

Paul Cramer

From: CPCInfo
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 9:04 AM
To: Paul Cramer
Subject: FW: Public Comment on Master Plan Amendments

From: Patrick Armstrong [mailto:patrick.n.armstrong@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 08, 2017 11:45 PM
To: CPCInfo
Subject: Public Comment on Master Plan Amendments

January 8, 2017

Director Robert Rivers
City Planning Commission
1300 Perdido Street, 7th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70112

RE: Master Plan Amendments

Good morning, Director Rivers and members of the City Planning Commission,

My name is Patrick Armstrong, and I'm a resident in Mid-City in New Orleans. I am writing to you as an individual, and the views below are my own and do not represent the views of any organization of which I am a part.

First of all, I would like to thank CPC Staff for the outstanding job they have done hosting public meetings, getting the proposed amendments uploaded to City websites so that they are easy to find online, and especially for Ms. Leslie Alley and Mr. Paul Cramer for attending the Mid-City Neighborhood Organization meeting in November to help demystify the Land Use map changes proposed for Planning District 4. I also would like to thank the staff for the hours of work they have undoubtedly put into the Master Plan amendment process.

That said, with 300+ proposed amendments to the New Orleans Master Plan, many of which are confusing to read and several that are redundant, there are a number of issues among the amendments I simply won't be able to address. As a private citizen, I have limited free time to dedicate to community engagement activities. While I do my best to remain informed and keep up with public policy and city decision making, the sheer volume and scope of these amendments as proposed has been impossible.

When I voted for the Master Plan to have the force of law back in 2008, I did not envision 300+ significant amendments for each revision process, and this experience has been very discouraging to me as a citizen that the public input process will truly be considered in good faith. What is the purpose of having a Master Plan with the force of law if every single thing about it can change every five years, with a volume of amendments so large that even this city's most engaged citizens cannot possibly read through them all? That does not strike me as best practice for good city planning.

To that end, I hope many CPC staff recommendations will be to either deny outright or significantly delay the more sweeping changes until more of the public has a chance to read, understand, and comment on these amendments. The Master Plan took a lot of work and considerable community engagement to create and finalize. Sweeping changes should not be the order of business for this amendment process.

For myself, I've identified the following Text Amendments and Map Changes to focus on. These are not all the changes I have concerns about, but they are the most significant that I could find and comment on within the public comment period.

Text Changes to Chapter 15: As I understand this amendment, much of the Neighborhood Participation Program will be moved into the auspices of the Neighborhood Engagement Office. While I have enormous respect for the staff in Neighborhood Engagement and know they work hard to fulfill their mission, I am against expanding their portfolio to cover the NPP and Community Engagement processes. They are simply too small an office and the NPP process is too large with many moving parts. To me, this would only set Neighborhood Engagement up to fail and undermine the already difficult to engage NPP.

I firmly believe the city should enact the District Councils called for in Chapter 15 as currently written, to help citizens better understand land use and zoning issues and how they affect cost of living and quality of life.

Councilmember Jason Williams' proposal to amend the Master Plan Land Use Map so that wide swaths of the city from Mixed Use Low Density (MUL) to Mixed Use Medium Density (MUM). I find these changes far too significant in terms of scale and effect to be an appropriate part of the Master Plan amendment process. The wide-ranging result of these proposed changes should require far greater public input than has currently been seen.

Additionally, for the Mid-City area, several parts of the neighborhood are already mapped for MUM, and many of the areas already mapped MUL were done so to reflect existing development patterns. In effect, many of these areas were already remapped MUL, upzoned, involve allowances for larger scale, more intensity, more density, and significantly reduced parking minimums for commercial uses. While there may be reason to make these changes in certain areas, I do not believe wholesale changes from MUL to MUM is justified.

Request Numbers PD-4-7, PD-4-18, and PD-4-48 also involve moves from either RDL-Pre or MUL to MUM. I have concerns regarding these changes for many of the same reasons listed above. There are simply so many areas that were remapped and upzoned already that have many uses in the zoning underneath, and I believe each of these changes represent significant consistency issues with regard to existing development patterns.

Text Changes Proposed by the Music and Culture Coalition of New Orleans (MACCNO). I am in strong support of these proposals. Based on what I have read from these amendments, they will do a great deal to protect New Orleans' cultural traditions and institutions against the pressures currently building that could undermine the widespread performance spaces used for music, artistic, or other cultural purposes.

