

Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP) Draft Zoning Amendments Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting

September 19th, 2022

Meeting Summary

City Planning staff presented an overview of the DOSP Draft Zoning Amendments that were discussed in more detail at meetings on May 11, May 16 and September 13, including a description of how the proposals respond to each of the DOSP's objectives. Staff then summarized and responded to the key issues and concerns raised by community members to date. These issues included concerns about the Zoning Incentive Program, Transfer of Development Rights program, development standards and special districts. The issues are summarized in the meeting presentation, available on the meeting website.

After the presentation, staff listened and responded to comments and questions from attendees, and then presented the next steps. Next steps include a session to study the Zoning Incentive Program, the calculations that went into it, and its relationship to the City's broader affordable housing strategy. Other next steps include online and chalkboard surveys and equity- and/or location-focused meetings with BAMBD, Chinatown and Art + Garage District stakeholders.

Attendees

Staff

- Daniel Findley, Planning
- David Early, PlaceWorks, zoning consultant
- Ed Manasse, Planning & Building
- Joanna Winter, Planning
- Khalilha Haynes, Planning
- Laura Kaminski, Planning
- Linda Hausrath (Hausrath Economics Group, economic consultant)
- Neil Gray, Planning
- Stephanie Skelton, Planning

Attendees/Registrants

(Due to a glitch in zoom, we lost record of the registrants. If you did not speak, but attended the meeting, we do apologize if we don't have your name down).

- Ada Chan
- Anne Christie (SPUR)
- Art May (Keystone Development)
- Caleb Smith (Housing & Community Development)
- Chris Buckley (Oakland Heritage Alliance)
- Gary Knecht (Jack London Waterfront Warehouse District)
- Hiroko Kurihara (Art and Garage District)
- James E Vann: (CALM, Oakland Tenants Union)
- Jeff Levin (East Bay Housing Organizations)
- Justin Zucker (Reuben, Junius & Rose)
- Naomi Schiff (Oakland Heritage Alliance and Coalition of Advocates for Lake Merritt)

- Preeti Srinivasan: (Urban designer, Mosswood resident)
- Rafael Gavilanes
- Steve Saffold (broker and investor)
- Steve Snider (Uptown Downtown Community Benefit Districts)
- Tiffany Eng (Old Oakland Neighbors / Friends of Lincoln Square Park / Family Friendly Oakland)
- Tim Chan (BART)

Comments and Questions and Responses

Affordable Housing

- Affordable housing is the primary concern of community members
 - a. The ZIP and zoning amendments only one small part of the DOSP's housing strategy, which includes mechanisms such as impact fees, an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD), an affordable housing infrastructure bond (underway), and General Fund revenues increased with new development. The ZIP is an effort to ensure that some of this housing is built downtown.
- Need to meet AB 686 requirement to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by building affordable housing downtown and address racial disparities by building a higher percentage of affordable housing to market rate; it seems like we've achieved less than 2% affordable units downtown recently.
 - a. Affordable projects applying for Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF) receive priority points if they are in the DOSP area.
 - b. A major challenge with building affordable units is that building affordable housing is far more costly downtown due to high land costs. Housing dollars build more units in other areas. If funds were allocated to downtown only, the risk is that they would sit unused for years because affordable housing developers rarely propose projects there.
 - c. The ZIP is designed to supplement affordable housing in downtown, with a 10% discount given to encourage developers to provide affordable units on-site.
 - d. The City needs sources of funding far beyond the capacity of development to meet its affordable housing needs.
- Question about what the Housing Element (HE)'s goals are for downtown
 - a. HE goals are not broken down by geographical area, but the DOSP incorporated the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) into its housing goal.
- Every development should contribute to affordable housing
 - a. Every development pays an Affordable Housing Impact Fee (or provides affordable units on site). The optional ZIP housing would be *in addition to* this requirement.
- Need clarity on how many units would be built under different scenarios
 - a. See 9/13 ZIP meeting presentation and FAQ for info on how many affordable units and impact fees would be produced under density bonus and ZIP scenarios.
- Do we need to max out densities in all the zones to achieve housing production goals of the plan? Or is there a target density below that is the most likely scenario?

- a. The Development Program (describes the Plan's goals for housing and employment space) is based on anticipated development under the maximum intensity scenario.

