

## Adam Zack

---

**From:** Erika Shook  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 5, 2019 8:10 AM  
**To:** Comp Plan Update  
**Cc:** Adam Zack  
**Subject:** FW: Land capacity analysis Sept 6, 2019  
**Attachments:** Scenario D.xlsx; ATT00001.htm

---

**From:** Rick Hughes <rickh@sanjuanco.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 4, 2019 8:57 PM  
**To:** Erika Shook <erikas@sanjuanco.com>; Mike Thomas <miket@sanjuanco.com>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Land capacity analysis Sept 6, 2019

FYI

Rick Hughes  
San Juan County Council  
Orcas/Waldron Island  
District #2  
[Rickh@sanjuanco.com](mailto:Rickh@sanjuanco.com)  
360-472-0253

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** <[jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com)>  
**Date:** November 4, 2019 at 6:37:46 PM PST  
**To:** Paul Kamin EWUA <[pkamin@rockisland.com](mailto:pkamin@rockisland.com)>, Terry Gillespie <[terrywg57@gmail.com](mailto:terrywg57@gmail.com)>, brian wiese <[brian\\_wiese@outlook.com](mailto:brian_wiese@outlook.com)>, joAn Mann <[jo.an.a.mann@gmail.com](mailto:jo.an.a.mann@gmail.com)>, Leith Templin <[leithtemplin@hotmail.com](mailto:leithtemplin@hotmail.com)>, "Charles Toxey" <[innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com](mailto:innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com)>, Rick Hughes <[rickh@sanjuanco.com](mailto:rickh@sanjuanco.com)>, Fred Klein <[freddythek10@gmail.com](mailto:freddythek10@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Land capacity analysis Sept 6, 2019

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear EPRC, Earlier this month we received the first draft of the conclusions of the LCA. On page 2 of the report we found that Eastsound has a projected supply of 474 dwelling units (against a need for 245) based on the scenario C that assumes the VC zone develops 100% residential. That seems neither a desirable nor likely option to base a plan upon.

Additionally the analysis finds a commercial development capacity of 594,362 s.f. based on scenario A (that assumes VC develops 100% commercial). This is a more plausible option but it is mutually exclusive with the former selection. Neither of these scenarios seems to me to represent what the Eastsound Plan projects as the direction or mix of uses for a future Eastsound. In fact almost all Eastsound land use zones are "mixed

use " zones. All the ER zones permit care facilities, utility and emergency facilities and community facilities. Village Institutional/Residential permits a wide range of non-residential and office uses in addition to residential uses.

So, now that we can see how this system works, I suggest we craft a Scenario D that represents the kind of Eastsound that currently exists and the Plan projects. Consider this scenario:

1. Village Commercial and Marina develops 95% commercial and 5% residential.
2. Village Institutional develops 75% residential and 25% non-residential.
3. All the Eastsound Residential zones develop 95% residentially.

Attached is a rough attempt to plot such a Land Capacity Analysis. Note that this is based on the same innumerate methodology that CDP is using for comparison. The conclusion, that there is a small shortfall of development capacity, seems consistent with a methodology that under estimates demand or growth and includes every, however unlikely, unit of development capacity. (Print the attachment legal size if possible.)

.....jmc

ps .It is worth noting that over the past ten years, the projected development capacity of Eastsound, with no change in land boundaries or zoning and notwithstanding considerable residential development has doubled from 687 units in 2009 to 1,3599 today. Different *methodologies*.

