

GATEWAY CODE WORKSHOP #2 SURVEY

STREETSCAPE DESIGN, MOBILITY/PARKING, PRIVATELY OWNED PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE

Survey Part 1: Streetscape Design Standards

Question 1: What is your general reaction to the recommended streetscape design approach?

23 responses

- Positive - I like the requirement for community spaces, sidewalks, and green (trees & plants)
- The wider the frontage zone the better. Especially if there isn't any setback on 2,3 and 4th floors.
- I think it will incentivize people to walk and gather more, additionally reducing need to depend on a car. I'd like there to be shuttle systems and alternative transportation parking visible in streetscape design.
- I am very excited by moving away from a car-centered model for our streets. As an Arcata resident who mostly walks and rides my bike in town, this will be a huge improvement!
- "New streetscape improvements consistent with the Code will be required only when a property is redeveloped. Improvements will be required only for street frontages abutting the redevelopment site. An existing property that does not redevelop will not be required to install new streetscape improvements or conform with new building placement standards." The above language should be further clarified by defining property redeveloped: as property that is permitted after the Gateway Draft is approved. Otherwise, any pre-Gateway Draft approval redevelopment/ remodel/ addition could be viewed as a trigger for new street scape requirements, beyond the original terms of a permit. It would be helpful to offer a diagram that shows an example of a new development next to an existing structure with the interphase of the recommended street scape next to an existing property that wouldn't require the recommended street scape.
- I appreciate the sidewalk widths and the street furniture zones. I think 15 foot setbacks for "Non-active" frontages is too much.
- fine
- Trees don't grow well surrounded by pavement. Use native shrubs. Where's the bike lane?
- I like it. I prefer tree lined streets so I hope the city can plant trees it won't have to cut down when they start to get big. There are ways to do that and I think the wider sidewalk is a start.
- Like the separation of pedestrians and traffic.
- Nicely designed to be sure, but looks pretty urban. Too much pavement.

- It's fine. Upgrade from basic curb and gutter. But providing should not be "traded off" for more height. Use your police power and simply require it.
- looks interesting. Not sure if all the elements are listed.
- I very much like the landscape/amenity zones in downtown and neighborhood landscapes, which insulate pedestrians from traffic. The requirement for privacy setbacks in neighborhoods are also beneficial to everyone. I'm puzzled about cyclists: will they get protection from moving vehicles as the pedestrians do?
- I like all of the steps taken to increase walkability, but we don't need to much landscaping aside from some trees.
- As stated in the Street Scape Design Standards Recommended Approach: Existing residence that are not redeveloping are not required to install new street scapes improvements or conform with new building placement standards. However, further clarification is needed: When a residence that is not redeveloping abuts a redeveloping property, It will not be required to install new street scape improvements or conform with new building placement standards.
- The options look good, and the wider the better assuming space is available and landowners will provide additional space. Do you plan to make this part of the form-based code so that developers will be required to provide these streetscapes (and not simply as amenities, which are optional).
- wide sidewalks and street trees
- Providing high-quality streetscapes that are visually interesting and provide safe AND comfortable places to walk and gather are wonderful visions. Thank you!
- I like them. Provides a good balance between uses, with a bit less to autos than we have now which is a positive.
- Generally good. I don't see how individual property owners will want to give up 15 feet or so that is part of the plan.
- Ben, this is Fred Weis. Thank you for your work on this. I spent time on entering my results (from memory) and when I went to submit all was lost. It is now 4:58. Please allow me a few minutes to re-type my inputs. It was my fault for waiting to complete this. Thank you. Basically, okay.
- This is a message for Ben Noble. This survey is being sent via a duplicate Google account. In this survey, it does not make a lot of difference if a person enters their views more than once...right? A person could create 10 accounts and make entries for each. It takes just a few minutes to make a 2nd (or 3rd or 10th) new Google accounts.

Question 2: Do you have any comments on the specific standards for the two example street typologies?

