Adam Zack

From: Fred Klein < freddythek10@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2019 9:18 PM

To: Adam Zack

Cc: John campbell; Paul Kamin EWUA; Brian Wiese; Terry Gillespie; Leith Templin; Charles

Toxey; joAn Mann; Rick Hughes

Subject: Re: Land Capacity Analysis

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.

Adam...while I may quibble with a couple of John C's reasonable expectations about future development in Eastsound, by and large, he is right on the money.

An important component of your analysis of development potential...something which I would heartily recommend to you...would be for you to engage directly with the current housing developers active in Eastsound who have current "in the trenches" experience with land availability, particularly for residential development (affordable or not) and include in your report their sense(s) of what's possible.

I would include OPAL, Homes for Islanders, John Miller, and Sean Demerrit.

Best wishes,

Fred

On Nov 19, 2019, at 8:33 PM, jmc779@rockisland.com wrote:

Dear Adam.

Rummaging thru my records, I do not find that I have sent you my concern about the conclusions on page 2 of the November 2 Second Draft LCA. Specifically that the Eastsound UGA has sufficient developable land available for 472 dwelling units <u>and</u> 594,362 sf of commercial development. Leaving aside the issues of innumeracy and methodology, it simply isn't so. Each of those numbers is based upon a different, mutually exclusive "Scenario".

The residential capacity, 472 according to scenario C, assumes that all the Village Commercial and Marina districts as well as all other residential districts develop residentially to 100% of capacity. This is an inconceivable and most undesireable eventuality.

The commercial capacity, 594,362 sf according to scenario A, assumes that the Village Commercial and Marina districts develop commercially to 100% of capacity. While this scenario is more plausible, it is incompatible with scenario C. The two scenarios are mutually exclusive alternatives. The scenarios do however provide some useful numbers of capacities to plan with.

The primary point of this LCA initiative is to determine whether there is sufficient appropriately zoned land in the Eastsound UGA to accommodate the projected residential growth under the present goals, policies and zoning. That target, from the

current Comp Plan Housing Needs Assessment, is 252 dwelling units. So, it is time to do some planning and evaluate these numbers in light of what the present plan allows and the EPRC can reasonably expect of these zones and designations in the light of past experience. to do that, consider a Scenario D as follows:

- 1. Village Commercial (VC) and Marina zones develop 5% residential and 95% commercial, about what has occurred over the past decade.
- 2. Village Institutional/Residential (VI/R) develops 75% residential and 25% commercial, again about what exists.
- 3. Residential zones, ER1 etc., develop 95% residential and 5% other uses, again about what has historically occurred.

In other words, what may reasonably be expected under current land use designations. Attached is that tabulation under the present LCA methodology. Note that the qualifying "factors" for public use, recreational use and market factor are unchanged and are added, not multiplied, together.

The result is a capacity of 239 units to meet a demand for 252 units, a shortfall of 13 units.

Commercial capacity works out to be 455,253 compared to 594,362 previously reported.

In allevents, scenario D, or something like it, seems a far more reasonable "scenario" upon which to evaluate whether Eastsound meets the requirements of Growth Management.

None of the above deals with the basic innumeracy of adding the various factor instead of multiplying them nor does it reflect the factors themselves particularly the recreational use factor, 35%, to reflect a 200% recreational development reality. On the principal of confining my communications to one subject and one page, I will make that case in another message.

John Campbell 360-376-2035