Text Changes Proposed by Ride New Orleans. I am generally in strong support of these proposals, with the significant exception of any change that directs much higher density land uses around transit corridors. We do need strong transportation alternatives in New Orleans, to make sure our citizens have access to first class transit to get around the city and metro area. Buses and streetcars should arrive on time and with shorter waits between rides, with fewer transfers and more robust stations where transfers are conducted. That said, New Orleans development patterns are already consolidated around many transit lines. Not only that, but transit lines can be moved, and several probably should be to deliver better services to those citizens who do not live in the "hot" neighborhoods that are already well-served by transit.

General Text Changes to Land Use Map Definitions. This part of the amendment process has been the most difficult to get a handle on, because many proposals affect the same definitions in different ways. I was unable to wade through all the text amendments, or itemize them successfully. I'll just state some general thoughts:

- I have significant concerns about any change that makes HU-MU a consistent use in low density, primarily residential areas. I believe the commercial intensification represented by such changes will be detrimental to residents' quality of life and cause land values to rise and price more people out of their neighborhoods.
- If there were a way to encourage lower-density multi-family residential uses that remained on a neighborhood scale and did not come along with tremendous density bonuses or commercial intensification, I would love to see a way to do that. I am in support of Councilmember LaToya Cantrell's proposed amendment PD-4-12 to support the Jane Place Neighborhood Sustainability Initiative, because that development is a neighborhood scale, multi-family density that promotes permanently affordable housing.
- That said, I realize remapping areas to Residential Medium Density Pre-War (RMD-Pre) can potentially be used to bring tremendous increases in density that become out of scale with surrounding low density areas. It is a shame that the only way to go from Residential Low Density to Residential Medium Density or Multi-Family

seems to involve allowing out of scale density or further commercial intensification. I think finding an appropriate middle ground would go a long way to solving several of New Orleans land use issues.

Because there are so many Master Plan amendments, and the process will include a back and forth between CPC and the City Council, I may have additional thoughts on these items as the process moves forward. I appreciate your continued consideration of my comments.

Thank you for all that you do.

Sincerely,

Patrick Armstrong

117 S. Solomon #1

New Orleans, 70119

Paul Cramer

From: CPCinfo
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 2:17 PM
To: Paul Cramer
Subject: FW: FLUM amendments PD-4-31 and PD-5-6

From: Liz B [<mailto:ebdbpbmb2002@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 1:20 PM
To: CPCinfo
Subject: FLUM amendments PD-4-31 and PD-5-6

Dear City Planning Commission and Staff,

I would like to oppose the change from Neighborhood Commercial (NC) to Mixed-Use Low Density (MUL) for FLUM amendments PD-4-31 and PD-5-6.

After reading many different opinions on this change, I would have to agree with the individuals that have stated Neighborhood Commercial has very restrictive uses that are designed to control they type of intrusion and impact on the surrounding residential neighbors. Most neighborhood commercial properties are extremely close to residential property on all sides. Both PD-4-31 and PD-5-6 appear to be as close as two feet from the residential properties that surround these commercial properties. To change to mixed-use low-density would open them up to higher intensity commercial uses.

Neighborhood commercial already allows a property to be residential so there is no real reason to have this change other than to allow the intrusion of higher density commercial property a residential area.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Boudreaux
Resident of District A

Paul Cramer

From: CPCinfo
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 3:01 PM
To: Paul Cramer
Subject: FW: 3100 Banks St.

From: Vero [<mailto:vero.sabo@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 12:55 PM
To: lcantrell@nola.gov; CPCinfo
Subject: 3100 Banks St.

Ms. Cantrell,

As you probably already know, the developers of 3100 Banks St. wish to have land use amended to Mixed Use Medium Density. The CPC plan of Development Character for this states "Height/mass, and density of new development varied to ensure proper transitions to surrounding lower density residential neighborhoods." However, your proposal to change the definition of pre-war lower density by deleting limitations such as "Maximum Density 24 units per acre" would jeopardize the quality of life that current low density neighborhoods enjoy.

In order to be able "to ensure proper transitions to surrounding lower density residential neighborhoods", there needs to be some sort of density limits. If there are no limits imposed, this could lead to undesirable consequences such as problems with limited parking spaces available in a neighborhood such as ours. Many of the residents rely on parking on the street since many do not have driveways. Also, this could lead to height of structures out of character and scale of surrounding neighborhoods. I hope you consider this. We all need to be mindful of potential benefits as well as consequences of such proposals. We need to ensure "proper transitions to surrounding lower density residential neighborhoods." Therefore, we need density limits.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Veronica Saborio Jarquin

3019 Banks St.
NOLA 70119