

## Adam Zack

---

**From:** Adam Zack  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 1:26 PM  
**To:** 'jmc779@rockisland.com'  
**Subject:** RE: Link to Land Use Urban Issues Presentation

Hi John,

My answers to your questions are provided in **bold** below. Let me know if you have any other questions

Dear Adam, Thank you for the link to the November LCA and Table 7 on page 22, I remain puzzled by the data, however. Looking at Achieved Density in the VR zone (bottom line) I see that 44 units were built on 50.52 acres for a mean achieved density of 0.284 acres/unit (3.53 u/ac.). First of all, that does not make sense.  $50.52/44 = 1.15$  acres/ unit, not 0.284 as shown.

**The 50.52 acres is the total of all acres that were developed during that time period, including nonresidential developments. The acreage of residential lots developed with the 44 dwelling units is 12.6 acres.  $12.6/44 = 0.284$  acres per dwelling. This is slightly less than the 0.25 acres per dwelling (or 4 dwelling units per acre) allowed in the VR designation.**

More to the point, there is no way that between 2005 and 2018 that the VR zone saw 50 acres developed into housing. I'm not sure there is 50 acres in the entire zone, developed or not. Similarly note 2 states that if April's Grove had been included that would have only slightly changed the achieved density ratio. Doubling the achieved units from 44 to 91 at 12u/acre would certainly change the achieved density to something above 6 units/ acre. Please take another look at this anomaly as it is the basis of the consideration of increasing the density in this zone to increase capacity in the UGA.

**The VR designation encompasses 155.38 acres. Adding April's Grove to the achieved density calculations would increase the number of dwelling units to 91 on 23.023 acres.  $23.023/91 = 0.253$  acres per dwelling unit (close to 4 dwellings per acre, the minimum allowed in VR).**

On the subject of increasing the allowable density in the VR district to encourage more development there, I wonder how increasing allowable density would "increase density" in the UGA? If developers and property owners are not utilizing the present allowable density, why would more allowable density result in increased development? Presently developers can build 12 units / acre PLUS an additional 12 ADU's for 24 units / acre, about the physical limit for conventional construction under a 35' height limit.

**Your comment highlights one of the major challenges for encouraging infill within the existing UGA boundary. This is the main point I have been making in the urban topic presentations I have recently made to Council, Planning Commission, and EPRC. The achieved density falling so far below the maximum allowed is a strong indicator that simply increasing the allowed density will probably not result in higher achieved density.**

A related thought, however, is to clarify that an additional ADU is in fact permitted for each basic unit. That is not at all clear. The Eastsound development regulations, Table 5 page 12, permit one ADU per lot. I like to see us encourage ADU's because they are small and affordable, what we need, and, in Eastsound, cannot be used for vacation rentals. Private developers can build them with no government subsidies. ADU's work. At least that is what everyone thinks although I cannot find that regulation either. EPRC may want to clarify that.

I'm not sure which regulation you were looking for. In the UGAs, the number of ADU is not limited. Specifically, San Juan County Code (SJCC) 18.40.240(B), which states:

"B. A detached ADU is permitted in the Eastsound urban growth area, the Lopez Village urban growth area and in all activity center land use districts, except island center district, on any lot that allows a principal residence as the principal use of the lot. Each ADU in these areas shall not be counted in density calculations."

too many thoughts in one memo.

Adam Zack  
Planner III  
Department of Community Development  
San Juan County, WA  
360-370-7580

[adamz@sanjuanco.com](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com)

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from San Juan County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW.

---

**From:** jmc779@rockisland.com <jmc779@rockisland.com>

**Sent:** Friday, March 13, 2020 12:32 AM

**To:** Adam Zack <adamz@sanjuanco.com>

**Cc:** Leith Templin <leithtemplin@hotmail.com>; brian wiese <brian\_wiese@outlook.com>; Charles Toxey <innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com>; joAn Mann <jo.an.a.mann@gmail.com>; Terry Gillespie <terrywg57@gmail.com>; Fred Klein <freddythek10@gmail.com>; Rick Hughes <rickh@sanjuanco.com>; rickxmas <rickxmas@msn.com>; John <jmillerorcas@hotmail.com>

**Subject:** Re: Link to Land Use Urban Issues Presentation

**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 Adam, Thank you for the link to the November LCA and Table 7 on page 22, I remain puzzled by the data, however. Looking at Achieved Density in the VR zone (bottom line) I see that 44 units were built on 50.52 acres for a mean achieved density of 0.284 acres/unit (3.53 u/ac.). First of all, that does not make sense.  $50.52/44 = 1.15$  acres/ unit, not 0.284 as shown. More to the point, there is no way that between 2005 and 2018 that the VR zone saw **50 acres** developed into housing. I'm not sure there is 50 acres in the entire zone, developed or not. Similarly note 2 states that if April's Grove had been included that would have only slightly changed the achieved density ratio. Doubling the achieved units from 44 to 91 at 12u/acre would certainly change the achieved density to something above 6 units/ acre. Please take another look at this anomaly as it is the basis of the consideration of increasing the density in this zone to increase capacity in the UGA.

On the subject of increasing the allowable density in the VR district to encourage more development there, I wonder how increasing allowable density would "increase density" in the UGA? If developers and property owners are not utilizing the present allowable density, why would more allowable density result in increased development? Presently developers can build 12 units / acre PLUS an additional 12 ADU's for 24 units / acre, about the physical limit for conventional construction under a 35' height limit.

