

CITY OF ASHLAND

Infill Strategies Project
Developer Roundtable
December 12, 2017

Guests:

Laz Ayala
Tom Bradley
Eric Bonetti
Ray Chirgwin
Mark DiRienzo
Mark Knox
Rick Lindemann
Gil Livni
David Thruston
Paige West
Jerome White

Staff/Consultants Present:

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director
Maria Harris, Planning Manager
Brandon Goldman, Senior Planner
Dana Smith,
John Fregonese, Fregonese Associates
Scott Fregonese, Fregonese Associates
Cassandra Dobson, Fregonese Associates

Presentation

John Fregonese made a presentation about the Infill Strategy project including the ideas for amendments to the land use ordinance and development standards. The presentation slides are available at ashland.or.us/transit_triangle.

Comments

- Like it all except have a problem with the building step back. This is too prescriptive. Should add flexibility for design alternatives because there are other ways to provide articulation in upper stories.
- Would love to see an examples you may have or think of for language for architectural articulation standard.
- Agree about building stepbacks. People love downtown with its multi-story buildings. Shouldn't water down, especially at Tolman because it is the entrance to our town.
- Did allow room for circulation in interior in building prototypes in ROI model?
- Construction costs have gone up and continue to rise. Around \$180 to \$185 a square foot. Includes permitting costs.
- Only one manufacturer makes elevators for three-story buildings. More flexibility in getting elevators for four stories.
- Is this an exercise to increase housing in the transit triangle or increase affordable housing? Don't like requirement of affordable. This creates a question going into a site, decreases the incentive to building housing.
- We've seen construction costs as high as \$225 a square foot.
- Have there been any conversations about allowing a higher FAR and more stories? This helps with the economies of scale.
- Have considered unbundling the parking requirements for the affordable units since those folks often don't have a vehicle. DHS gives clients free bus pass. Developer could provide a program and binding agreement that residents don't have car – build a bus stop, provide bust program, provide car share. This compared to the cost of building parking can be far less.
- Heard at previous stakeholder meeting that market will drive how much parking is needed. Also, banks sometimes won't lend if not showing "enough" parking.
- What is the thinking of prohibiting condos? Where do residents go from there, if they start renting and want to buy something.

- One could still be condos but not using the option offered in the transit triangle overlay using FAR rather than density cap, reduced landscaping and parking. Concern with condos is that they tend to be a luxury and used as second homes rather than housing for workforce. If have those buyers can drive up market price.
- If goal is to loosen code and encourage housing, consider allowing more residential and requiring less commercial requirement drives up costs because there is limited demand in Ashland for retail and office space. This becomes a risk, and too much if have to build 65% commercial on ground floor. Suggest model where allow residential on ground floor that can be later converted to commercial space.
- How about live/work units.
- What about parking placement and allowing on both sides?
- Parking at rear of building provides buffer from adjacent residential zones.
- It would be best to have parking on Ashland St.
- How far have you drilled into future of cars and autonomous car. If I were developing, I would incorporate flexibility in design so that as parking isn't needed could replace with more residential development.
- My kids are in their 20's, have driver's licenses but don't want or have cars. We're focused on early retirees who want and have cars but this will change soon, is changing with the next generation.
- What about option for development that provides car share? Could have two or three cars, residents buy into program and managed by HOA. But would need reduction in parking to offset costs.
- Consider allowing smaller spaces for ultra-compact cars – can fit two in one traditional space.
- Have you looked at commuting patterns and commuting between cities? Still a lot of that going on in the valley.
- The idea is if there were some rental units in this area, some of those people could live and work in Ashland thereby eliminating some of the daily travel between cities.