21 responses

- The larger sidewalk in high traffic area makes this a lot more accessible for those in wheelchairs or pushing strollers.
- Are there any options for businesses to have a larger outdoor presence, if they prefer?
- Figure 3 with the Town Center Street seems better than the other but there is not any setback on the buildings shown in the examples.
- Neighborhood typology's would serve more of an arcata feel. I think there can be space for both, but also centering spaces with fruit trees, and community garden space. A community bulletin board, something for he vets, and animal care fountains.
- How will existing structures that front a zero-lot line, or a reduced frontage setback be affected by these two examples of street typologies. For example, existing residences and/or businesses located on L Street, south of 8th Street and north of 9th Street outside of Town Center typology. The assumption is the entire frontage of the existing "non redeveloped" property will not be required to install new street scape standards or conform with new building placement standards, unless redevelopment occurs.
- The "town center" type should apply to 11th Street in much of the plan area. This is already an area with lots of businesses and heavy pedestrian use, and will become more so.
- Where there is not enough room on major connecting streets(like 8th, 9th, and 11th st) for protected bike lanes, this should be included within the property line, just like sidewalks.
- I like the separate parking, biking, and driving lanes: all not on the sidewalk.
- Where do bikes go? Is there a separation of bikes from pedestrians? Is there a separation of bikes and other vehicles?
- Landscaping should be required on the non-active 15' frontage zones in order to break up the concrete and allow for drainage and prevent the "heat island" effect - with climate change, heat is more and more likely in Arcata especially in a concrete/built out environment. Also, consider permeable surfaces.
- If street is shady and cold then " amenities" will not be enjoyable to, say, sit outside. Still needed is a shadow map assuming tall buildings. See Fulton Ave in Berkeley where new tall buildings 7-8 stories have created a dark, shady canyon in what used to have sun..
- I don't understand the question. I like the way they look. for highly used areas, IO like the concept of active space. For less used, I like private space against the homes.
- No. The dimensions seem fine. I like the 10' sidewalks! I think they will feel safe and welcoming to walkers.
- More sidewalk and less continuous landscape, just occasional trees/vegetation/art/etc.

- Provides diagrams that illustrate the interphase between existing non redeveloped properties and redeveloped infill in relation to both street typologies.
- They look fine, assuming you can obtain the width proposed. But you do need to provide for fire truck access to the buildings where you have potentially large trees and wide sidewalks. How will that work?
- islands off the sidewalk for benches and reflection
- "May be tailored for unique conditions on individual parcels" does not build confidence in my certainty. I feel we all have to compromise for the sake of certainty. Since onsite parking will be significantly reduced, I feel that adhering to this wide sidewalk vision should be very concrete and not be subject to too much "wobble-room" for modifications/easily granted variances. **Please consider language in the FBC that limits/discourages developers to leniently ask and receive variances for the proposed wide sidewalks.
- What happens in a case where a parcel has "legacy" buildings on one side or the other -- where it's unlikely that there will be a wider sidewalk on adjacent properties?
- Non-active is 15-7-5' and active is 5-7-5'. It seems that Active should be the larger of the two... so I don't understand the need for deeper sidewalks in non-active zones.
- If you have received this message, this is the result of a duplicate account. That is, 1 person has 2 (or more) accounts. Please report this situation to Jen Dart at the City of Arcata, and also to bn-survey@arcata1.com Thank you.

Question 3: Do you have any comments on varied frontage zone standards for active and non-active frontage types?

20 responses

- Really like the idea of frontage for both commercial and residential.
- What about a choice for a non-active section and the addition of an active section. Especially on building 3 or more stories high.
- No active frontage should all have a component of housing. Active frontage should be centralized not scattered.
- Before the street typologies are finalized into form-based code, a map should be formulated to clarify under what typography each street/block, within the proposed Gateway District, will be subjected to.
- 15 foot vegetation-dominated frontage zones for residential buildings will limit housing production unnecessarily, and will make it much harder to create a vibrant pedestrian environment. If you are going to require a larger setback/frontage zone for these uses, it

should be a porch/patio area that creates a friendly neighborhood feeling between residents and street users, not a vegetation screen that keeps people apart.

