Park Ave Community Project Phase II

CAC Meeting Framework Refinement/ Code Concepts August 12, 2020
Discussion Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Community Resiliency Overview Presentation
3. Framework Alts Engagement Feedback Summary
4. Refine Framework Plan - Discussion
5. Preliminary Code Concepts
6. Next Steps
1. Increase employment opportunities, promote innovative business ventures and enhance access to business and community services amenities, while remaining sensitive to existing businesses adjacent to transit, along McLoughlin and along the near side streets.

2. Increase the diversity and accessibility of housing choices adjacent to transit along McLoughlin and along the near side streets, while maintaining sensitivity to existing residences.

3. Provide safe locations, crossings and connections for walking, biking, transit and parking.

4. Cultivate a heart and hub of neighborhood activity supported by a network of community gathering spaces that are safe and welcoming both day and night.

5. Treat natural systems as a benefit and an integral part of our community identity by preserving, promoting and enhancing native natural elements at a variety of scales.

6. Promote resilient, sustainable systems, and infrastructure.
COMMUNITY RESILIENCY
The ability to protect against, adapt to, and recover from disruptions

RESILIENCE

Designing for now and the future
RESILIENCE: POTENTIAL DISRUPTIONS

**Human**
- **Health** - pandemic, chemical/hazard spill
- **Supplies** - drought, food shortage, fuel shortage, power outage
- **Air quality and Comfort** - forest fire, volcanic eruption, extreme cold and heat, gas leak
- **Personal safety** - active shooter, bombing/terrorism, building fire

**Business/Community**
- **Movement** - transportation disruption, road/infrastructure collapse, protests, large public event, winter storm
- **Organizational** - economic emergency, labor strikes, employee attrition, technology disruption, internal operations change and flexibility

**Building**
- **Stability** - earthquake, landslides, high winds, building fire
- **Water damage** - sea-level rise, flood, tsunami, dam failure, pipe burst
RESILIENCE: STRATEGIES

Durability and Resistance

Anticipate and Adapt

Change Conditions and Prevent

“External” force/disruption: Flooding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience Strategies</th>
<th>Durability and Resistance</th>
<th>Anticipate and Adapt</th>
<th>Change Conditions and Prevent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESILIENCE: DAILY VALUE & SYNERGIES

What resources are needed during a disruption that also improve daily lives?

**Human Scale**
- Ability to make social connections
- Access to food, water, and shelter
- Information
- Source of income

**Building Scale**
- On-site energy
- Operable windows / Passive comfort
- Private outdoor amenities
- Flexible/convertible uses

**Community Scale**
- Public Parks and Open Space
- Resource/information Hub
- Walkable neighborhoods
- Access to safe bike networks

**Increased Efficiency**

**Improved Physical and Mental Health**

**Economic Gains**

**Social Capital**
RESILIENCE: DENSITY

Human scale
Density of Stuff

Block/Building scale
Density of Space

City/Neighborhood Scale
Density of Resources
(Network Density)
RESILIENCE: DENSITY
City/Neighborhood Scale - Support Critical Resources (Network Density)

- Concentrate enough people in a neighborhood to support diverse resources and services
- Allow for people to live and work close enough to amenities to support walking and biking - can be a balance between centralized and de-centralized
**Equitable access** to resources that encourage shared use

- **Wider sidewalks** to support private business use
- **Flexible roads** for diversity of uses
- Protected/separated **bike networks** to encourage use through safety
- **Car-free zones** to support various pedestrian movement and gathering adjacent to buildings
RESILIENCE: PUBLIC SPACE
City/Neighborhood Scale - Accessible, Flexible Public Space
Concentrating development, and accommodating higher building heights on a development site, leaves more land area available for open space.
Integrating natural systems into our built environment is essential to our health and wellbeing and ability to mitigate the effects of climate change.
RESILIENCE: BUILDING DESIGN

How do we make healthier and more functional buildings?

Encourage use of stairs and open air circulation

Spaces that accommodate living and working functions

Hands free circulation and restrooms

Use your roof

Flexible and adaptable office spaces

Separate HVAC for the mudroom

Glass unit door beyond allows daylight into mudroom and corridor

Shades can be added for privacy

Mudrooms become opportunities to display personality in corridors

Rethink transition spaces
1. Concentrations of development and people (a.k.a. density) support critical services.

2. Concentrating development in an area and on a development site leaves more land area for open space.

3. Streets are public space and should be designed as such.

4. Integrating natural systems offers benefits to daily life while also mitigating future challenges.
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Establish and maintain an emergency communication network.
- Establish a central meeting place and storage for emergency supplies and information exchange.
The ability to protect against, adapt to, and recover from disruptions

QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

Designing for now and the future
FRAMEWORK ALTS
ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK SUMMARY
LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

Identify areas of differing character, use, and development intensity such as: housing type and density, employment centers, commercial districts, etc.

