

Mike Smith

From: Bob Bengford <bengford@makersarch.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2013 10:40 AM
To: 'Roger Wagoner'; Lance Bailey; Mike Smith
Subject: RE: Ellensburg Density Assumptions

Agree that full build-out capacity analysis is unnecessary. If you were to do some more realistic build-out assumptions - It seems to me that we make some assumptions of 20 year growth per the comp plan projections (as the sunset / timeline for SEPA purposes) and allocate new development to the zones based on their extent in the city and developability. But again, this is more work – and maybe not necessary. I would let Mike make the call on our direction.....thanks Roger...

Bob Bengford, AICP
Partner

MAKERS architecture and urban design LLP
1904 Third Avenue, Suite 725, Seattle, WA 98101
Tel 206 652 5080
www.makersarch.com

MAKERS is now a certified Women's Business Enterprise (WBE) and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE).

From: Roger Wagoner [<mailto:Roger.Wagoner@bhccconsultants.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2013 10:04 AM
To: Bob Bengford; Lance Bailey; Mike Smith
Subject: RE: Ellensburg Density Assumptions

Good analysis, Bob. But, the only way to really determine if the proposed density changes may have "significantly adverse" impacts triggering an EIS would be to calculate the net future buildout capacity of undeveloped land in each zone under current zoning and the proposal. But that's way too theoretical and unnecessary in my opinion. No one knows when buildout could occur, and whether development will reach the maximums allowed in the proposal. Since the City collects impact fees for parks and traffic, and the rates can be adjusted regularly, I think that the most likely impacts of growth would be mitigated using those funds. Other mitigations are also built in, and the City has to do project-level SEPA analysis when it permits development. So unless you guys have a problem with this, I think that a DNS is appropriate. I can spend some time writing more of a rationale if you like. Your call.

From: Bob Bengford [<mailto:bengford@makersarch.com>]
Sent: Mon 3/4/2013 12:08 PM
To: Roger Wagoner; 'Lance Bailey'; 'Mike Smith'
Subject: Ellensburg Density Assumptions

Roger/Mike/Lance – I put together the attached chart to help with the SEPA analysis associated with the code update. It includes a comparison of standards between current and proposed code – including density and dimensional standards plus parking. In the right column I've added some assumptions comparing how these zones have/will be developed. Mike and Lance – this is where we could use your observations – to see if I've included the right range of numbers on how these zones are typically being developed – notably:

R-S – from memory I've noted that these are averaging about 4 units per acre (gross) – or is it actually less since we're using "gross" in our new #s?

R-M I guessed about 10/acre – but only based on zoning – not sure if there's much built in last 5-10 years to help come up with this number.

Roger – let Mike or Lance know if you have any other questions on this.

I also took a stab at identifying some of the key mitigation features – most notably the reduced block size provisions, impervious area provisions (including street design), density/sprawl comment, parking, and transit implications. The bottom line is – the code won't increase population growth – but it will likely ensure that new development is more concentrated (taking up less land and less resources) and more connected/better designed/more pervious area than under the current code.

Let me know if you have any other thoughts/questions.

Bob Bengford, AICP

Partner

MAKERS architecture and urban design LLP

1904 Third Avenue, Suite 725, Seattle, WA 98101

Tel 206 652 5080

www.makersarch.com

MAKERS is now a certified Women's Business Enterprise (WBE) and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE).