

## Adam Zack

---

**From:** Fred Klein <freddythek10@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 9, 2019 2:10 PM  
**To:** Adam Zack  
**Cc:** John Campbell; Paul Kamin EWUA  
**Subject:** Eastsound LCA

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Adam,

In conversation with others on development capacity within the existing UGA boundaries, I've learned that:

It is also worth noting that roughly 2/3 of that development capacity, 519 of 764, lies in the Village Residential 4-12 unit zone and assumes there will be NO commercial/institutional development.

If this is accurate...and this is what your algorithms are telling you...I would urge you to get a sense of what's on the ground, and ask yourself what the realistic potential for this VR 4-12 area actually is.

It consists of two lotting patterns, the first being very small lots, virtually all of which are presently occupied by small single family detached dwellings; the second being a few larger lots with a small number of one and two story apartments. My hunch is that if you were to take a look around, you would readily conclude that the potential for future development within the planning period is but a tiny fraction of what your present analysis concludes.

I understand that you base your analysis on the allowable densities in each land use designation...but if the goal is to actually provide development opportunities within the UGA, perhaps some history will help to give some context and override the implications of this particularly sloppy land use designation which only occurs in this one isolated area.

When I arrived here thirty years ago, this area had been designated as an isolated pocket of Village Residential land. I don't know when or why that occurred; the very small SFD lots had been recorded long before planning of any kind occurred. Most likely, the VR designation was in response to a small pocket of one and two story apartments, but I speculate.

I do recall, when serving on EPRC, participating in a LU review which determined that the VR designation was inappropriate, and the VR 4-12 was concocted so as to recognize the small lots AND the isolated pocket of rental apartments, and to avoid the \*taking\* of any of their development potential.

There was NEVER an intention to convert the large area of tiny lots into multi-family development at 12 du/acre.

To suggest that the VR-4-12 area has a development potential to satisfy the projected need for over 500 dwellings defies reason.

In any event, please supplement the results of your computer analysis with your planning skills and expertise and ensure that this CP update process is more than just an exercise to generate numbers which purport to satisfy GMA mandates.

Best,

Fred