Density Bonus

- Confusion about how the ZIP and Density Bonus programs interact if a developer does both.
 - a. A developer would apply the ZIP first and get its bonus, then apply the State density bonus to the total units generated under the ZIP. Impact fees would be paid on the ZIP units, not on the Density Bonus units, generating far more impact fees than under the base/existing regulations.
- Concern that uses of ZIP and Density Bonus will generate very tall buildings
- The City is gathering data on what downtown projects have provided affordable units to take advantage of the density bonus program.

Downzoning

- Desire to downzone to extract more benefits from development or make participation in the Zoning Incentive program mandatory.
 - a. Reducing the zoning to levels below current intensity essentially would make participation in the ZIP mandatory to achieve what is allowed now by right. This is not legal under SB 8 and SB 330.
- Can't we downzone if we upzone elsewhere?
 - a. This is possible, but no areas have been proposed The ZIP is not considered upzoning as it is not allowed by right.
- Can't we upzone of it's for the purpose of building affordable housing (exception to SB 330)?
 - a. No. There are instances where affordable housing can be encouraged such as to protect and preserve SROs or to allow for inclusionary housing projects. The exception does not apply to induce density bonus projects. City attorneys have surveyed other jurisdictions on this provision as well.
- Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA) has identified areas they believe could have the base (or by-right) intensities upzoned with little or no adverse impacts in exchange for downzoning vulnerable areas elsewhere.
- OHA has proposals for downzoning they would like to discuss with staff

Historic Areas

- The height increases for the fire alarm building are intended to be used for a jazz museum, not high-rise residential.
- Desire to keep heights as they were in the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan
- Concern that downzoning in historic areas undermine the TDR program

Fees/ZIP Requirements

- Confusion about why the ZIP fees/requirements (e.g. for affordable housing) are so low relative to the need.

- a. The ZIP fees are not based on impact or need. They are based on the value created by allowing additional intensity, and the amount able to be captured for community benefits.
- Desire to understand the value of the fees collected and how they will be used
- Desire to ensure that fees are used in the downtown, not elsewhere in the city
- Are in-lieu fees based on the value of the real estate in a particular location within the DT? Concern that in-lieu fees being different in different parts of downtown could result in “red-lining” or “green-lighting.”

a. *The three different price areas were actually developed to prevent that outcome. There are nuances between Jack London East and Jack London West whereby construction type can be higher or lower on a cost per square foot basis. If we used one fee across the entire downtown, developers would be super-incentivized to develop in the areas where they could earn the most value and completely disincentivized to develop in areas where paying the same fee as the expensive areas wouldn't make those areas worth developing. This benefit area approach adjusts the fee/required benefits to the market area, so development is relatively equally incentivized throughout the downtown.*

Extra value is created through up zoning. It's true that those payment amounts are going to be determined by location where the project is and dictates the value on what's being captured. The plan is to capture 1/3 of the value. 1/3 is captured to go to the City, its specified by location. All of this was based on real estate feasibility analysis. So, you can see what additional value was created. The in-lieu fee is not a separate analysis. They were all based on the same results. Feasibility was calculated at the base density and under the ZIP.

- Area A has the highest created value
- Area B has middle tier created value
- Area C has the lowest created value
- I understood that part of the proposal would value capture and refund some of the money back to the developer. If that's the true, would the City agree to that policy, because they utilize the impact fees? Am I misunderstanding? The impact fees were applied to the basic development is that correct?
 - a. *There is no refund of anything to the developer. Under the ZIP all of the impact fees would be paid. Under the state density bonus the impact fees would **not** be collected by the City. The state density bonus is oriented toward lowering the cost of housing. If a developer doesn't do the State density bonus, the developer pays affordable housing impact fees, transportation fees, etc. If they do the state density bonus, they don't pay affordable housing impact fees, but they pay on the other impact fees.*

- Funds we get from the ZIP (and the Impact Fees) are one-time funds. However, buildings provide revenues for the City's tax base that are ongoing funds. Those will help with City services in downtown (and to be used in the rest of the city), as well as maintenance, which impact fees do not fund. Those are an ongoing source of funding that we can get from development, so we need to measure that against one-time funds.
- It is true that projects currently do not pencil. There are dozens of approved high-rise projects in Oakland, San Jose and SF that will never get built; construction costs have not stopped going up and are not expected to.