ACTIVE STREET DESIGN

Contributes to an active public realm through design that engages sidewalks and streets through techniques like: frequent building entries, transparency of ground floors, building facade variation, and limited driveway access points.

NEIGHBORHOOD/VILLAGE CENTER

A walkable heart and hub for the community, and where the community comes together for services, gathering, etc.
LANDSCAPE & PLANTING IMPROVEMENTS
Enhanced landscaping and planting along existing connections. Preserve existing natural features and Oak trees.

PEDESTRIAN & BIKE IMPROVEMENTS
Provide sidewalks with landscape/planting buffers between sidewalk and any vehicles. Provide buffered/protected bike lanes.

CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
Provide a designated and safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing. Treatments at each crossing vary based on conditions.
Identify areas of differing character, use, and development intensity (where do you want to see an increase of employment and housing?)

Locate desired hubs of activity

Locate active ground floor design

Locate pedestrian and bicycle improvements

Locate street crossing improvements

Locate opportunities for landscape and planting improvements
TRANSFORM MCLoughlin

CREATE A VILLAGE MAIN STREET
REFINED FRAMEWORK PLAN
ALTERNATIVES
KEY QUESTIONS FOR CAC
WHERE SHOULD HOUSING OPPORTUNITY INCREASE OCCUR?

Where should a housing increase occur?

Should allowable housing intensity be increased in both the MR-1 and GC-C3 zones?

For the 20 year Framework Plan, where should new bike/ped connections be located? Should all new connections intersect with the Trolley Trail, or should some terminate at existing roads (i.e. Linden Lane or Linden Place)?

Where should activity in the study area be concentrated?
BASELINE FRAMEWORK ELEMENTS
(WHERE WE HAVE COMMONLY AGREED SUPPORT)
Engagement feedback consistently pointed to a need for change along McLoughlin:

- **62%** Increase Employment all along McLoughlin
- **34%** Add landscape and trees (+49% asked for landscape and trees on all streets)

Complete sidewalks connections are also key along Park, Oatfield, and Courtney.
ADD LANDSCAPE AND NATURAL SYSTEMS

- Add landscape and trees on all streets and new development. 49%
- Along all of McLoughlin. 34%
- Along all of new bike/ped paths. 32%
- With new development. 28%
FRAMEWORK ELEMENTS STILL IN QUESTION
(WHERE WE NEED CAC INPUT)
83% of survey participants would like to see an increase of housing opportunities in the study area.

Where should this housing increase occur?
Survey results indicated that participants would like to see an increase in employment opportunities all along McLoughlin, with strong support for offices, healthcare related uses, and maker spaces.

Results related to housing were more varied. 83% of respondents would like to see more housing in the area, with the highest percentage of respondents wanting to see more housing in the current MR-1 zones, followed closely by housing in all areas and the area adjacent to transit.

From three developer interviews conducted over the past month, all three would like to see increases to the residential density allowed in the General Commercial (GC) C3 zone (red) along McLoughlin, as well as in the MR-1 (orange) zone.

The General Commercial C3 zone has the largest number of potential redevelopment sites, and is the area where change is most likely to occur.
QUESTION #1 FOR CAC
WHERE SHOULD HOUSING INCREASE OCCUR?

ZONES REFERENCE
- GC - C3
- MR -1
- SFR

MAP OF HOUSING INCENTIVE AREAS
- EVERGREEN ST.
- SILVER SPRINGS RD.
- TROLLEY TRAIL
- MCLoughlin Blvd.
- OATFIELD RD.
- HOLLY AVE.
- COURTNEY RD.
- TORBANK RD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Near the transit station (currently zoned General Commercial, shown in pink on the map)</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Along all of McLoughlin Blvd. (currently zoned General Commercial, shown in pink on the map)</td>
<td>18.79%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. East of existing commercial area along McLoughlin Blvd. and west of Oatfield Rd. (currently zoned for Multi-Family Residential development, shown in orange on the map)</td>
<td>35.46%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To the west of the McLoughlin Blvd. commercial area and east of Linden Ln (currently zoned for Multi-Family Residential development, shown in orange on the map)</td>
<td>29.43%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All of the above</td>
<td>24.82%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Don't want to see more housing opportunities</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents:</strong> 282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION #1 FOR CAC
WHERE SHOULD HOUSING INCREASE OCCUR?

