

05-05-2021 Town Council Meeting

Responses to Council Questions

Item 18: Evidentiary Hearing Continued: SUP Modification for University Place, 201 S. Estes Drive.

Council Question:

Could the applicant please provide written response to the advisory boards' stipulations indicating for each whether they have made the requested change, and if not, their willingness to do so, or reason for inability to do so?

Staff Response:

Please see the attached document for the applicant's response.

Council Question:

Have there been any changes to the application since we last reviewed it?

Council Question:

In their presentation, the applicant responds to Council questions/comments from the previous meeting. I could not tell, however, if they were responding in terms of the original proposal or if changes had been made. Has the applicant made any changes to their proposal since the last meeting and, if so, what are they?

Applicant Response:

The items in the draft presentation slides were primarily detailed explanations of the conditions we have previously proposed and the justifications for doing so. Exceptions or new conditions include:

- *Our proposal to commit to treat stormwater with approx. 30,000 SF of additional drainage area in addition to enhancing the existing storm systems. That creates a total of ~100,000 SF of stormwater drainage area being treated through rain gardens or alternative storm systems.*
- *We are also in agreement to dedicate at least 20% of the proposed incubator retail to minority owned businesses as proposed by Council member Huynh.*
- *We agree to remove the word "optional" and add a minimum width to the outdoor amenity space in the cross-section of the proposed Internal Main Street, with a minimum width proposed to be 50' from curb to curb comprised of sidewalk, landscape & hardscape.*
- *Our presentation on Wednesday will also include a revised proposal for addressing the concern over potential conversion rights from commercial to multifamily.*

Council Question:

Has the applicant responded to the requests from multiple advisory boards regarding unbundling of parking, impervious surface, and rainwater harvesting?

Applicant Response:

Unbundling Parking -We are open to unbundling of parking; however, it would only be applicable to the multifamily portion of the property. One issue with doing so is that with the

05-05-2021 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions

site containing multiple parking areas for different uses, by unbundling parking, it will likely just result in multifamily residents electing to not pay for parking and then parking their vehicles in the retail parking areas to avoid paying rather than incentivizing them to not have a vehicle. We are proposing a significant parking share within Pod A between the multifamily and retail. Currently, there are ~250 surface parking spaces on Pod A serving the existing retail. Our proposed plans would have a total of ~400 spaces that would include replacement spaces for the existing retail, spaces to serve the new retail (~9,000 SF) in the multifamily building and for the ~250 multifamily units. That's a net increase of only 150 spaces for the added 250 units and 9,000 SF retail. Typical parking for those uses on a stand-alone basis would be ~1.35 spaces per unit on multifamily (337 spaces) and 4.5 per 1,000 SF on retail (41 spaces), which would be an additional 378 spaces, so our proposed parking assumes 228 spaces less than what would typically be provided based on a shared parking model.

Impervious Surface - Due to the many constraints as a result of having 30+ existing retail tenants with various lease rights that include protected parking fields, view corridors and maintaining specific number of parking spaces, only ~45% of the site would be available to provide the majority of the reduction to impervious area. This creates a true hardship, but we are proposing to reduce impervious to a at most 75%, which would be equal to a reduction of approximately 55,000 SF or 1.2 acres.

Rainwater Harvesting – As presented to the Stormwater Board, we are committing to add/expand rain gardens on the site to capture an additional ~30,000 SF of drainage area for a total of ~100,000 SF of drainage area. This is in addition to the ~55,000 SF of impervious area being removed.

Council Question:

What is the actual length of the residential building proposed for Willow Drive?

Applicant Response:

The length of the building proposed on Pod A (Willow Dr.) is approximately 535' in length. Given that the driveways on both the north and south side of the proposed apartments and the alley drive aisle between apartments and Silverspot are protected by tenant lease rights, the perimeter of the block is already established. We understand that if we were starting new today, we would be creating a smaller block length, but under the existing constraints, we have tried to address the additional length with the articulation of the building.

Council Question:

Given the flexibility proposed for the site – particularly the ability to convert Pod C to residential -- what assumptions were used in conducting the TIA?

05-05-2021 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions

Applicant Response:

The TIA assumed the following:

- *Phase 1 (2023) – 350,000 SF retail & 255 multifamily units*
- *Phase 2 (2025) – 50,000 SF office*
- *Phase 3 (2027) – 100,000 SF office, 150 hotel rooms, 100,000 SF retail & 45 multifamily units.*

The TIA did not assume conversion rights for multifamily from retail/office since the traffic generated from the commercial uses is more intense and converting to multifamily would result in less traffic.

Council Question:

As the applicant has cited existing lease obligations for their inability to address certain board and Council concerns regarding, for example, parking requirements and impervious surface, can they share the timeframes associated with those leases and would they be willing to adjust phasing such that certain parts of the project would not be built until lease obligations no longer existed and concerns could be addressed?

Applicant Response:

We are not able to share detailed information as the leases contain confidentiality clauses; however, we can provide the lease expirations for the 5 largest tenants without specifically naming them to provide context as to the long-term nature of those lease terms. In no particular order, they are: 2050, 2045, 2038, 2035, 2040. This extends far beyond the timeframe of our proposed redevelopment.

**05-05-2021 Town Council Meeting
Responses to Council Questions #2**

ITEM #18: Evidentiary Hearing Continued: Special Use Permit Modification for University Place, 201 S. Estes Drive

Council Question:

Now that we are apparently able to apply the Town wide traffic model to specific projects, would it be appropriate to use it for the University Place proposal?

Staff Response:

The University Place redevelopment project is developed in the Town-wide Traffic Model and will be presented as part of the public process.

Council Question:

I noted that the Stormwater Management Utility Advisory Board had reviewed this application. Upon whose request was that review conducted? Are the comments made consistent with the Board's charge?

Staff Response:

The standard procedure for Council to receive input from the Stormwater Management Utility Advisory Board (SMUAB) on a development proposal is for Council to request for the SMUAB to provide that input. In this case, the applicant requested to present the development proposal to SMUAB and ask for comments.

The comments were stormwater related and within the SMUAB's charge.