- I watched the video last week so I can't remember these specifics.
- The more space there is between vehicles and buildings, the nicer the space is.
- Without built-out modeling, I can't visualize where in Arcata one might achieve the "Town Center Street Typology Non-Active Building Frontage Type." With a total of 60' of frontage zone, sidewalk and landscape/amenity zones if both sides of the street are built in this fashion, and then up to one or two lanes for vehicular traffic, it seems pretty unrealistic that we'll ever see this happen.
- They're fine. But should not be considered a "community benefit". Should simply be required for new construction.
- I answered that as question 2.
- The shallower vs deeper frontage zones for active vs non-active types is appropriate for the different uses. Private residence owners may react to the increased setback dimensions due to added sidewalk easements, but it's better city planning that way and makes for a more "livable" environment for everyone, so I support it. I would be willing to accommodate this kind of change in my own neighborhood, so don't feel bad about asking others to accept it.
- I don't think there needs to be more frontage for non-active/private, yards can be nice but take up space, water use, also contributes to less community
- Provide a block by map to identify what street typology will applied applied to that neighborhood.
- The varied frontage zone standards are good, but you do need to find ways to incentivize landowners/developers to dedicate part of their frontage for this to work. How will you do that? Will you need to use eminent domain to obtain the desired frontage if property owners don't agree? Will they be part of the form-based code and thus mandatory for developers/new purchasers of the properties?
- variety is good, with set backs from the street, recessed patio entrances, ground floor apartments with a garden entrance for each unit.
- Active: I question if 5 feet is wide enough to accommodate a quality outdoor dining experience. How can 5 feet be enough room to allow for usable tables, comfortable chairs, multiple patrons, servers...? This measurement seems very limited and dining activities will organically encroach onto the pedestrian sidewalks, thus creating unnecessary conflicts.
**Please consider widening the Active Frontage measurements of 5 feet to match the Non-Active Frontage measurement of 15 feet. 15 feet seems more realistic to the average American diner.
- I don't fully understand why active should be 5-7-5 and non-active be 15-7-5.

- See above
- Thank you for your work in making a new Form-Based Code for Arcata.

Question 4: Is there anything else you would like to share about streetscape design standards?

18 responses

- Some have suggested that all bike racks be covered but I disagree. If there's a concern about weather people can buy seat covers.
- Diagrams do not show any options for variances on the street for bike/car parking, etc.
- Make it bike paradise, longboard heaven and roller blade rockin.
- Following approval, the of the draft, the proposed street topology standards for redevelopment offer an opportunity for increase open public space to possibly interphase along a future L Street Linear Park.
- Don't forget about bikes! The landscape zone should have regular bike parking areas, and you should consider where the bike lanes will go. Putting the bike lane between the sidewalk and the landscape zone is one possibility, to buffer the bike lane from both moving cars and the door zone, although it makes access to pedestrian amenities like benches more difficult. In any case, bike lanes will need a physical buffer on many of these streets, which means cars can't be parked directly next to the landscape zone as shown in the diagrams.
- It'd be nice to have more emphasis on walking and biking.
- I was concerned about some of the parking options. I like the idea of having a bike, pedestrian and alternative transportation friendly community. But I also know this is the hub north east and south: at least a hundred miles out. Everyone comes to Arcata. They are rural community members, they drive, and need to park to shop, etc. Also I remember that having a car as a young mama made a huge difference in my ability to meet my child's needs away from home. Lastly, as a disabled old person, I need to drive because my body doesn't work anymore. This plan should not make any of our lives harder. We all need to park. The easier it is to find a spot, the less we are driving around.
- Keep bicycles and motor vehicles separated.
- Concerns about private frontage: Will a requirement for a property owner to give up 15-25' of private land for private, active or non-active frontage, or 12-22' have a chilling effect on development? Will developers go for a density bonus project instead and get these requirements waived? Will it feel like there is no setback if paving up to the edge of a building is allowed? Are there precedents regarding a private property owner's liability for accidents/injuries/criminal activity that takes place in their privately-owned publicly accessible open space? Does the City take on that liability as a result of requiring this type of

use? If not, will a developer ever opt for this type of use? The City should secure publicly-owned public space before upzoning inflates land prices. A linear park at L Street between Alliance and Samoa is very popular and will preserve the great walkable, bikeable, community spirit that we now have at and around the Creamery Building. I wish diagrams had shown an entire street instead of just one half, from both the "section" and "plan view" perspectives. For that matter, a built-out 3D model of the GAP might actually HELP get these drastic zoning changes accepted by the community. Don't write off our concerns as "fear of change."