The housing types that received the highest rankings may be most appropriate in different areas of the site.
QUESTION #1 FOR CAC
WHERE SHOULD HOUSING OPPORTUNITY INCREASE OCCUR?

Consultant team recommendation: increase the allowable residential density in both the GC-C3 (red) and MR-1 (orange) zones, with higher density in GC-C3 zones, to catalyze change along McLoughlin. Allow different housing types in each zone suited to proposed densities.

Should allowable housing intensity be increased in both the MR-1 and GC-C3 zones?
84% of survey participants would like to see at least one new pedestrian and bike connection, with 36% supporting connections along all five alignments depicted. Only 16% did not want to see any new connections. Highest ranked alignments are Silver Springs (17%), Torbank/Courtenay midpoint (16%), and Torbank (16%). The lowest ranked was Evergreen (12%).

For the 20 year Framework Plan, where should new bike/ped connections be located? Should all new connections intersect with the Trolley Trail, or should some terminate at existing roads (i.e. Linden Lane or Linden Place)?
Urban design best practices recommend 400’-800’ block maximum for walkable neighborhoods.
Urban design best practices recommend 400'-800' block maximum for walkable neighborhoods.
QUESTION #2 FOR CAC
NEW CONNECTION LOCATIONS?

Urban design best practices recommend 400’-800’ block maximum for walkable neighborhoods.
SURVEY QUESTIONS RELATED TO BIKE/PED CONNECTIVITY AND CROSSINGS

A. Where would you like to see new east/west bike and pedestrian only connections from McLoughlin to the Trolley Trail roughly aligned with?

B. Where would you like to see new east/west bike and pedestrian only connections from McLoughlin to Oatfield Rd. roughly aligned with?

C. Where would you like to see new street crossings along McLoughlin?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evergreen Ave.</td>
<td>12.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Silver Springs Rd.</td>
<td>17.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Midpoint section between Silver Springs Rd. and Torbank Rd.</td>
<td>15.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Torbank Rd.</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Midpoint section between Torbank Rd. and Courtney Rd.</td>
<td>16.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All of the above</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Don’t want new connections</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents: 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SURVEY: WHERE WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE NEW BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS (EAST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evergreen Ave.</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Silver Springs Rd.</td>
<td>23.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Torbank Rd.</td>
<td>20.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Holly Ave.</td>
<td>11.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All of the above</td>
<td>36.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Don't want new connections</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 277
### Survey: Where Would You Like to See New Crossings of McLoughlin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Roughly in alignment with Evergreen</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roughly in alignment with Silver Springs</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Midpoint section between Silver Springs Rd. and Torbank Rd.</td>
<td>19.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Roughly in alignment with Torbank</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Roughly in alignment with Holly Ave</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All of the above</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Don't want new street crossings</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents:</strong> 280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION #2 FOR CAC
WHERE SHOULD NEW BIKE/PED CONNECTIONS BE LOCATED?

Consultant team recommendation: add new bike and pedestrian connections along the Silver Springs and Torbank alignments. Consider additional connections at 400’-500’ intervals to create walkable blocks. These connections need not all continue to the Trolley Trail.

For the 20 year Framework Plan, where should new bike/ped connections be located? Should all new connections intersect with the Trolley Trail, or should some terminate at existing roads (i.e. Linden Lane or Linden Place)?
QUESTION #3 FOR CAC
WHERE SHOULD ACTIVITY IN THE AREA BE CONCENTRATED?

Our Framework Plan alternatives considered an option to focus activity along McLoughlin and another to focus activity along a parallel Main Street.

Where should activity in the study area be concentrated?

The following slides offer a few new variations for consideration along with the previous two.
FOCUS ON MCLOUGHLIN

Focus neighborhood activity along McLoughlin itself. This option will require a transformation of McLoughlin.
Focus activity on north/south village main street west of McLoughlin. This feature may present access and connectivity challenges, but has the opportunity to expand over time.
Focus community activity along 29th St. This option builds on an existing street and is located close to the light rail station.
Create an east/west pedestrian promenade west of McLoughlin, roughly in alignment with Evergreen St. This site presents some access and topography challenges, and is short in length, but could create a neighborhood pocket of activity.
Create an east/west neighborhood hub roughly in alignment with Silver Springs Rd. This option could be further supported by an additional north/south pedestrian connection, and connection to Linden Ln.
Focus activity along an east/west main street aligned with Torbank. This option builds largely on existing streets, and connects to both a bus stop and Oak Grove Elementary, as well as to Linden Ln.
Focus activity along an east/west main street aligned with Torbank. This option builds largely on existing streets, and connects to both a bus stop and Oak Grove Elementary, as well as to Linden Ln.
Consultant team recommendation: the Silver Springs and Torbank Hub concepts offer the fewest access and connectivity challenges, can connect to bus transit as well as the existing Linden Ln., and sit adjacent to opportunity sites for redevelopment.

