

## ATTACHMENT 3: ANALYSIS OF BIA RESPONSE TO 1-ACRE STANDARDS EXAMPLE

### **Parking Lot Efficiency**

BIA has stated in their response that 340 SF per space is not an accurate representation of the amount of space needed to encompass parking spaces and on-site circulation. A typical parking space (9'x18') requires 162 SF of space. The remaining 178 SF of space within that assumption accounts for internal circulation needed to access the parking spaces and provide fire access. The table also assumes an additional 10% of the overall parking area will be used for parking lot buffering and landscaping. While parking efficiency varies depending on the development and site conditions, Kimley-Horn and Associates has determined through analysis of previous development projects that the 340 SF per space calculation is a conservative estimate appropriate for planning purposes.

### **Site Development Capacity**

BIA has stated in their response that due to fire and on-site circulation, parking, and setbacks, only 50% of a typical site is developable. As shown in Table 1 of the original memo, these factors have been taken into consideration and the range of "Buildable Areas" shown for the various Development Scenarios is between 14,636 and 18,644 SF. That is approximately 34 – 43% of the overall site, in agreement with BIA's statement.

### **Revisions to Site Development Table**

In their correspondence, BIA provided a revised Development Scenarios table.

The BIA revised table has been inserted below, with comments showing where the City believes that BIA has overestimated the amount of space needed for parking and drive aisles. Additionally, the City believes BIA has made some mathematical calculations that were not in line with the previous assumptions made for the table, including that Scenario 1B and 2B take into account no impact from the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor setback, while 1A and 2A show a full impact (50% loss of the third floor). The BIA revision table shows scenarios 1B and 2B with a 50% loss of third floor as well. The table below includes a redline strikeout showing what the City believes to be more realistic development scenario space assumptions.

**Table 4**  
**Revised Development Scenario Table (Response to BIA Revisions)**

	DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS			
	1A	1B	2A	2B
Total Building Area	43,560	43,560	43,560	43,560
<b>SF Removed</b>				
Setbacks (inclusive of common amenity space)	7,956	7,956	7,956	7,956
Parking (340 <del>to 420</del> sf per stall) <del>avg 380 sf</del>	<del>12,160</del>	<del>12,160</del>	<del>12,160</del>	<del>12,160</del>
	10,880 <sup>1</sup>	10,880 <sup>1</sup>	13,600	13,600
Parking Lot Landscaping (10% of Parking)	<del>1,216</del>	<del>1,216</del>	<del>1,216</del>	<del>1,216</del>
	1,088	1,088	1,360	1,360
<del>Internal Circulation less setbacks</del>	<del>8,524</del>	<del>8,524</del>	<del>8,524</del>	<del>8,524</del>
Amenity Space (common and private)	5,400	9,000	2,000	6,000
<b>Subtotal (SF deducted from Total Building Area)</b>	<del>35,256</del>	<del>38,856</del>	<del>31,856</del>	<del>35,856</del>
	<b>25,324</b>	<b>28,924</b>	<b>24,916</b>	<b>28,916</b>
	<del>8,304</del>	<del>4,704</del>	<del>11,704</del>	<del>7,704</del>
<b>Buildable Area (1-floor)</b>	<b>18,236</b>	<b>14,636</b>	<b>18,644</b>	<b>14,636</b>
<b>Buildable Area (2-floor)</b>	<del>8,304</del>	<del>4,704</del>	<del>11,704</del>	<del>7,704</del>
	<b>18,236</b>	<b>14,636</b>	<b>18,644</b>	<b>14,636</b>
<b>Buildable Area (3-floor) – 50% of 2<sup>nd</sup> floor</b>	<del>4,152</del>	<del>2,352</del>	<del>5,852</del>	<del>3,852</del>
	<b>9,118</b>	<b>14,636</b>	<b>9,322</b>	<b>14,636</b>
Maximum building floor area	<del>20,760</del>	<del>11,760</del>	<del>29,260</del>	<del>19,260</del>
	45,590	43,908	46,610	43,924
Building Efficiency 80%/Misc. Building Space 20%	<del>4,152</del>	<del>2,352</del>	<del>5,852</del>	<del>3,852</del>
	9,118	8,782	9,322	8,785
	<del>16,608</del>	<del>9,408</del>	<del>23,408</del>	<del>15,408</del>
Total Net Rentable Space (sf)	35,472	35,126	37,288	35,139
	<del>554</del>	<del>314</del>	<del>780</del>	<del>514</del>
<b>Average Rentable SF per Unit – w/ 3<sup>rd</sup> floor setback</b>	<b>1,216</b>	<b>1,171</b>	<b>1,243</b>	<b>1,171</b>
<del>Average Rentable SF Per Unit – No 3<sup>rd</sup> floor setback</del>	<del>664</del>	<del>376</del>	<del>936</del>	<del>616</del>

1. Developments 1A and 1B show a podium or wrap style parking scenario, with at least half of the parking under residential units or all parking stacked in a 2-story parking structure. The total required parking for Developments 1A and 1B is 21,760 SF.
2. Each Development scenario assumes a different amount of amenity space is allocated to the perimeter setback area.
  - Development 1A assumes 3,600 SF of amenity space within the perimeter setback.
  - Development 1B assumes no amenity space within the perimeter setback.
  - Development 2A assumes 7,000 SF of amenity space within the perimeter setback.
  - Development 2B assumes 3,000 SF of amenity space within the perimeter setback

The primary difference in assumptions is that BIA proposes an increase from 340 SF to 380 SF for the purpose of calculating parking and internal drive aisles. As determined above, this number is above average for site planning purposes. Additionally, the chart has an added line item of 8,524 SF for “Internal circulation less setbacks.” This line item is duplicative of what was calculated for in the 380 SF and it is unknown how this number was calculated.

**Multiple Buildings (Building to Building Setback)**

**Attachment 4**, *Sage Canyon Development Example*, shows how multiple buildings on a single site do not exhibit a constraint on development of the Sage Canyon Site at 30 dwelling units per acre.

**Open Areas Around the Structure**

**Attachment 4**, *Sage Canyon Development Example*, shows a 10' clear space around each building for access to balconies or fire access.