- Keep in mind safety, community, privacy, aesthetic value, noise level, pollution in the air caused by traffic, multiuse, homeless population needs.
- I know this pedestrian-centered process has been evolving in many other communities, so Arcata isn't pulling designs out of a hat. I trust that city designers know what works best; the plans look good to me.
- Redeveloped expanded street scape typology has the potential to flow into a walking mall or linear park, increasing the public realm and multiplying the Community benefit.
- Go for as much frontage width as possible to encourage pedestrian traffic and active frontage usage by both businesses and residential properties.
- variety
- 11th Street is very busy with lots of pedestrian activity. Not clear as to why it is being considered equivalent to 12th Street (and other east/west streets in the Plan area). **Please consider 11th Street's assessment of pedestrian activity somewhere in-between the Town Center AND the other east/west streets.
- I don't know the necessary width to allow outdoor/ sidewalk eating opportunities, but would like to make sure that is built in. The use designation should also allow for this. Would like to also see options for parklets for more outside options for restaurants.
- If there is 5-7-5 -- with 12' for pedestrians -- there could be, say, 10' for peds, add 5', then you'd have an 8' bike lane included there.
- I question if developers will be happy about giving up an additional 12' - 22' of their parcel. It also seems that the sidewalk/frontage could be, say, 10' total, and add 5' to the setback, and then you'd have 8' for a bike lane. Also, what happens when there is an adjoining "legacy" building that is not being developed? Where the existing building is much closer to the street. Is the wide sidewalk then discontinuous?

Survey Part 2: Mobility and Parking

Question 5: Do you have any specific recommended revisions to the proposed mobility and parking standards?

20 responses

- I'd encourage serious consideration of ADA and strollers accessibility.
- Please don't allow too much parking - our long term trajectory and our long term goals are to use fewer personal cars.
- Development that has a combination of commercial and residential needs to have clear guidelines for parking requirements. I don't see that the required parking is near enough for Arcata's wet climate nor not realistic for the amount of folks that will have cars. This area is too rural and folks like to drive to the river, ocean, forest, etc. I would highly recommend that a parking facility be created for folks to park cars when not in use. Edge of town, barrel district, bottoms, somewhere.
- A limited parking as possible. Remove traffic from this area. Only resident and some hotel. Develop shuttle from plaza, sunny brae, Manila. Alliance, valleywest, old arcata road, west end road, and creamery. Make the university pay for it. Or work with them and other transportation agency's to discuss alternatives to busses.
- I strongly support proposed mobility and parking standards for the Gateway Code. I am an Arcata renter who is seeking to reduce my dependence on a car and these revisions will be so useful to me – and transformative to so many others!
- 2. Unbundled Residential Parking Spaces. Payment for residential parking spaces must be unbundled from the cost of rent or purchase. The cost of the parking space must be included as a separate line item in the unit sale price or rental agreement. How will this policy be enforced? Will it ultimately save renters any money with Market rate housing? Or will housing units and the parking spaces go to the deepest pockets? Leaving lower income renters to circle around Arcata, emitting CO2 from the tail pipe, searching for limited parking. The ultimate goal appears to hopefully reduce emissions and possibly have less vehicles on the road. Lower income tenants will likely be priced out of limited monetized off-street parking and possibly priced out of their vehicles; however, due to zero off street parking minimums of the future high-density infill, on street parking will eventually be overtaxed. If future infill requires no parking minimum, then the city needs to model for the potential future demand for on street parking and prepare for the reality of parking garages.
- 1. Remove minimum parking requirements for "employment uses" and hotels. There is no basis for requiring these. 2. Reduce maximum parking limits. 3. TDM plans should be required for larger multifamily residential and for moderate-sized non-residential uses, not just those greater than 10k sf. 4. Parking cashout and unbundling for commercial spaces should be required to be offered on a daily basis, as paying for parking daily has been shown to be more effective at reducing driving than buying annual or monthly passes. 5. Guaranteed ride home should be a TDM option. 6. TDM programs should have the option of including other measures which can be justified by evidence as having similar or better effects than those specified in the code. 7. Carpool and carshare parking space requirements are insufficient. It will take more than 1 shared car for every 50 units to convince most people not to own a