Community Outreach

- Naomi Schiff: Yes, have another CAG meeting and try to have some dialog between community groups and developers, something that hasn't really occurred. Requesting more CAG meetings.
- Jeff Levin: What's the schedule for future meetings? The September ZUC meeting was canceled - does that allow more time for CAG and other meetings to allow a more thorough public review of ZIP and other zoning amendments? When will the final plan, zoning amendments and EIR go to Planning Commission and City Council?
 - a. We are still scheduling other stakeholder meetings, we are in the works of creating a meeting to discuss affordable housing/the ZIP, we are working on getting a ZUC date, we are working on it as soon as we can. We will be setting up some further meetings.*

Community Benefits

- Tiffany Eng: I am learning more at each mtg. Still trying to understand how we're going to achieve community benefits if no one participates in voluntary program. Tiffany Eng: For example, would increase in CIP fees cover costs of all unfunded CIP and transportation projects on the equity scored projects. And how big of a bite would it make to our affordable housing goals. I worry it will be even more segregated. Developers are already building private rooftop dog parks and bragging about having the "largest amount of private outdoor space downtown." I would love more incentives to fund amenities like these instead in public spaces.
 - a. Joanna Winter- We just looked at this for affordable housing impact fees but could add CIP as well.*
- James E Vann: How does the community achieve "benefits" if developers do not desire additional density?
 - a. Development projects are still required to pay affordable housing, transportation and infrastructure impact fees.*
- What would be the relative increase in CIP fees that would go to parks, infrastructure to support that density? Carrying this example all the way through would help identify true

community benefits. Is current CIP impact fees (not going into affordable housing) published? If we add that many more units, will there be more money for unfunded parks and open space projects on the CIP list? Asking because it is currently hard to follow how any impact fees from last boom over last 7 years have benefited CIP projects in the downtown area.

a. *We are going to try to answer these questions with further research.*

Additional Programs:

- Joanna Winter: The City could also create a program that focuses on addressing vacant retail spaces, outside the realm of zoning.

Transfer of Development Rights Program

- Joanna Winter: Eliminating CUP: We think that this is a good suggestion, we are happy to work on, it gets complicated figuring out how to record it without a CUP but can try to work through.
- Joanna Winter: We have heard there is a desire to start from a lower intensity to the intensity that exists now; we have the same concern for doing this for the TDR that we would for the ZIP.

Value Capture

- Joanna Winter: Another concern is that understanding that this is a value capture program, maybe we are not charging developers enough of a value capture. The way that the program is designed, is based on the idea that 1/3 of the cost would go to the developer to be an incentive to participate in the program 1/3 of it would go to the land cost, which would increase because the value was increased by the added intensity that we are allowing, and then 1/3 of it would go to community benefits. We understand there is concern about the 1/3 formula.
- David Early: what can be extracted from the extra value that's created from upzoning? The ZIP is not intended to offset impacts but rather capture 1/3 the value created from upzoning. Hausrath's math is based on current asset value (e.g., rent collected over time). The more value you capture, the less residual value over time.

ZIP

- James E Vann: I think the ZIP is still a work in progress, how will it work how will it be administered, I think we need a more intensive study. The ZIP needs to see what alternatives there are. Would like you to look at other programs that can be funded?
 - a. *Joanna Winter: A concern we have heard is that the zoning incentive program will compete with and detract from the State Density Bonus program; in reference to your question, Linda has completed some additional analysis that is a comparison of the Density program, generally there are 2 different programs, they offer different incentives, different developers, and that would encourage developers to participate in one versus the other, depending on what they were*

trying to achieve, and provide different benefits to the community. The state density program is focused entirely on affordable housing, the zoning incentive program includes affordable housing, but also has some of the other community benefits that we don't have a mechanism for. [Shares the analysis report.]

