

9/12/11

City of Ellensburg  
Land Development Code Update

David Miller Review Comments

Articles 4 & 5 (version: 1017\_DraftCode\_Master.docx - 9/1/2011)

Article 4: Community Design

1. **General Comment.** The chapter is exceptionally well written. It clearly indicates that substantial time has been spent in review/editing by the Consultant team and City staff.
2. **Page 4-2. 15.40.020 B. 2. Design.** Typo. "Principle arterials" should be "Principal arterials."
3. **Page 4-3, 4-4 and 4-5. Streetscape Design Section - Graphics (Figures 15.40.020 B and C, 15.40.030, and 15.40.040).**
  - a. All. It would be helpful to depict dimensions for the overall cross section and for each defined section (travel lane, bike lane, etc.) to establish a sense of scale. I suggest placing the dimensions under the cross section graphic and above the Figure number/description.
  - b. Figure 15.40.020 B and C and 15.40.030. The white text used to identify the outer sections (sidewalks) is difficult to read against the very light gray color used for the section (suggest another color).
  - c. Figure 15.40.040. The terminology and color schemes used in this figure are not consistent with the three previous street cross section figures.
  - d. Figure 15.40.040 uses "Auto Lane" while the other figures use "Travel lane" to identify the roadway main travel lanes. The terminology should be consistent.
  - e. Figure 15.40.040 depicts bicycles sharing one auto lane; when this occurs in the previous figure (15.40.030), the lane is identified as "Shared auto/bike lane." The terminology should be consistent.
  - f. All. Colors used for specific items (parking, sidewalks, travel lanes, bike lanes, etc.) should be consistent, if possible. Planting strips and Planting/street trees are green in all figures, but the other colors vary between figures.
4. **Page 4-6. 15.41.020 Block design & connectivity standards.** Suggest revision that acknowledges that "walking" also includes alternative pedestrian-oriented modes of travel including wheel chairs and power chairs that are intended to be used on sidewalks and paths.
5. **Page 4-10. 15.41.030 Community design provisions. Section A.** Typo. "New residential subdivisions are...to ensure that *it* maintains the established character..." Replace "it" with "they."
6. **Page 4-11. 15.41.030 Community design provisions. Section D. Edges and Fences.** I agree that reverse frontage lots should be discouraged and limiting the percentage of the subdivision's frontage

is the way to do that. However, I also believe that if we do not limit the number of driveway curb cuts that may be located on arterial frontage we risk repeating our experience on north Water Street with too many driveways directly accessing the street. We should consider limiting the number of curb cuts within a specified distance (intervals, max number per block, etc.). Options may include shared driveways or alleys that provide vehicle access at the rear of the lot; however, unless we limit the number of driveways connecting to arterials there isn't much of an incentive to seek alternative solutions.

7. **Page 4-11. 15.41.030 Community design provisions. Section D. Edges and Fences. Item 2.** Suggest adding “shared or common driveways” to second sentence.
8. **Page 4-15. 15.41.050 Lot design. 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph.** “To maximize site efficiency and usable open space, *small lot* developments are encouraged to utilize zero-lot line and courtyard access configuration...” How do we define “small lots” for the purposes of encouraging this type of development? Presumably, it has more to do with the lot’s width dimension than overall square footage. Suggest adding some type of maximum width for “small lots” otherwise we could end up with significantly larger structures on slightly larger lots using the 10-foot opposite side yard setback.
9. **Page 4-16. Figure 15.40.050 B and C.** It appears that vehicle access to the garages in Figure C is intended to come from the street; however, the orientation of the triangular car symbols in Figures A/B and C is not consistent. In Figures A and B, the triangles are inverted and the access clearly comes from the adjacent alley (base of the triangle in direction of access); In Figure C, the base of the triangles face the rear lot lines (not intended to provide alley access) and tips of the triangles point toward the street. My first impression was that vehicle access was intended via the reciprocal use easement lots. It may be helpful to label the long driveways in Figure C with arrows to clarify the access.
10. **Page 4-17. 15.41.050 Lot design. Section D. Pedestrian-only entry lots.** Suggest adding “Cottage Housing” as an example of this type of lot configuration to the section.

## Article 5: Project Design

1. **Page 5-6. 15.51.030, Item B.** The second sentence references “the 4 street frontage type designation...” in the accompanying table. The table lists five categories (including a subcategory of Secondary Street). Clarify in text. Typo in second sentence “Table 15.51.030 below includes a summary of the 4 street frontage type designation along with links to the appropriate...” Should be designations (plural).
2. **Page 5-8 to 5-12. Figures 15.41.040 (A-E).**
  - a. **Page 5-9. Figure B.** Why does the University Way Gateway Corridor end at North Wenas Street, rather than Main Street?
  - b. **Map Legend (applies to Figures B, C and D).** A common legend is used for each map, which is good for consistency but results in some legend items not appearing on individual maps. Example: the Secondary Street 2 line type appears only on Figure C.

- c. **Page 5-11. Figure D.** The gap in the University Way gateway corridor in the area outside the city limits looks odd. From a long-term planning perspective, we should consider including street designations for streets traveling through “UGA” areas to be consistent with designations for those streets in adjacent areas within the city limits.
  - d. **Page 5-12. Figure E.** The Storefront Street designation for East University Way, east of Chestnut to 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue seems inconsistent with the balance of University Way (Main to Chestnut), largely located along the campus frontage. I’m open to the idea, but I need to better understand why the two sections of University Way are being treated differently. I favor a university district designation along both sides of University Way from Main to Alder that would provide long term development potential that could build a stronger interface with downtown Ellensburg.
3. **Page 5-17. 15.51.070 Secondary Street 2 standards. Section B.** “...there are no limitations as to the location of parking along street frontages...” Why do we want to allow front parking if we do not allow that in the Secondary Street standard?
  4. **Page 5-25. 15.52.030 Open space for non-residential and multi-family uses. Section D. Open space requirements for multifamily uses., Item 2.** Text indicates that “up to 50 percent of required open space may be provided by private or common balconies...” I do not think that allowing the open space reduction for private balconies is consistent with the concept of providing open space that enhances the development or the community. Common use balconies with common access could accomplish this, but private balconies do not. For mixed-use buildings “shared roof decks” and “common indoor recreational areas” are identified as acceptable options; these are consistent in emphasizing common space.
  5. **Page 5-25. 15.52.030 Open space for non-residential and multi-family uses. Section D. Open space requirements for multifamily uses.** Replace period at the end of the last sentence in the introduction with a colon.

End of Comments.

I will provide additional written comments for the balance of Article 5 later this week.