

REAL ESTATE TASK FORCE

TESTING WORKSHOP

NOV. 30 - DEC. 3, 2004

Report of

Dale H. Porath, AIA

EAGLE RIVER FRED MEYER

Conformity to Revised Title 21 Issues

1. Required landscaping in utility easements (currently permitted, prohibited by Revised Title 21)
2. Infill vs. Greenfield (subject to interpretation)
3. Minimum dimension of landscaped areas (currently an average of 8 feet, 10 feet minimum in Revised Title 21) existing development does not meet 10 foot minimum.
4. Interior landscaping area (currently 5% of parking lot, 10% in Revised Title 21), project provided 9%.
5. Drop off area (new requirement without definition of the dimensional requirement)
6. Decorative fence around the perimeter of parking lot. (New requirement with no specifics for what constitutes a decorative fence.)
7. Hose bibs within 100 feet of all landscaping or irrigation system (new requirement).

Recommendations by Issue

1. Permit required landscaping to be located in utility easements in support of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan to provide more compact development. Be more cognizant of potential conflicts of planting locations and utility easements in the platting process.
2. Better define infill and greenfield. Possibly defining by location where sites are to be considered infill or greenfield.
3. As has been suggested reduce to 9 feet, but make it a minimum average to encourage more potential variation in design.
4. Provide incentives for larger plant material by allowing reductions from the 10% if larger plant material is installed.
5. Provide more detail of intent or dimensions.
6. Provide standard designs by community or neighborhood.
7. Delete, let the private sector determine the most effective method of watering landscaped areas.

STEWART TITLE

My approach to this project is a little bit different because of it's proposed rezone to RCMU and the comment that RCMU would include a minimum lot coverage of 35%. The Draft Module Two does not have any dimensional standards and measurements as yet for the mixed use districts, but if the intent as stated is to create higher density development and a component of that is a minimum 35% lot coverage I decided to see what the impact would be on this site.

I made the following assumptions:

1. The use would be commercial (office or retail with retail limited to those uses that had a parking requirement of 1 per 300 s.f.)
2. That the minimum setback on interior lot lines would be 20 feet to permit 45% or less unprotected openings (external windows), per Title 23.
3. Required landscaping not permitted in utility easements.
4. Site is classified as infill development.

The site area is: 39,150 s.f. (270 ft. x 145 ft.)

Minimum lot coverage at 35% = 13,702 s.f.

Required parking = 46 spaces

Required loading berth = 1 type B (14 ft, x 30 ft.)

Minimum building facade facing street = 30% of frontage

Maximum parking lot facing street = 70% of frontage

Private common open space (15% of land area) = 5,872 s.f.

Perimeter landscaped area: 5 feet with ornamental fencing per 21.07.090.G.9

Interior site landscaping: 10' per 21.07.080.D4

Parking lot landscaping: 10%

See attached Exhibit A for site plan attempting to meet minimum criteria above.

Results:	Parking lot:	16,000 s.f.
	Snow storage:	3,200 s.f., none provided
	Required parking:	46 required, 44 provided
	Required loading berth:	1 required, none provided
	Minimum building coverage:	13,702 required, 13,375 provided
	Private common open space:	5,872 s.f. required, 5,080 s.f. provided
	Interior site landscaping:	10' required, 10' provided
	Parking lot landscaping:	1,600 s.f. required, 200 s.f. provided
	Garbage enclosure:	none provided

The 35% lot coverage does not work on this site. A better approach may be to adopt a minimum FAR (Floor Area Ratio).

Structured parking could possibly work physically, but certainly not economically. My guess is that the key to mixed use higher density goals lies in larger aggregated parcels with the Municipality participating with the private sector in redevelopment projects.

7TH PLACE

Conformity to Revised Title 21 issues:

2. Tree retention (new requirement)
3. Public open space dedication and fees in-lieu (new requirement)
4. Private open space (new requirement)
5. Traffic impact mitigation (more defined requirement)
6. Wall mounted mechanical and electrical equipment (new requirement)
7. Maximum grade for parking or interior drive lanes (new requirement)
8. Maximum building dimension (new requirement)

Recommendations by issue:

1. Tree retention is exempted in zones that require no yards and allow 100% lot

coverage which is the case in the C-2C Zoning District. However, Table 21.07-1 lists the CBD Districts as requiring 15% tree retention. The Table should be corrected to omit the CBD Zones from this Table.

2. This development would have required approximately a third of an acre dedicated as public open space at CBD land prices. I would recommend that the CBD be exempted from this requirement.
3. This requirement seems to be unrealistic in the CBD. For this use 30% of the site would need to be common open space and there is no fee in lieu of option. Development in the CBD is incented by the bonus point system to reward amenities not legislate them, especially in a zone that is intended to create the most dense development.
4. A traffic impact analysis may have been required had the traffic engineer felt that it was warranted. I doubt with the number of parking spaces provided that would have been the case here.
5. The original plans had located the electrical service in an area that would have been acceptable however the utility company unilaterally placed it in the worst place possible. The electrical utilities continue to have a major negative impact on our built environment. It would sure be nice if they could be brought on board to be more responsible for improving what Anchorage looks like.
6. The drive to the parking below the structure exceeds the 5% maximum grade but is heated which is a mitigation. I believe that this is an excellent example of "alternative compliance" which is written into the Revised Title 21.