- Naomi Schiff: And the highest possible buildings?
 - a. *Joanna Winter- that could be, depending on the developer.*
- Jeff Levin: What are the tradeoffs between incentives and the benefits? I tried to work one out; can we take a short minute to figure out, if I am understanding correctly how does the ZIP work? [Jeff showed a presentation of calculations for an example ZIP project.]
 - a. *Linda Hausrath: There are combinations, we calculated the cost per bonus unit with all those combinations [referring to Jeff Levin's presentation], and the one that was used was 20 percent density for very low-income units. Under the State Density Bonus, there are no impact fees paid to the City [unlike the ZIP]. The City has an affordable housing trust fund and has the power to leverage those moneys.*

ZIP Analysis

- Jeff Levin- Was the rate of return to the developer analyzed? Encourages staff to model different type construction changes, e.g., Type III to Type V.
- Namoi Schiff- Sure would like to see the calculations. Wondering about things like rents collected over decades.
 - a. *David Early: Linda's math is based on current asset values which is set by what we think will be collected over time. The analysis was done in 2021, given the high construction costs, the issues with attainable rents, none of those developments with those dollars were feasible. Then we created feasible projects, in most cases it requires a 20 percent difference between value and cost particularly through low rise buildings. The feasibility must improve.*
 - b. *Linda Hausrath- The analysis was done in 2021-2022, and our initial run of all of these, given the high construction cost, and the issues with attainable rents, it renovated elements with those dollars, it was a negative land value. Then we worked to create feasible projects. It requires at least a 20 percent difference between revenues and costs. Feasibility must improve. The more you capture the less residual there is left to provide an incentive to developers and landowners.*
- Justin Zucker- if a state density bonus project would piggyback with the zip incentive? Would that then be feasible in the current market conditions? Because I'm hearing in current market conditions neither the base nor the density is feasible? Is it possible in the current environment with the density bonus layered on top to make a project feasible?

- a. *Linda Hausrath: Probably not but the density allowed by the California density bonus is not going to make a difference. Because you can get quite a bit of density with the ZIP. There are situations where the regulatory concessions, timing, low impact fees, can make a difference. It depends on the situation. Right now, the gap between revenues and construction costs is very large. Putting that California density bonus on top in order to make it work would depend on the development and whatever development concessions they can get.*
- Naomi- we have repeatedly asked for folks to look at the Emeryville program, due to their point system with density benefits.
 - a. *Joanna Winter- We have looked at the program, but we would like to go beyond that program with analysis of the value created by the incentives. The proposed ZIP uses dollars instead of points; these are based on Linda's calculations.*
- Jeff Levin: Since we haven't seen any of the prototype or pro forma models, I'm wondering whether the analysis looked at the impact of the share of value going to developers, have they impacted their rate, and specifically the rate of return I don't know if that was part of your analysis or not.
 - b. *Linda Hausrath- That is in the pro forma, yes.*

Chat Log

Tim Chan/BART: Interested in housing, affordability, mobility, homelessness. support maximizing density.

David Early: He/him. With Place Works, working for the City of Oakland on the zoning code.

Naomi Schiff: Oakland Heritage Alliance and Coalition of Advocates for Lake Merritt. Ran a business downtown for 36 years

Anne Christie: with SPUR, thanks for hosting!

Steve Snider: Uptown Downtown Community Benefit Districts.

Justin Zucker: Reuben, Junius & Rose, live off Piedmont Ave.

Tiffany Eng she/her: Old Oakland Neighbors / Friends of Lincoln Square Park / Family Friendly Oakland.

Chris Buckley: with Oakland Heritage Alliance.

Steve Saffold: broker, and investor.

Gary Knecht: Jack London Waterfront Warehouse District.

Art May: Keystone Development – developer.

James E Vann: CALM OTU, Interested in ZIP, FAB, & racial equity.

Preeti Srinivasan: (she/her)- urban designer and resident of the Mosswood neighborhood.

Caleb Smith: Oakland Department of Housing and Community Development

James E Vann: CALM, OTU, Interested in ZIP, FAB, & racial equity.

Jeff Levin: East Bay Housing Organizations, interested in affordable housing, displacement, ZIP, and equity

18:14:34 From Jeffrey Levin, EBHO: Jeff Levin, East Bay Housing Organizations, interested in affordable housing, displacement, ZIP, and equity

18:16:20 From Justin Zucker: Maybe go no video that usually helps

18:18:57 From Jeffrey Levin, EBHO: AB 686 requirement to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing?

18:20:55 From Naomi Schiff: Affordable Housing has been the primary request of most participants since the very beginning of this DOSP.

18:24:50 From Laura Kaminski: We lost you

18:28:13 From Tim Chan: Interested in housing, affordability, mobility, homelessness. support maximizing density.