personal vehicle. Also, the threshold for non-residential should be 10,000 sf (as for the TDM program), not 40,000, which will likely not apply to many or any new buildings, and the threshold should be lowered for residential buildings as well. 8. Surface parking should not be allowed to touch the pedestrian zone; it should always be behind buildings. 9. Bike parking for residential uses should be required to meet higher standards for weather and theft protection, as it will often/always be used for longer-term/overnight storage.

- Residential TDM should be required for buildings over 4 stories, and not be part of a community benefit menu. Indoor bike storage should be required for all residential with spaces equal to number of bedrooms. In order to have a car free lifestyle, there must be a protected place to park the "car alternative". Would you leave your bike on the street overnight? Ebikes should not be parked inside units due to fire risk.
- yes. I think adequate parking should be provided and not limited. Hopefully everyone will walk, bike, bus, or other wherever they need to go instead of driving, but it is short sighted to take away people's options. It feels dictatorish. Just because there is a space, doesn't mean they have to have a car. It is an option. Now if they rent for an out of town trip or have a guest who drives, they have a spot to park. It is a nightmare to travel anywhere that doesn't have adequate parking and it is ignorant to think we can all manage without a car.
- Provide safe, convenient parking for EVs (all kinds) that includes charging stations.
- No parking maximums. Parking is expensive for developers to provide - that should be a deterrent on its own. On the other hand, projects won't get built if the developer thinks people with cars won't rent from them. "The market" should indicate the middle ground. Requiring an onsite TDM coordinator will chill the development of office, R&D, and other defined employment uses. Add requirements for EV charging!
- The reality is people will still have cars. You can't wish it away. Standard parking ratios should be required, or find places for parking structures and require in lieu fee from project developers to construct and maintain. Seniors rely on their cars at least thru their 70s. They're not going to bike, or carry groceries on a bus. It is nuts to eliminate all parking requirements. Developers know many renters reject units with no parking, and most recognize and accept, that they ll have to pay for it.
- no.too complicated to give an intelligent, informed response.
- No parking minimums
- If zero off street parking is mandated in residential infill, then ADA parking need to be clearly addressed to fully accommodate ADA standards.
- Minimum parking spaces should be required for all multistory residential properties as well as for all commercial businesses. Plan on building at least 1 multistory parking structure in areas expected to have high density usage offering paid public parking.
- parking in rear, under back of buildings

- 1) GA-7a: Revisit language order b/c "vehicles" and "trucks" are written 2x in the sentence. 2) **Please consider including electric vehicle infrastructure when creating parking slots. 3) **Subsidized transit passes should specify minimum # of years, (and should expand beyond 3-5 years). 4) There have been rumors that Sorrel residents are selling their subsidized transit passes. 5) **Please consider increased safe & covered bicycle parking as requirements and not as benefits. 6) Bike Infrastructure needs to be solid to avoid theft. (I have heard that even some city staff do not trust locking their own personal bikes to downtown racks). Provide for larger frames/trikes. 7) Futuristic, creative single-occupancy vehicle transportation visions (golf carts, mini cars) seem absent from these discussions. 8) Yes to draft policy GA-7m: Parking lot locations/proposed standards. 9) Employee showers do not seem like a community benefit to me.
- No, I like it.
- Concept and intent is good -- but not suitable for Arcata, unfortunately. Providing fewer parking spaces will NOT reduce the number of cars substantially, in my opinion. So the cars will spill over into parking spaces in adjoining neighborhoods.

