

From: Devon Haggie <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 7:24 PM
To: City Clerk; Kelly Gleason
Subject: City Council Objective Design Standards
Attachments: Planning Commition.docx

Please see attached public comment regarding your upcoming City Council meeting.

Sincerely

Devon

City Council

I am writing this public comment regarding your Objective Design Standards ODS. Sorry I couldn't attend in person I will be traveling out of country on your meeting date. First off just like I have stated before at the Planning meeting, 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 city council 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 also like to bring your attention to a couple other topics within your agenda. Some of these I previously made a public comment about at your planning commission meeting.

Pg 138 9-3.262

(B) Enclosed storage requirement increased by 30 square feet and now must only be accessed from the outside. This is extremely restricting. If possible, can this storage also be accessible from the inside like your current standard.

Pg 155 9-4.106

(B) If you want RMF zones to be developed fully you must provide a larger buildable footprint. Please consider allowing front setback 12'

Pg 184 9-4.106

This allows frontage setbacks of 12' which contradicts your 9-4.106 Pg 155 verbiage. Please allow 12' front RMF setbacks.

Pg 184 9-3.262(b)

Please allow this storage to be accessible from either outside and/or inside. This will allow better design flexibility.

I want to thank you for considering my public comment and I regret not being able to attend the meeting in person. I know that Kelly is extremely knowledgeable regarding my current project and could address any questions you might have. I only ask is that the project address is not stated publicly. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best Regards

Devon Haggie

Pg 138 9-3.262

(B) Enclosed storage requirement increased by 30 square feet and now must only be accessed from the outside. This is extremely restricting. If possible, can this storage also be accessible from the inside to meet your new criteria

Pg 155 9-4.106

(B) If you want RMF zones to be developed fully you must provide a larger buildable footprint. Please consider allowing front setback 12'

Pg 184 9-4.106

This allows frontage setbacks of 12' which contradicts your 9-4.106 Pg 155 verbiage. Please allow 12' front RMF setbacks.

Pg 184 9-3.262(b)

Please allow this storage to be accessible from either outside and/or inside. This will allow better design flexibility.