18:29:37 From Naomi Schiff: Lost Joanna again

18:29:53 From Hiroko Kurihara: Can you talk more about the surveys?

18:30:01 From Naomi Schiff: Lost again

18:30:29 From Tiffany Eng: Are the dates published online of the special interest meetings?

18:31:18 From Naomi Schiff: Dropping out again

18:32:56 From James Vann: How does the community achieve "benefits" if developers do not desire additional density

18:33:25 From Naomi Schiff: Downzoning WITH UPZONING, in other areas.

18:34:33 From Naomi Schiff: SB8 DOES ALLOW downzoning if there is affordable housing intention. It's an exemption.

18:35:39 From Joanna Winter (she/her): Sorry, I misspoke, SB 8

18:36:18 From James Vann: How many existing high-rise developments in the downtown have requested bonus intensity?

18:40:12 From Christopher Buckley: Oakland Heritage Alliance has identified areas that we believe could have the base (or by-right) intensities up zoned with little or no adverse impacts in exchange for downzoning vulnerable areas elsewhere.

18:40:16 From Hiroko Kurihara: Maybe Linda could address value capture?

18:42:11 From Hiroko Kurihara: Are in-lieu fees based on the value of the real estate in a particular location within the DT?

18:44:00 From Joanna Winter (she/her): <https://www.oaklandca.gov/documents/comparison-of-zip-and-density-bonus-housing-outcomes>

18:44:07 From Naomi Schiff: When you do both ZIP and SB8 how do they interact?

18:44:46 From Naomi Schiff: Dropped out!

18:45:30 From Naomi Schiff: And the highest possible buildings?

18:45:50 From Naomi Schiff: Burj Khalifa

18:47:25 From Tim Chan: sorry, have to drop off. thanks all!

18:48:27 From Naomi Schiff: It's not downzoning to keep the height as it was in Lake Merritt Bart Specific Plan.

18:50:51 From Hiroko Kurihara: Need Clarification re In-lieu fees: Are the amounts based on the value of the real estate in a particular location within the DT?

18:50:54 From James Vann: What are the current standards for "Work-Live" in the downtown area?

18:56:54 From Hiroko Kurihara: The concern I have is how those values are determined in a specific area could become instead of a "red-lining" area or site would become a "green-lighting" to developers or owners bc they anticipate lower values and lower associated contributions

18:59:10 From Justin Zucker: open to the walk through by Jeff

19:04:25 From Gary Knecht: gotta go to dinner. Thanks.

19:11:49 From Ada Chan, ABAG/MTC: encourage they make sure it is documented. it is not in the current plan.

19:12:19 From Hiroko Kurihara: Part of the problem is that fees go into one fund without being able to target back into the DT.

19:13:19 From Jeffrey Levin, EBHO: I think it would be possible to require that at least the impact fees on the incremental units be dedicated to affordable housing in the DOSP area and not elsewhere

19:13:31 From Justin Zucker: Linda mentioned a report released today, can you please share a link to it?

19:13:51 From Joanna Winter (she/her): Yes, Justin, it's the one I shared earlier - <https://www.oaklandca.gov/documents/comparison-of-zip-and-density-bonus-housing-outcomes>

19:14:00 From Tiffany Eng: How many more affordable housing units would be able to be built then with this example? What would be the relative increase in CIP fees that would go to parks, infrastructure to support that density? Carrying this example all the way through would help identify true community benefits. Is current CIP impact fees (not going into aff. housing) published? If we add that many more units, will there be more money for unfunded parks and open space projects on the CIP list? Asking because it is currently hard to follow how any impact fees from last boom over last 7 years have benefited CIP projects in the downtown area.

19:14:55 From Justin Zucker: Thanks, Joanna

19:16:14 From Hiroko Kurihara: I have to jump off now and trust my fellow CAG working group members will forge on! and encourage others to join our working group. 😊 Thanks Joanna and staff!

19:19:06 From Naomi Schiff: Sure, would like to see the calculations. Wondering about things like rents collected over decades.

19:20:08 From Tiffany Eng: I feel like we've achieved less than 2% affordable units downtown the last 5+ years, and that wasn't with any incentives, which is part of the disappointment with this math.