Question 6: Is there anything else you would like to share about parking and mobility standards?

20 responses

- The basic concept of encouraging more walkability is a good one especially if it's paired with more public and ride share transportation.
- Paid parking with low amounts of available parking is going to create a competition for parking with higher income folks coming out on top. Not a good feel for equality with development! Better reached deeper into your thoughts and come up with some other alternatives.
- What about the rail road. Marin just got a rail working again and it's been a great success. Cross guards might be a nice touch for tamilies and to create a slow paced apneaphere. Also fountain stations easily accessible.
- I want to say thank you for being forward-looking and helping use our built environment to usher in a car-free future that will be more sustainable and also help foster mobility and community.
- Owning a vehicle is expensive and getting more off the roads contributes to safer roads and lower CO2 emissions. In a perfect world, you could flip switch and people will abandon their vehicles. Unfortunately, the premise requires the growing pains of congestion, in hopes that it will become too inconvenient to own a vehicle. It also relies on an improved, more reliable public transportation system. In addition, Cal Poly needs to educate and incentivize student to live a car free lifestyle, otherwise, the additional pressure of increased enrollment will represent a continual net gain in vehicles on the road. Ultimately, active transportation will be

key moving people outside of automobiles. Another reason the City of Arcata should preserve the L Street Rails with Trails Corridor and enhance its open spaces into a linear park.

- See above.
- Let's promote walking, bicycling, and mass transit. Makes for a friendlier area than parking lots and noisy cars.
- I really liked the suggestion from a community member to add electric charging ability to all the parking spaces. I thought that was really smart and far sighted.
- A motor vehicle is still the cheapest, most practical mode of transportation for Humboldt County. Until that changes we need to provide safe parking for tenants that includes the ability to charge their vehicles using their own utilities.
- With a great amount of density already allowed in the Draft Plan, how is a developer going to be incentivized to go for more density through the community benefit program? I believe it will be easier for a developer to do a density bonus project and get a bunch of City requirements waived.
- Do not concur with the premise that parking demand can simply be ignored. Parking will simply be forced into other neighborhoods , shifting the impacts there. See Berkeley or any dense urban city. I no longer even go there. They've created a mess. Primary should be requirement of working EV chargers to meet the energy goals. It is not a " community benefit", especially as the EV fleet grows. If you're expecting more bicycles you'd better provide spaces to store them safely.
- ditto.
- I'm concerned that the city will underestimate Gateway residents' need for cars. Rural living is by definition spread-out, and cars are often needed to access outlying areas or avoid adverse weather, especially for older and mobility restricted folks. Tourists and visitors from, say, Trinidad or Kneeland will also need parking spaces. Extra fees for residential parking would be a hardship for some low-income people who rely on their cars for moving between multiple work sites and transporting equipment. Could there be waivers for these individuals? One more thing, which I brought up at the Zoom meeting: I don't understand why multi-layer parking isn't considered (or maybe I missed it?). If parking is to be accessed via alleyways, and the lower level of parking could be slightly below ground level, then the visual impact of second or third levels wouldn't detract from the overall visual appeal of the area.
- Neighborhood residential parking permits should be issued for the Gateway District or eliminated from all other neighborhoods in Arcata.
- People are going to have cars for the foreseeable future, until public transportation options improve or car-sharing increases. Be sure to make adequate provision for that. Promote car-sharing alongside bike sharing. Need to have vehicle charging stations throughout.
- zip car+shared cars program, bike and scooter parking

