

Planning Commission

I am writing this public comment regarding your Objective Design Standards ODS(CPP21-0053). Sorry I couldn't attend in person due to another engagement. First off, I would like to give credit to Kelly Gleason for all her hard work towards this draft resolution. Kelly and her team have met with me multiple times over the last 2 years to assist with my RMF-24 project. I am not a professional developer; I just enjoy the design characteristic and building. It has taken me 2 years to digest your existing development standards and I'm currently working on revision number 10. In my opinion some of your proposed ODS proposals would benefit development but I would like to bring your attention to some aspects. All your standard design options would look great as a completed building. Example: 4 tiers- Required components, Wall Pane Variation, Fenestration and Materials, Roofs. While each tier contains several elements that the developer can choose to create a quality building design. I wanted to bring your attention that each element will increase construction costs. A square would be the cheapest building to build but it's not aesthetically pleasing. Whenever you change building shape and aspects you will have an increased cost due to material, engineering, and man hours. This doesn't incentivize affordability by design.

I would also like to bring your attention to parking. Under the current code the practical buildable envelope is always constrained by the parking requirements. With the proposed ODS fractional units how will parking be calculated. Would this calculation be based on room numbers or units. I would like to recommend and hopefully the planning commission would support my recommendation. With the additional building requirements and costs possibly required by ODS proposal, could decreased parking requirements be considered with this proposal? This would allow the building envelope to expand and thus incentivize affordability by design. I would recommend following the states density bonus law parking requirements as follows.

Studio	1 Space
1 Bedroom	1 Space
2 Bedroom	1.5 Spaces
3 Bedroom	1.5 Spaces
4 Bedroom	2.5 Spaces

https://www.meyersnave.com/wp-content/uploads/California-Density-Bonus-Law_2021.pdf

This decrease in parking requirements is happening in other cities and some have no parking requirements. You could also consider decreased parking requirements if the project is close to public transportation.

I would also like to bring your attention to a couple other subjects. 9-3.262 increased storage space and requiring it to be accessible from the exterior creates an additional design challenge. Page 52 (iii) Tier 3 Amenities formatting issue. Page 66 9-4.106(b)(1) 15-foot setback along street creates a tighter building envelope especially if on corner lot. Please decrease this setback.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best Regards

Devon Haggie

