

## URBAN VILLAGE SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION: May 2, 2007

### Motion #1 – Relating to a Preferred Land Use Scenario

#### Motion by Commissioner Lee Pinkoson, Seconded by Ed Poppell Motion passed 4-1, with Commissioner Donovan opposing

Refer back to staff the issue of density in the Urban Village for a recommendation, keeping in mind the discussion of the Subcommittee. The discussion of the Subcommittee included the following general criteria for a land use scenario:

- Provide a range of minimum residential densities which “raise the bar” higher and “push the market” to provide higher densities in the area.
- Minimum densities around 24 to 40 units per acre should be used as a general guide, but Planning Team staff has the flexibility to recommend appropriate minimum densities, taking into account market factors.
- The highest density and intensity land uses should be concentrated around the SW 34<sup>th</sup> Street/SW 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridors, with densities and intensities stepping down as they move to the west and north toward environmentally sensitive areas
- The Subcommittee is generally supportive of the concept of a mix of non-residential uses within the residential areas. The 1.1 million square feet of non-residential which was proposed in the Activity Node and Density Maximization Plans is too high and should be scaled back

### Motion #2 – Relating to Local Examples of Density

#### Motion by Ed Poppell, Seconded by Jeanna Mastrodicasa Motion passed 5-0

Provide data and examples, including photos, of various residential densities in the local area. Specifically, information should be provided on the following projects:

- Apartments at SW 13<sup>th</sup> Street and Depot Avenue
- University Corners (*not yet built*)
- Project at SW 6<sup>th</sup> Street and SW 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (*not yet built*)
- Various apartment complexes south of Archer Road
- Piccadilly

Uninc St -  
50/acre  
SW 2nd -  
100/acre

#3  
• Policy for annexation tied to densities  
• EARS County - Urban Service Area - to due

Lona Donovan  
6/14/07

#070037

The evaluation of impacts of the four development scenarios at build-out projects the following:

- 1) No Change to current land use plan: expected population is 11,000, with commercial at 270,000 sf.
- 2) Core Park plan: expected pop at 11,000; commercial at 440,000sf.
- 3) Activity Node plan: expected pop at 31,000; commercial at 1.2 million sf.
- 4) Density Maximization plan: expected pop at 61,000; commercial at 1.2 million sf.

Here is an alternative proposal which I prefer:

- Before any further decisions are made about what scenario to pursue, the County would work with the City to get this general land area annexed into the City.
- Thereafter, the City would have primary responsibility for deciding what land use and zoning practices will occur along this urban fringe.
- Interested parties could then examine what scenario is most healthy for the urban area and beyond.

An acceptable alternative scenario for me is:

- Continue the MTPO discussion regarding which it prefers among the current four proposed scenarios.
- Once that decision has been made, no further action will be taken until the area is annexed into the City.
- Thereafter, the City would determine the timing of the changes to be made in the land use plan and in zoning.

The reasons for recommending the above change are as follows: To assign any of the four scenarios for urban development to the County will likely have the same result that other regions have experienced:

- Urban fringe growth that competes with the City for urban development resources and causes the economic core to decline.
- Urban sprawl into the unincorporated areas that is lower density and eats up green space and natural resources before there is real need.