

Building

From: Emily Angell <emily.angell@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 11:14 AM
To: City Planning
Subject: 60 unit Development - Proposed PUD-comments for criteria of ordinance 95-4 section 4.136 & SR/RZ zone standards in ordinance 95-4 section 3.030

As a full-time resident of the adjacent neighborhood to the east of the proposed development, we are grateful for the addition of affordable housing in the community and very much welcome it in the neighborhood. The following comments are in the interest of achieving a more appropriate scale and quality for such development, as well as connectivity/integration as it relates to the surrounding community and stated goals of the City as defined by the Comprehensive Plan.

1. **Character and Quality** - The development, as proposed, does not achieve the stated Objective 3 of the Comprehensive Plan, to 'Protect the character and quality of existing residential areas and neighborhoods from incompatible new development.' The proposed site plan of three-story block buildings are not of a design or character represented anywhere in the area and are directly adjacent to a modest, single and double-story residential neighborhood zoned for manufactured dwellings. The proposed buildings are by far the largest in the region. As this will be the first development of its scale, I believe it important to set a precedent for achieving the desired character and integration as it will influence future development. Could the desired density be achieved through two-story buildings that integrate with the existing character and landscape of the region, and make better use of the site area and topography? The request for additional 3' height allowance further exacerbates this incongruence.

Previous site plans (shown as Figure 2 in the Packet) seem to site the buildings in a way that is more respectful to the character of the land and surrounding neighborhood, providing more buffer with existing residential area to east, with paths that connect through the site, and a soccer field (acknowledgement of multi-age recreational opportunities). While the current plan shows a small playground area and community space, there seems to be a missed opportunity for building healthy living into the plan. The proposed configuration is contrary to the stated goal 'to maintain and create residential living areas which are safe and convenient, which make a positive contribution to the quality of life, and which are harmonious with the coastal environment.' The layout of the development seems to maximize density at the expense of safety (only connectivity throughout site is via parking lots), convenience (no non-vehicle connectivity to town), and quality of life (large box units with little privacy and three flights of stairs to drag your stroller, groceries, etc. up).

Clarification on whether or not any universal design principles have been considered for this development would be helpful.

2. **Buffers** – The existing plan shows insufficient buffers with the existing neighborhood, particularly in the in the southeastern corner of the site. Would siting of the larger buildings (particularly at the southern end of the development) further from the existing neighborhood provide opportunity to maintain the existing natural mature tree buffer that exists behind the houses on Clipper Ct. (consistent with the proposal’s stated objective to achieve building scales that are ‘informed by the coastal and forested surroundings’) and foster better relationships with those residents? At minimum, a larger buffer should be considered in this corner of the site and mitigation of headlight disturbance for cars entering parking areas from Loop Rd.

3. **Connectivity** - As proposed, this is a large, landlocked development with ingress and egress through Loop Rd. to Necarney City Rd. only. Connecting Loop Rd. to Meadows Dr. would provide connectivity between this development and the center of town, alleviating some of the traffic to Necarney and providing much needed off-arterial biking and pedestrian routes. This connection would be directly supportive of the City’s transportation goal #22 to support non-motorized and transit connections from key destinations and the commercial core. Not connecting these roads provides a contradiction to the applicant’s request to reduce the parking requirement which is based on the assumption that lower income residents will have fewer cars. The provision of bike parking should also consider that the development should have safe access to bikeable routes (which Necarney does not satisfy). In envisioning this development, we must consider that people of all ages (including teenagers, elderly, parents with strollers, people with mobility assistance devices) need safe and accessible ways to get to town without a car. Connecting Loop Rd. and Meadows would be the easiest and most immediate and cost effective way to achieve this.

4. **Traffic** – Please clarify how the traffic study has taken into account the approved expansion of the State Park as well as forthcoming development throughout the Highlands, at Pine Ridge, and Heron’s Rest. The assumed 1% growth rate seems low for this area given what is known about future development. Necarney Rd. is notoriously dangerous for bicyclist and pedestrians, as well as vehicles. The school bus stop is located on Necarney Blvd. a short distance from the proposed Loop Rd. Current conditions are already unsafe for children accessing the bus stop and high volumes of speeding summer traffic are very common along this stretch. What consideration has been made for children in this new development to safely access the school bus?

It is imperative that City’s Transportation plan keep pace with development in this area (the Sea-Forest neighborhood and Pine Ridge developments where many families live currently have no safe access (particularly for youth) and connectivity to town without a vehicle). This development would further justify the urgent need for bike/walking lanes along the full stretch of Necarney from Hwy 101 to Classic St.

5. Seeking clarification on the definition of affordable housing used for this project. If stated as a percentage of mean income, what defining parameter constitutes the mean (state, county, city?).

6. Seeking clarification on phasing of this project and whether or not public improvements will be required.

7. I would advocate for a higher concentration of native plants in the plan given the benefits to the environment, the character and quality of the area, and given the lower survival rates of non-natives.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and for the City's efforts to bring needed housing solutions to our region. This development is a new direction for the City and it is my hope that the design can maximize benefits to the residents and the broader community.

Sincerely,

Emily Akdedian