s response to our concerns – not being heard. Affordable housing equals subsidized housing. We want it to say “market rate affordable housing”. Not just lower income. Want to see moderate income household’s needs addressed as well.
<b>V26</b>	Nick Lucchesi, NCHB: General comment about the process. Public forum on Energy

	Element. None of my viewpoints got into the RCEA document. It didn't reflect the whole group. Concerned that could happen with this Plan as well. Standards need to be clear.
<b>V27</b>	Tina Christensen: Proceed slowly. Infrastructure analysis needs to be complete before we can think about putting more high densities in urban areas. Go slow!
<b>V28</b>	Jen Kalt, Native Plant Society. The BOS already laid out the parameters of the alternatives considered in the Plan. We've got 20,000 large lot parcels that could be built on – that seems like enough to me.
<b>V29</b>	Mark Lovelace, Healthy Humboldt: There's been a lot of public input at every step of the general plan update process. Don't revisit decisions that have already been made. Don't revise the guiding principles. We want a good set of alternatives. Be clear of different choices. None of these alternatives can be a "straw man". Alternative A needs to be feasible. We should have scalable development in Alternative A. Need "quality of life" in the guiding principles. New economic study: sectors that are growing are dependant on our high quality of life. Industry, high tech, (one more). Housing doesn't drive the economy. We need housing affordable for those that work here.
<b>V30</b>	David Cobb, Democracy Unlimited: There's been a lot of public process for input into the general plan. Decisions have been made, votes were taken, and now a few individuals are trying to undermine the public process. HELP caricatures in the newspaper, lawsuit against the County. Quality of life is critical. Infrastructure cost of infill is less than sprawl of Alternative C. Alternative C is a recipe for sprawl. Affordable housing for all income levels? The term has implications in State and federal law.
<b>V31</b>	Diane Ryearson, Healthy Humboldt. Not sure about P-7. Are we picking and choosing among guiding principles? What I thought is we were to propose language to better differentiate between the alternatives.
<b>V32</b>	Dave Peake: Quality of life includes freedom to do what we want to do. Rules for urban areas don't fit rural areas. Need to allow for more spread out development.
<b>V33</b>	Hans Parshall: Quality of life includes allowing larger lots. The Plan shouldn't force people onto smaller lots.
<b>V34</b>	Shannon Tracey: Affordable housing, transportation cost are concerns. We need to have some areas where infill is allowed. Quality of life includes open spaces. Cost of maintaining road infrastructure is less with infill development. Supports Alternative A
<b>V35</b>	Rob McBeth: Cluster industries in new economic study – one of those was mine. My employees can't afford a home. Need to address affordable housing. Less regulations would help.
<b>V36</b>	Chuck Harvey: We have to face reality of impending global catastrophe.
<b>V37</b>	Jim Hoff: Infill is OK in the desert. Many properties in the urban areas can't be developed. We need a mechanism to allow for those infill parcels to be used.