A related thought, however, is to clarify that an additional ADU is in fact permitted for each basic unit. That is not at all clear. The Eastsound development regulations, Table 5 page 12, permit one ADU

per **lot**. I like to see us encourage ADU's because they are small and affordable, what we need, and, in Eastsound, cannot be used for vacation rentals. Private developers can build them with no government subsidies. ADU's work. At least that is what everyone thinks although I cannot find that regulation either. EPRC may want to clarify that.

too many thoughts in one memo.

.....jmc

---

**From:** "adamz" <[adamz@sanjuanco.com](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com)>  
**To:** "jmc779" <[jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 9, 2020 4:28:22 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Link to Land Use Urban Issues Presentation

Hi John,

The information regarding achieved density is in the November 4, 2019 Land Capacity Analysis Report. The discussion of recent development begins on page 21 of that report. The specific information about achieved density is in Table 7.

I'm pretty sure that I sent a hard copy of the report to you a while ago, but if you need another copy it is available online here: [https://www.sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/View/19296/2019-11-04\\_Zack\\_Memo\\_w\\_att\\_LCA\\_Report\\_2nd\\_Draft\\_PC-CC\\_Briefings\\_11-19](https://www.sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/View/19296/2019-11-04_Zack_Memo_w_att_LCA_Report_2nd_Draft_PC-CC_Briefings_11-19)

Let me know if you need any other info.

Thanks,  
Adam Zack  
Planner III  
Department of Community Development  
San Juan County, WA  
360-370-7580  
[adamz@sanjuanco.com](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com)

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from San Juan County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW.

---

**From:** [jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com) <[jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 7:47 PM  
**To:** Adam Zack <[adamz@sanjuanco.com](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Link to Land Use Urban Issues Presentation

**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, I continue to be puzzled by your statistic of 4u/acre in V-I/R zone. Certainly not recently. Can you forward your data so I can understand? Thanks.

.....jmc

---

**From:** "jmc779" <[jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com)>  
**To:** "adamz" <[adamz@sanjuanco.com](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 29, 2020 12:46:47 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Link to Land Use Urban Issues Presentation

Adam, Thank you for forwarding this link. My connection is very slow and that helped.

I continue to be concerned with your image #23 which states "2005-2019 .....Village Residential develops about 4 units/acre". My records only cover 2013-2018 but they show a very different picture, 16 units/acre. See attached. The zone is composed almost entirely of parcels created before there were any size or density regulations. Development is either individual small existing lot developments and "developer" developments with very few of those. The vast bulk of the capacity in that zone lies in about half a dozen parcels.

The proposal to encourage more dense development by increasing the allowable density in that zone is unlikely to have any affect. The zone presently allows, including ADU's, 24 units/acre. That is about the physical limit of three story construction as Adele Lane and Haven Road will confirm.

The difficulty for anyone hoping to build housing in Eastsound is finding any land for sale. The surest way to cure that is to expand the UGA north of Anderson (Bartel) road. There is at least one eager seller and the area is already served by water and sewer.

.....jmc

---

**From:** "adamz" <[adamz@sanjuanco.com](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com)>  
**To:** "jmc779" <[jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 27, 2020 4:34:05 PM  
**Subject:** Link to Land Use Urban Issues Presentation

Hi John,

The presentation I gave to the Planning Commission and County Council in February is available at the following link:

[https://www.sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/View/19824/2020-02-10\\_LU\\_Urban\\_issues\\_pres\\_CCPC\\_02-2020](https://www.sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/View/19824/2020-02-10_LU_Urban_issues_pres_CCPC_02-2020)

I will be at the March 5 EPRC meeting to make a similar presentation to the committee. Let me know if you need anything else.

Thanks,  
Adam Zack  
Planner III  
Department of Community Development  
San Juan County, WA  
360-370-7580  
[adamz@sanjuanco.com](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com)

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from San Juan County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1			Village Residential density study by Permits					
2								
3								
4	year	address	parcel #	parcel area	# units	units/acre		
5				acres				
6	2012	152 Haven Road	271460054	0.25	1	4.0		
7								
8	2013	42b Madrona St.	271449057	0.375	1	2.7		
9		40B Madrona St.	271449057	0.375	1	2.7		
10		40C Madrona st.	271449057	0.375	1	2.7		
11		64 Haven Road	271460062	0.51	1	2.0		
12	2014							
13	2015	40A Adele Lane	271449060	0.0433	1	23.1		
14		40B Adele Lane	271449060	0.0433	1	23.1		
15		40c Adele Lane	271449060	0.0433	1	23.1		
16		40D Adele Lane	271449060	0.0433	1	23.1		
17		40E Adele Lane	271449060	0.0433	1	23.1		
18		40F Adele Lane	271449060	0.0433	1	23.1		
19	2016							
20	2017							
21	2018	63 Haven Road	271460059	0.1	2	20.0		
22		67 Haven Road	271460059	0.1	2	20.0		
23		73 Haven Road	271460059	0.1	2	20.0		
24		79 Haven Road	271460046	0.1	2	20.0		
25		85 Haven Road	271460045	0.1	2	20.0		
26		91 Haven Road	271460044	0.1	2	20.0		
27		97 Haven Road	271460043	0.1	2	20.0		
28		64 Urner St.	271460059	0.1	1	<u>10.0</u>		
29								
30						302.5	15.9	units/acre