

**From:** [Darren Racusen](#)  
**To:** -- City Council; -- City Clerk  
**Subject:** GP Land Use Framework - Historical Agriculture Structures & Zoning  
**Date:** Monday, April 29, 2024 5:51:30 PM

---

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

City Council members,

I think there are strong arguments against including the Hunt & Behrens and other historical ag structures in GP land use alternatives. I communicated this point at our PC meeting on the land use alternatives, but wanted to make sure these points carried through:

- GPAC had no consensus that these structures/areas should be included. Brent Newell brought forward these areas for consideration and other members including Bill Wolpert, Bill Rhinehart, Mary Dooley and others indicated they did not support including these areas for change in intensity of use during GP process. That may have changed in subsequent discussions, but I was certainly surprised to see it move forward after watching that GPAC process.
- The GP Economic Development Framework indicates Agriculture is a vital part of our economy to consider moving forward. One of the only tools we have to support that community and economy is to preserve and support current agricultural uses within city limits. Incentivizing redevelopment of relevant pieces of that supply chain seems counter to those goals and would lead to a disconnect between the Economic Development and Land Use frameworks.

Another 2 broad considerations shared by Ron and Troy from Rami at our PC meeting on land use:

- Up-zoning everywhere dilutes the incentives from those areas where you really want it (ie. impact of up-zoning around transit is diluted if many other areas in town are up-zoned)
- Improving street design, walk-ability and aesthetics of our major boulevards and street fronts is a long-term investment to incentivize infill development in areas like E. Washington. In the case of Area 3.3 Troy agreed those kinds of infrastructure changes (elucidated in policy questions A&B) will likely be necessary to produce outcomes of "Attracting active, flexible ground floor uses including maker spaces, live/work units and temporary units" (policy question C in that section).

15-minute neighborhoods:

- Make sure identifying sensible nodes in an eventual expanded transit network is focus of the exercise - reliable and efficient transit infrastructure is the only realistic way to come close to mobility goals. From those you can build out retail and "third space" activity centers
- Consider moving away from the "15-minute" language toward "Complete Neighborhoods"

--

Sincerely,

Darren R.