TOWN CENTER

Conformity to Revised Title 21 Issues:

1. Tree retention (new requirement)
2. Public open space dedication and fee in lieu (new requirement)
3. Private open space (new requirement)
4. Traffic impact mitigation (more refined requirement)
5. Facade materials (new requirement)
6. Snow storage(new requirement)

Recommendations by Issue

1. This site was 80% covered by tree canopy and has a requirement to retain 30% of that canopy or 24% of the site is required to be undeveloped. In addition trees located in easements cannot be used to comply which further reduces the developable area. This site is zoned R-4 which is characterized as medium to high density residential. I would question the equity of a site that has so much tree canopy as opposed to one that had little or none. Perhaps the percentage for R-4 should be adjusted downward or a maximum percentage of the site that is devoted to tree retention is established.
2. If we make the assumption that these units average 2 residents per unit the public open space dedication would be 1.8 acres. The entire site is 3.69 acres meaning that almost half would be devoted to park or the site acquisition cost has been increased by 50%.
3. Private open space for residential development containing 5 or more units is 30%. Assuming that the developer pays in lieu for public open space dedication and tree retention stays as is, 54% of the site is undevelopable in a high density zone.
4. If the traffic engineer that this project required a traffic impact analysis I would

expect that most of the issues would be internal given the supporting developed street systems.

5. The existing development does not meet the new facade materials for multi-family residential standards. I believe that Chris has enough or more than enough input to redraft this section.
6. This development lacks the areas required to comply with the 20% snow storage requirement. In general the majority of multi-family projects are in a similar situation and probably as a project type the most impacted by snow management.

LAKERIDGE

Conformity to Revised Title 21 Issues:

1. Tree retention (new requirement)
2. Public open space dedicated and fee in lieu (new requirement)
3. Private open space (new requirement)
4. Facade material (new requirement)
5. Building articulation and architectural variety (new requirement)
6. Snow storage (new requirement)
7. Perimeter buffer landscaping (revised requirement)
8. Interior site landscaping requirements (new requirement)

Recommendations by Issue

1. This site was 40% covered by tree canopy and would have a requirement to retain 30% of the existing tree canopy or 12% of the site area. As with Town Center there are many utility easements on site which may have contained part of the tree canopy which cannot be used for the retention percentage. With the reported peat depths on this site tree retention may have a positive impact on habitat but probably not much of a visual impact based on the tree types that grow in deep peat soils.
2. Assuming 2.5 occupants per unit this site would have required 1.35 acres of public open space dedication or fee in lieu. We don't know what the site size is so the percentage is unknown.
3. The private open space requirement would be 30% for this project. This is the type of project that would really benefit from having usable open space for its users. Again the issue is whether 30% for medium to high density development is correct.
4. See Town Center Item No. 5
5. This project meets the criteria of no more than six townhouse units attached, but does not meet any of the differentiating attributes. It would benefit from incorporating these requirements.
6. See Town Center Item No. 6
7. A 10 foot buffer landscaping would be required along the Jewel Lake Road frontage. Unfortunately there is a 10 foot utility easement there.
8. There is a new requirement for parking lots to be separated from buildings by a ten foot wide interior site landscaping. This project would have benefitted from that requirement.

SECLUSION BAY

Conformity to Revised Title 21 Issues:

1. Residential Development Standards, garage doors, building materials (new requirement)
2. Cul De Sacs (new requirement)
3. Sidewalks (new requirement)

Recommendations by Issue:

1. There was much discussion on how to improve and accommodate this style of development which I believe Chris is assimilating into a redraft of Residential Development Standards.
2. Chris indicated that the intent is not to prohibit cul de sacs, but to promote pedestrian connectivity which could occur through trails.
3. The Revised Title 21 would require sidewalks on both sides of the street. If these are to try to be functional in my opinion they should be separated from the street construction.

GOLDENVIEW

Conformity to Revised Title 21 Issues:

1. Wildlife habitat protection (new requirement)
2. Residential design standards, garage doors, building materials (new requirement)
3. Tree retention (new requirement)
4. Private open space (new requirement)

Recommendation by Issue:

1. Based on unspecificity by state it appears to be not the appropriate time to include in Revised Title 21.
2. Based on discussions Chris has input to include in a redraft.
3. Because much of the remaining undeveloped land is on the hillside where the tree canopy is plentiful this will be a confining issue in development. Suggest reviewing the percentage or limit the percentage of any parcel affected.
4. As someone commented, in a large lot development private yards are the private open space and should be considered in satisfying this proposed requirement.

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

1. This is a significant rewrite of Title 21 which as presently constructed will leave many existing properties “non-conforming” as to use, structure or characteristics. This label will create negative economic impacts for the property owners and the Municipality. To avoid these impacts consideration should be given to addressing these properties similarly to the existing Sec.21.55.130.
2. The new mixed use zones need to be drafted and the “reserved” provisions filled in so that meaningful comments can be put forward. Their proposed locations need to be better defined than the asterisks in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. As demonstrated by the Stewart Title example the implementation of the mixed use development may be problematical on smaller infill properties. At a minimum the municipality needs to recognize their role in providing supporting infrastructure to accommodate these pedestrian oriented centers i.e. creating and maintaining effective and useable sidewalk pedestrian systems.
3. As was demonstrated by the workshop virtually every project will be impacted by the combination of tree retention, public open space and private open space. These requirements seem counter intuitive to the stated goal in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan for more compact development.
4. With the proposed zoning changes in Module One all current B3 properties would become GC. It is interesting to note that the GC zoning district in the Revised Title 21 doesn't allow grocery stores or liquor stores as permitted uses. This means that virtually every existing grocery store in the Municipality would be “non-conforming”. I presume this is an oversight and these uses should be permitted in the new GC zoning district. If not the only permitted zones would be the CBD, the new mixed use zones and 5 other parcels currently zoned B1. All but one of which are too small for grocery store use.
5. The parking section of the ordinance differentiates shopping centers from other retail and has a different parking ratio. There is no definition of shopping center to know if it is intended to apply to buildings with enclosed malls only or buildings with multiple tenants. Also is the ratio applied to gross footage or net leasable square footage.