

To: CLASP Committee
From: Bob Pendoley
Date: February 23, 2001
Subject: Our next meeting

Our next meeting will be on Thursday March 1, 2001 at 7:30 PM in the Fellowship Hall at Redwoods Presbyterian Church, 110 Magnolia Avenue. Redwoods Presbyterian is located at the corner of Magnolia and Alexander.

Two outcomes are recommended for your meeting:

1. "Finalize" land use decisions for the Niven property
2. Accept in concept design guidelines for the Niven and Nazari properties

If we can accomplish these two items, we will have resolved, in concept, most of the major outstanding issues. It should be possible to address the remaining issues in an administrative draft of the full plan for consideration at your next meeting.

Niven Land Use

At your last meeting you asked the Design Subcommittee and the consultants to develop options permitting a total of 85 units including a 27-unit affordable project of town homes/flats and a mix of cottage units and single-family homes. You also requested economic analyses of the alternatives.

The recommendations are described in the attached issue paper titled "Summary of Major Development and Design Recommendations." These recommendations are based on ideas that were developed in several meetings with the Design Subcommittee. Due to time constraints, the subcommittee is still reviewing the issues paper as this memo is being written. Subcommittee members may have refinements when we meet next week.

The issue paper recommends that a range of allowable units be set for the cottages and single-family homes, with a cap of 85 units including the 27 affordables. The alternatives that were evaluated in the development of this recommendation are described and analyzed in the attached Technical Memorandum dated February 7, 2001. The technical memo includes a table that summarizes the alternatives. Please note the data on average lot size and unit size for the single-family homes. As you would expect, the number of single-family homes goes down as the number of cottages increases. This results in larger single-family lot sizes (up to 12,000 square feet) and homes (up to 4,800 square feet).

I suggest that you divide the recommendation into the following issues and discuss them separately as way to find areas of agreement:

- Unit cap – do you agree with the 85 unit cap?
- Housing mix – is the mix of affordable town homes/flats (which could be for-sale, rentals, or possibly, both) appropriate?
- Ranges – would you accept a range of units for the cottages and single-family homes?
- Bonus units – do you want to recommend bonus units?
 - Senior housing bonus -- a bonus unit of 1 single-family home could be given for every 2 (3 or 4?) cottages that are age restricted. The rationale is that senior citizen housing generates less traffic (especially peak hour traffic) than single-family homes.
 - Public parking lot -- another approach would be to allow additional units in return for donating a public parking lot.
 - There should be a cap on the number of bonus units.
- Lot size/unit size – reducing the density, especially on the single-family homes, tends to drive the lot and house size up. Other options such as allowing bonuses, requiring a frontage road parallel to Doherty (discussed in the design guidelines for the Niven property) and a public parking lot would tend to reduce lot size. Do you want to try to deal with lot size now, or offer recommendations that would help the Planning Commission to resolve the issue when the actual project is before them? Would you prefer to deal with the issue in housing design guidelines?

Staff and the consultants strongly recommend that you allow for flexibility on these issues. There should be an overall density ceiling on the property. However, it would be helpful to have ranges on the unit types to allow the developer, Planning Commission and City Council room to negotiate, respond to public concerns, adjust to changing market conditions and to have some flexibility in designing the project. Similarly, it is important to allow for some flexibility in housing and lot size. Guidelines that clearly express your intent but which leave the decision makers room to shape the final design of the project will be most effective in the long run.

You may find other issue areas to add to this list. I recommend we find the areas of general agreement on these issues and then vote on them as a package.

Design Policies

The bulk of the issues paper focuses on recommended design guidelines. We propose to work through them one section at a time. Please double check the discussion of offices on page 4; does it reflect your previous deliberations?

Next Steps

If we can come to closure on the Niven land uses and reach conceptual agreement on the design guidelines (we can expect that there will be some unresolved details), we can begin work on the administrative draft of the specific plan. This will be a fairly long document, but you will have reached basic agreement on the most important elements: planning and design principles, land use, design and circulation. The other elements are more technical and are driven by the areas on which you will have already agreed. We are hopeful that you will be able to find the admin draft acceptable in the course of a single meeting.

Tom Cooke and I are still working on a schedule for producing the administrative draft. We will have a recommended date for your next meeting when we meet on March 1.

I have enclosed a recent report to the City Council on the status of CLASP and the 2050 project.

If you have questions, comments, suggestions or anything we need to discuss, please don't hesitate to call me at 472-3614. My e-mail address is rpendoley@home.com Have a great weekend!