- Limiting onsite parking and relying on street parking will most likely require the city to eventually build a multi-story vehicle parking structure garage (probably with loans/bond \$\$), similar to the other cities that also naively believed cars would not be necessary for seniors, families, disabled, visitors, professionals, beach/nature loves, etc. (Even developer Mr. Strombeck has stated it was unrealistic to assume most of his renters would not have cars.)
- 2) **Please consider holding a GAP Mobility/Transportation Study Session with the Planning Commission/City Council. The seniors, disabled, business owners, young parents' voices are not being heard.
- 3) I find it ironic that decision-makers (including staff) individually drive to these meetings, park their cars, and then discuss limited parking standards and alternative modes of transportation.
- I appreciate that it includes the best practices from other jurisdictions and some new policies to try. We certainly need to lessen auto usage and not design our community around their needs.
- Developers have stated that they will not build with less than 1 car per unit. Also, the available street parking is being severely reduced for other reasons -- in many areas it is <50% of what it is now. I'm in favor of the concept, but not the actuality. Not practical.
- A local developer has stated that he cannot have at least 1 space per unit, then he will not build. They developers have to be able to successfully rent out their units, and he doesn't feel it can be done with 0.25 parking. What is not stated is that while the Plan says that there will be "adequate" on-street parking, in reality, with new street designs, bulb-outs, etc., the on-street parking spaces are being reduced by in many cases over 50% -- no kidding. This is a problem.

Survey Part 3: Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Open Space

Question 7: Do you have any comments on the specific standards for privately owned publicly accessible open space?

17 responses

- Great concepts here. Especially linking the spaces.
- It would be ideal to have these spaces provide walking access TO something (another street, etc).
- The city should be preserving any open space they can so that there isn't a reliance on developers to pick (maybe) open space as an community benefit. A good example would be the Public and Transportation Safety's vision of the L Street becoming a permanent Linear Park. We saw the recent failure at the Sorrel building as the developer maximized on units. One of the last opportunities to open up a segment of the Jolly Giant was lost forever and folks are left with reliance on City Parks for their open space activities.

- Commercial kitchen spaces! Commercial refrigeration storage, green space for permaculture and seed and food producing. Dog area working out agreement with Coastal commission and lean into community support for an arcata dog park area. Should be open and not enclosed area. Designated offleash area. And trail.
- In Table 1 Publicly owned private space requirements should begin at 4 stories, otherwise tenants are penalized when renting in 4 story buildings and developers are incentivized by not having to set aside the open space. Ultimately, private open space within the development may all be amenity driven and not guaranteed.
- Standards for public access should also specify that all activities allowed by law in a public space - including freedom of assembly and freedom of speech - are also allowed in privately owned, publicly accessible open space.
- Very good: Linked together by safe and convenient bike/pedestrian facilities. Adequately maintained for public access and safety.
- I remember there were the dual recommendations of natural scape and providing trails for the disabled. I absolutely believe all public open space comply with the ADA standards of accessibility. And I love natural scapes. We can have both. I also remember, during the sidewalk portion, a community member kept stating she needed sun to sit and walk in. I want to add that, as a disabled person, I need shade. The sun can make me sick. Believe it or not, it's an autoimmune thing.
- Unless the city finds a way to fund and build parks in the gateway area, we need more open space.
- It looks like you don't have to provide it under 6 stories. I strongly object to no accessible space. I think that regardless of the height of the building, there should be publicly accessible open space. The way the project is described at the beginning of this survey implies by graphics and language that there will be ample open space. I don't understand.
- Privately owned public open space requirement standards should apply starting at 4 story buildings under 30,000 square feet.
- Mandate the creation of privately owned publicly accessible open space.....not just as an amenity. Otherwise it won't happen. I like the idea that they can be interconnected. Determine the landowner's legal ability to set public usage standards so that they retain the right to avoid homeless encampments in such spaces...e.g. set time of usage standards, noise limits, etc.
- designed for the tenants of the building in the sunny area with partial shade. trees, outdoor seating, planters to define the area with an eating or card/game area
- 1)** 3-D modeling would be SOOO helpful with these draft standards. 2) Yes to "Glazing on the ground floor [windows] shall be transparent and non-reflective." 3) Yes to fences, walls & hedges with a maximum height of 36 inches.

- For a larger space, or the suggested square, will agreements include discussion of who is responsible for any security needs?
- Should be required for all buildings -- not just for those above 4 stores.
- Should be required for ALL development, of any height.

Question 8: Do you have any other thoughts to share about privately owned publicly accessible open space in the Gateway Area?