Where should activity in the study area be concentrated?
PRELIMINARY CODE CONCEPTS
SETBACKS/Frontage

CURRENT STANDARDS

No maximum setback requirement

No requirements for setback design

PROPOSED CHANGES

Establish a maximum setback

Require landscape as part of setback / frontage

Require buildings to engage public space
**SETBACKS/FRONTAGE**

**PROPOSED CHANGES**

- Between private sites and public streets:
  - Emphasize building frontage
  - Use pedestrian plazas, trees and landscaping between the sidewalk and private site
  - Move private parking to side or rear of sites

- Will be complemented by elements within the public right-of-way such as:
  - Expanded sidewalks
  - Street trees and landscaping between the sidewalk and street
  - Protected bike lanes
  - On-street parking
SITE UTILIZATION PRIORITIES

CURRENT STANDARDS

- Large surface parking requirements (1.25 stalls per unit)

PROPOSED CHANGES

- Increase open space on parcels
- Balance building, parking, and open space mix with 0.5 stalls per unit
SITE UTILIZATION PRIORITIES

PROPOSED CHANGES

- Prioritize site area for uses in the following order:
  - Increase effective area available for building footprints, to increase housing and employment opportunities
  - Maintain existing area for courtyards and open space
  - Reduce site area devoted to private parking
GC - C3 MIX OF USES

CURRENT STANDARDS

- **Manufacturing** - on site manufacturing from raw materials **not permitted**.

- **Auto oriented** - range of auto-oriented uses are currently allowed.

- **Outdoor storage** - outdoor storage and uses currently allowed.

PROPOSED CHANGES

- **Manufacturing** - allow on-site production of goods from raw materials to be sold (i.e. breweries and distilleries would be allowed).

- **Auto oriented** - limit new uses like self-storage, commercial storage, car wash, gas station, car sales or car repair uses.

- **Outdoor storage** - prohibit outdoor storage and limit outdoor uses to cafe seating, street vendors, and sidewalk sales.
GC - C3 MIX OF USES

CURRENT STANDARDS

PROPOSED CHANGES
GC - C3 DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY

CURRENT STANDARDS

- Commercial scale: currently no maximum height or floor area ratio requirements.
- Residential scale: maximum of 25 dwelling units per acre with no maximum height or floor area ratio requirements.
- Minimum density of 22.5 units/acre required.

PROPOSED CHANGES

- Commercial scale: maintain existing requirements to preserve flexibility.
- Residential scale: Allow up to 50-100 dwelling units per acre
- Up to 4-5 story developments expected, but no height limit proposed
- Continue requiring minimum density of 22.5 units/acre
GC - C3 DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY AND USES

EXAMPLE: 50 DU/ACRE

EXAMPLE: 100 DU/ACRE
GC - C3 DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY

CURRENT STANDARDS

Maximum 25 du/ac, with minimum 22.5 du/ac for residential development

No maximum height or FAR for commercial development

PROPOSED CHANGES

Allow 50-100 du/ac, minimum 22.5 du/ac for residential development

4-5 Story Development
MR-1 DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY & USES

CURRENT STANDARDS

- Allows up to a maximum of 12 units per acre with minimum of 9.6 units per acre
- Allows townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, multifamily and manufactured dwelling parks
- No new single-family detached dwellings are permitted; existing houses are “grandfathered in” as nonconforming uses

PROPOSED CHANGES

- Increase maximum density to 20-30 units per acre, potentially depending on type of use and scale
- Maintain minimum density
- Allow cottage cluster developments in addition to existing uses
MR - 1 DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY AND USES

EXAMPLE: COTTAGES

EXAMPLE: TOWNHOUSES
MR-1 DENSITY

CURRENT STANDARDS

Maximum density of 12 DUs/acre

PROPOSED CHANGES

Increase density to allow up to 20-30 DUs/acre
NEXT STEPS
# PARK AVE COMMUNITY PROJECT

## UPDATED PROJECT TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principles</th>
<th>Framework Plan</th>
<th>Development &amp; Design Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Today’s CAC Mtg.**
- **Presentation to Board of County Commissioners (Public Hearing)**
- **Online Survey Open**
- **Public Workshop**
QUESTIONS?
THANK YOU!

Tim Smith
tims@seradesign.com

Erin Reome
erinr@seradesign.com

Emma-Quin Smith
emmaquins@seradesign.com