

June 14, 2011

RE: PD Text Amendment

Dear Michelle Leininger,

Here are a few comments to follow up on the PC discussion regarding the PD Text Amendment.

First, we would agree that it is easy to let the CC have the authority to increase or decrease the parking requirements of a project.

Second, we would like to discuss the area requirement. After reviewing several small projects, it does appear that there is little need for someone to go the PD route if they just own one lot. However, there are several older projects on two lots which may benefit from this text amendment. So, it would seem a minimum lot area might be a quarter of an acre (.25ac).

Third, regarding the height, we think that the wording should be revised slightly to state that the height can be increased when the setback is increased on the front or side yards, but not required against the alley. This would keep the mass of the buildings further from the street and closer to the alleys.

The final comment relates to the bedroom equivalent. Attached is a spreadsheet which is an effort to try to compare the different numbers that have been suggested and how those numbers may impact the type of units built. I am not sure what can be deciphered from this chart other than the numbers are actually fairly close, so maybe it really does not matter which ratio is used. If someone wants to maximize the number of bedrooms they will still build all four-bedrooms. I think option C is the most accurate, but also creates the most potential for someone to just build one bedrooms. Option A and B are the simplest, but also provide no 'incentive' for the construction of one-bedrooms. My thought is, either go with the ratios of Option D which provides some incentive for one bedrooms, or go with A since it is the simplest.

Please let me know your thoughts and we can discuss this at your convenience.

Sincerely,



Paul Werner