

From: [Pamela Cross](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: DGIP - MARCH 27, 2017 MEETING
Date: Thursday, March 23, 2017 3:12:08 PM
Attachments: [density.pdf](#)
[Screen Shot 2017-03-19 at 8.43.03 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2017-03-19 at 8.12.51 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2017-03-19 at 8.08.10 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2017-03-19 at 8.01.48 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2017-03-19 at 8.04.19 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2017-03-19 at 8.13.20 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2017-03-19 at 8.14.29 AM.png](#)

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: PAM CROSS

DATE: 03/23/2017

I read with great interest Ms. Redinger's Staff Report for Monday's City Council meeting.

After a thorough review of the the process that brought us to this point, Staff recommended removing the Density Bonus in R-4 and R-6 zones. I heartily agree with this decision.

Quoting from the Staff Report:

"Generally speaking, if someone wants to build a Living Building single-family home, it is based on a personal commitment rather than a profit motive. It is therefore unlikely that a property owner would request a density bonus for a Living Building (Tier 1) or Petal Recognition (Tier 2) project. **It is more likely that a speculative developer would build a Net Zero Energy Building (Tier 3) project, for which they might consider a density bonus to be a meaningful incentive.**"

"Despite the aforementioned reasons that the DGIP would be utilized infrequently (if at all) in single-family zones, the only concerns expressed to date by residents or Commissioners centered on this possibility. "

I believe that a developer would jump all over this using the Tier 3 option. Under the original proposal, Tier 3 would qualify for 2 Bonus houses.

Many of the small houses built in the 1950's are on sizable lots. Developers are buying these houses, tearing them down, subdividing the lot and building multiple houses. Some are small cottage homes. However, I have attached pictures of three large houses built on 7,000sf lots. These houses tower over the rest of the neighborhood. They are on lots 509, 507, and 503 with a shared driveway access. From the aerial view you see how little space is between them.

If a speculative developer were to buy the rest of the block house by house, this would adversely affect the neighborhood. No tree canopy - actually no trees at all. No sunlight will enter those houses or "yards". Increased traffic on an already busy road. This kind of density - whether it is green or not - is not desired in our neighborhoods.

I propose the Council take Staff's recommendation to remove the Density Bonus in R-4 and R-6. The up zoned areas around the future light rail is already planned for density. This is the area planned for development. There is no reason to include R-4 and R-6 in DGIP.