19 responses

- I would encourage space requirements for 4 story buildings as well especially if they're mixed use.
- Some roof deck, public space would be nice too.
- Figure 7s open space concept is frankly laughable. More well thought out ideas and details for this idea are needed. Keep working. Try harder. Be more creative.
- Bring ambassadors of a sort to table through a business improvement district that is connect but seperate to arcata main street.
- Yes, I think that the current plan for privately owned publicly accessible open space is an exciting approach to helping support developments that add to the vibrancy of our town and address community needs. My one piece of feedback is around how these spaces interact with law enforcement. In other places I have lived, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces have been over-policed – making them unwelcoming to communities of color and other communities that have mistrust of law enforcement. While I know that this is outside of the boundaries of a zoning plan, I would invite City staff to think about community-based interventions that keep these spaces safe and welcoming without an outsized police presence.
- 1 Proposed open Standards 2 Pay in Lieu to be used by the city to construct offsite public space should dedicated to Gateway specific parks. For example, Pay in Lieu can go to the enhancement of the existing L Street Rails with Trails Corridor and all of its open spaces into a Linear Park
- The city should consider how to limit or prohibit private policing and over-policing of these spaces in general, in order to ensure that they are truly public and truly welcoming to all.
- Need to have active amenities, ie. basketball courts, tennis courts, pickleball courts, bocce lanes, swings, playground equipment, etc.
- Are there precedents regarding a private property owner's liability for accidents/injuries/criminal activity that takes place in their privately-owned publicly accessible open space? Does the City take on that liability as a result of requiring this type of use? If not, will a developer ever opt for this type of use? The market may limit building

height and accordingly publicly-accessible spaces. Again, it seems that a density bonus project could avoid providing these community benefits and could, in fact, waive a lot of City requirements.

- Spine up. Cities have police power. Why so afraid to use it? Simply require builders to deal with the impacts they impose. They don't get a "goody" - like another story -- for meeting basic development requirements. Regarding public open space, what good is a shady, cold, dark wet bench on a grass patch, in between tall, dark looming buildings? You assume developers here will provide good design. They'll just stick minimal "open space" in the dark odd corner - postage stamp tokens. There is little comfort in 7 vs. 8 stories. 4 should be the max. Developers don't even want to build 7 stories, too expensive.
- I don't really understand the concept. How do you access private property? Also, even though the L Street corridor is not mentioned, I strongly believe that the L Street Linear Park should be kept as the centerpiece of this project. It would be a terrible mistake to lose this opportunity, and create a busy thoroughfare instead. If that happens, shameful!
- Protection from northwest prevailing winds and access to direct sun are essential for open spaces.
- In lieu fees from Infill projects unable to comply public owned private open space requirements, should be exclusively applied to open spaces, parks and linear parks in the Gateway District.
- I think that if we designate the L Street pathway as a linear park, and fully develop it as a park with mixed use buildings (small shops on ground level and residential on top with roof gardens), there will be less need for privately owned publically accessible open spaces. A linear park that extends north-south through the Gateway area will help provide public open space.
- private from the passing public with hedges, benches in areas, game tables, plantings/trees
- Re present/future surveys: 1) **Please consider providing a space for survey assessment/feedback. 2) **Please consider including survey questions such as, "Did you attend the coordinating virtual workshop?" "Where do you currently live?" "Are you a student? Business owner?" Etc... 3) Thank you for posting the virtual workshop #2 recording so quickly, and for the 2 survey e-notifications. Thank you for providing the date/time as to when this survey will close. 4) Please know that one week to fill out this survey #2 was really not enough time to process all the information provided for the purposes of this survey. 5) Thank you to city staff & consultant team for all your hard work.
- Concern about the length of the term of the contract to maintain, how long will it be kept in public use, enforcement mechanisms once project completed, and making sure these are all recorded on deed.
- In Lieu fees should be used WITHIN the Gateway Zone.

- If a developer pays in-lieu fees, they should be high enough to, essentially, purchase land of that size (sq.ft.). The in-lieu fees MUST be used on a park space within the Gateway Area -- so that people can walk to it. Otherwise, if the fees are used for a park that's 2 miles away, we are encouraging automobile use.