

Amy Buckler

From: jerome parker <jerome.parker@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2014 11:05 AM
To: Amy Buckler
Cc: Leonard Bauer
Subject: Please Distribute to OPC and to Gary Cooper

Colleagues -

As you know, we agreed at the 4/7 OPC meeting to delay discussion of the multi-family development code amendment (OMC 18.04.060) to our next regular meeting. At the meeting, I said I would provide background comment that might facilitate resolution of our deliberation on this matter.

This is my individual comment. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of Kim Andresen with whom I worked on the "Draft Analysis" referenced in the staff report prepared for the 4/7 OPC meeting.

First, I want to thank the staff - Amy and Leonard - for their decision to submit our analysis to Gary Cooper for review and to thank Mr. Cooper for his careful and thoughtful comments. It is gratifying to have our effort dealt with in a serious and respectful manner.

Regarding Mr. Cooper's analysis, most of his points are well-taken. The only additional comment I offer from a quantitative perspective is that in our calculation of impermeable surface, we did not include the amount of such surface required for parking, roads, and sidewalks. This is because we felt we had made the point that the standard for impermeable surface in a five acre parcel would already be exceeded by the construction of the housing. Mr. Cooper's work suggests this is not necessarily so. I believe that when parking, roads, and sidewalks are added in, it would be extremely difficult to develop and not exceed this impermeable surface standard.

However, that is not the point I wish to emphasize. Rather, I wish to make clear that the actual change that is proposed has to do with the mix of housing on a five acre parcel, i.e. a proposed requirement that no more than 70% be in any one housing type.

This provision was not the focus of the "Draft Analysis" submitted by Kim and me. I have no problem with the proposed change. (Again, I am representing only my opinion, not that of Kim.)

The focus of our analysis was the feasibility of the current RM-18 zones for small parcels, i.e. those between 5 and 10 acres. I remain convinced that the current standards (OMC 18.04.060) make development of these parcels either impractical or impossible.

Nonetheless, I would rather let owners and potential developers of these parcels do the calculations to determine if development under RM-18 is feasible. If it works, fine. If it doesn't, we will have several small parcels that might serve well as neighborhood parks.

Jerry Parker

April 16, 2014

Hi Jerry,

Following is my response to your email that will be inserted in the OPC packet:

First of all, let me commend you on such a thorough review of this proposed code amendment. You have raised several good points, overall pointing to the difficulty of fitting development at desired densities into the complex mix of applicable development regulations. One way to look at this mix of land use regulations is as a math equation where each type of use on the site (buildings, parking, open space, etc.) has to meet each minimum, maximum and percentage standard and yet be balanced to not exceed the size of the site or buildable area. It really can be difficult to achieve this, especially when unique site constraints come into play.

Your additional comment below, "that in our calculation of impermeable surface, we did not include the amount of such surface required for parking, roads, and sidewalks" is a good point. When Gary and I were conferring on this memo, he mentioned that he did consider this - again at a broad level. While I agree it will potentially be difficult to maximize density at 18 Units per Acre once all the site characteristics and regulations are taken into account, I offer the following additional information to address your concern:

- Assume the 5 acre parcel has the dimensions 670' x 326' (the actual dimensions of one of the affected sites.)
- Mr. Cooper assumed duplexes border most of the site (except for ingress/egress) and the dimensions of each duplex lot are 77.5' x 77.5'. Each duplex lot would provide driveway and parking for residents of the duplexes.
- In order for residents to reach their duplexes, there would need to be a driveway traversing the perimeter of the duplexes – so all the way around the development.
- There are 75 parking spaces required for the apartment building, and let's assume much of the apartment parking is provided along the driveway perimeter and along the perimeter of the apartment building, rather than concentrated into a lot.
- A generous parking stall size would be 10' x 20' = 200 sq. ft. each. Mr. Cooper assumed 400 sq. ft. for each parking space, thus he must have included the associated driveway aisles in his estimate.
- Assuming 50 stalls are provided along the perimeter of the driveway that traverses the site, and 25 stalls along the perimeter of the apartment complex (assuming has dimensions 68' x 200'.)
- Although the street standards for Local Access streets would not apply here since this would likely be a private driveway rather than right-of-way, for purposes of testing whether there is enough room for the parking, driveways and sidewalks let's assume local access standards for on-street parking (6' wide) with a 1-way driving lane (12' wide) and sidewalks with curb and gutter (6.5'). That's a total of 24.5' for sidewalks, parking and driveway. This is all cursory, of course.
- Referring to Mr. Cooper's memo, here is where we are:
 - **After duplex lots, amount of remaining land = 92,460**

- **Size of apartment building =** - 13,600
- **TOTAL left** **78,860 sq. ft.**
- Assume the driveway is 515' long on the east and west, and 171' long on the north and south; this is probably generous, but it is the site perimeter length minus the duplex lots. (515' x 24.5' = 12,618 sq. ft. ; 171' x 24.5' = 4,190 sq. ft.) Total for all four sides = 33,616 sq. ft.
- **Total for driveway, sidewalks & 50 parking stalls =** **- 33,616**
- **Generous total for 25 remaining parking stalls =** **- 5,000**
- **Open Space Requirement (30 % of 92,460) =** - 27,738
- **TOTAL left** **12,506 sq. ft.**

Again, this is very cursory. It does not consider critical areas, easements, dumpsters, stormwater, or other very real land use needs. It also does not consider the use of townhomes as a potential buffer which is allowed when the site does not directly face a single-family use (smaller minimum lot size of 4,800 for two units); the 15% lot size reduction for transitional housing allowed in OMC 18.040.080; or that some of the open space requirements may be met by other land uses already calculated.

In conclusion, the amount of available land to meet all the regulations is typically a tightly knit package, and depending on the site characteristics it may be difficult to achieve 18 units per acre on certain sites.

Also, thank you for your comment making clear that the, "the actual change that is proposed has to do with the mix of housing on a five acre parcel, i.e. a proposed requirement that no more than 70% be in any one housing type." That is the proposal for the Planning Commission to consider in making their recommendation the City Council this evening.