19:24:00 From Rafael Gavilanes: supply side economics

19:24:00 From Ed Manasse: The extra units allowed through the zip will also create significantly more impact fees from that site than would happen under existing regulations, That difference in generated impacts fees is also a community benefit

19:24:53 From Naomi Schiff: Seems like downtown ends up being for the wealthy and we shunt everyone else out further.

19:24:55 From Tiffany Eng: Do we need to max out densities in all of the zones to achieve housing production goals of the plan? Or is there a target density below that which is the most likely scenario.

19:25:19 From Rafael Gavilanes: Oakland is full of construction projects, seems like a sellers' market, Hello!

19:25:20 From Steve Saffold: Well, put, Linda. Regarding the high-rise example, there are dozens of approved high-rise projects in Oakland, San Jose and SF that will never get built. it's not even close. Construction costs have not stopped going up and are not expected to.

19:26:11 From Tiffany Eng: Ed, understanding increase in fees collected and where they would go would be helpful to clarify the community benefit.

19:26:36 From Joanna Winter (she/her): Tiffany, we just looked at this for affordable housing impact fees, but could add CIP as well

19:27:44 From Tiffany Eng: For example, would increase in CIP fees cover costs of all unfunded CIP and transportation projects on the equity scored projects. And how big of a bite would it make to our affordable housing goals.

19:29:13 From Naomi Schiff: Are we going to end up with a less-diverse downtown?

19:30:14 From Joanna Winter (she/her): Also, a meeting survey. Please take this survey so we can track who is attending:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeNMIEBax0kQ5XRsas1mkOluoLhVej1hHNnHioACfo2-e_bkQ/viewform?usp=sf_link

19:31:03 From Tiffany Eng: I worry it will be even more segregated. Developers are already building private rooftop dog parks and bragging about having the "largest amount of private outdoor space downtown." I would love more incentives to fund amenities like these instead in public spaces.

19:32:47 From Naomi Schiff: Will affordable development be able to acquire land, even if funded by EIFD, in competition with private developers, in a scenario with high-density zoning? We need some areas where construction type will reward people for building aff. housing downtown.

19:34:21 From Joanna Winter (she/her):
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeNMIEBax0kQ5XRsas1mkOluoLhVej1hHNnHioACfo2-e_bkQ/viewform?usp=sf_link

19:35:11 From Stephanie Skelton (City Of Oakland): For those of you that didn't get the link to the presentation for tonight here it is: <https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/2022-09-19-CAG-Presentation.pdf>

19:36:22 From Naomi Schiff: Yes, have another CAG meeting and try to have some dialog between community groups and developers, something that hasn't really occurred.

19:36:35 From Tiffany Eng: Thank you.

19:36:40 From Stephanie Skelton (City of Oakland):

<https://www.oaklandca.gov/topics/downtown-oakland-specific-plan-zoning-amendments-downtown-plan>

19:37:14 From Justin Zucker: Thanks for the presentation. Much appreciated

19:37:39 From Tiffany Eng: I am learning more at each mtg. Still trying to understand how we're going to achieve community benefits if no one participates in voluntary program.

19:37:58 From Christopher Buckley: Another CAG meeting would be advisable to review possible upzoning in some areas to compensate for downzoning elsewhere.

19:39:07 From Jeffrey Levin, EBHO: What's the schedule for future meetings? The September ZUC meeting was canceled - does that allow more time for CAG and other meetings to allow a more thorough public review of ZIP and other zoning amendments? When will the final plan, zoning amendments and EIR go to Planning Commission and City Council?

19:41:27 From Justin Zucker: But wouldn't downzoning in historic areas undermine the TDR program?

19:43:37 From Jeffrey Levin, EBHO: From SB 330: (Gov Code 66300(j))

"(j) Notwithstanding subdivisions (b) and (f), this section does not prohibit an affected city or an affected county from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that is intended to preserve or facilitate the production of housing for lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code..."

19:43:41 From Tiffany Eng: I agree -street trees are going in right now w/o any incentives.

19:45:55 From Christopher Buckley: Not really, since even with downzoning most historic bldgs in the downzoned areas would still have significant unused development capacity. Also, many historic buildings would not be in downzoned areas.

19:48:18 From Christopher Buckley: My comment above responds to Justin's question.

19:50:25 From Joanna Winter (she/her):

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeNMIEBax0kQ5XRsas1mkOluoLhVej1hHNNhioACfo2-e_bkQ/viewform?usp=sf_link