

From: [Peter Van Meter](#)
To: [Neal Toft](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Regarding 5.A, Housing Element, 10/1/24
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2024 10:44:48 AM

Dear Neal and City Council –

I am opposed to the proposed project at 605-613 Bridgeway, but I am concerned that the public may be relying on the applicability of Ord. 1022* as one reason that it is inappropriate. I would hate to see this reliance be overturned later by a legal challenge based on an apparent mistake in a housing element map. We need a definitive ruling on this as soon as possible.

It appears that there is a significant error, as *Figure 1A: Ordinances 1022 & 1128 and Restrictions Zoning Map*, shows Ord. 1022 applying to the CC District. While the source wording of the initiative (passed 6/4/85) leading to Ord. 1022 includes the broad words “commercial and industrial zones” at least three times, implementing legislation clarified this designation.

Resolution 3407 (7/16/85), *Clarifying Certain Provisions of the Initiative*, states that the initiative “does not affect the C-C (Central-Commercial) Zoning District or any residential Zoning Districts.”

The initiative provisions are in the Municipal Code as *Section 10.40.020 Development standards of the fair traffic limits initiative*. Following the Resolution, it states that “This section . . . does not affect the CC (central commercial) or any residential zoning districts.”

Please clarify this important distinction. Thank you.

* aka Fair Traffic Initiative

Peter Van Meter

Cell: (415) 699-2739
mycre@pacbell.net