

# Phase Two Narrative

## PART 1 - Proposed building program summary

Corner Lot - two single-family dwellings

Bldg. A - Small House [2-BR, 2.5-BA]

1. open living-dining-kitchen
2. separated flex room
3. second floor bedrooms and bathrooms including main BR suite
4. deck and outdoor storage

Bldg. B - Main House with shared functions [4-BR, 3.5-BA]

1. separated suite on ground floor with kitchenette and accessible features
2. living-dining-kitchen accommodating multiple cooks and large-ish gatherings
3. laundry/utility area which is also shared with the small house
4. second floor bedrooms and bathrooms including main BR suite
5. attached double carport
6. rooftop deck



340 N. Flower St.  
Anchorage, AK 99508  
(907) 351-4805  
www.frame-ak.com

**Seth C. Yerrington**  
**dba FRamE Residential Design**

Infill Lot - two single-family dwellings

Bldg. C - Small House [2-BR, 2.5-BA]

1. open living-dining-kitchen
2. separated flex room
3. second floor bedrooms and bathrooms including main BR suite

Bldg. D - Main House with shared functions [4-BR, 3.5-BA]

1. separated suite on ground floor with kitchenette and accessible features
2. living-dining-kitchen accommodating multiple cooks and large-ish gatherings
3. laundry/utility area which is also shared with the small house
4. second floor bedrooms and bathrooms including main BR suite
5. attached single garage
6. rooftop deck

**PART 2 - Multi-generational and resident livability highlights and features**

A. accessible features. In Bldgs. B and D, the separated suite on the First Floor complies with applicable accessibility standards.

B. Site features - Corner Lot

1. patio with fire pit
2. raspberry patch
3. long run for dogs
4. private fenced yard for small house
5. connecting gate at boundary of infill lot
6. additional driveway area not under carport
7. entry sequence treatments to welcome visitors
8. concrete sidewalks, flush to floor [no step-up]
9. screened outdoor storage below deck
10. fences with translucent panels
11. substantial landscape plantings [trees, shrubs, perennials, edibles]

C. Site features - Infill Lot

1. patio [shared]
2. private fenced yards
3. connecting gate at boundary of corner lot
4. shared driveway with parking for five vehicles
5. raspberry patch and adjacent landscaped area
6. long run for dogs

D. renewable energy provisions - solar panels, both photovoltaic and thermal type are located on walls where they will receive south and west daylight exposure

**PART 3 - Anticipated construction methods and special conditions**

A. recessed ground floor framing. Rather than the usual practice of platforming the floor joists on top of the foundation wall, would recess the joists into the foundation and support the bearing ends on pony walls down to the footings. This allows the sidewalks to be flush with the floor for accessible entrances without the use of ramps. This method is proposed for all four buildings. At Building D, the concrete garage floor to be approx. 7-1/2" below the first floor finish floor.

B. flat roofs with parapets. In recent years CIHA has used flat roofs with parapets only on large, multi-family buildings; with its smaller projects defaulting to cold/ventilated pitched roofs with 2 ft overhangs and no parapets - sometimes a low pitch, less than 3 in 12 with single-ply membrane roofing and more often 3 in 12 or steeper with asphalt composition shingles. Proposing flat roofs with parapets here so the multi-generational housing will stand out more from the dominant pattern in the neighborhood, signaling a new approach and modern

please see page three

sensibility. The configuration also allows wall-mounted solar panel arrays. Roof construction - single-ply membrane, tapered rigid insulation; with internal drains and overflow scuppers. Additional provisions at the ground for absorption of concentrated runoff into below-ground swales.

C. rooftop decks. There is more than one way to build these. Propose that the walking surface should be a typical composite decking which is installed dead level flat; and below that, tapered sleepers, single-ply membrane, tapered rigid insulation; with internal drains and overflow scuppers.

#### **PART 4 - Key questions, issues or complexities experienced during the design process**

A. The hypothetical sites in the design initiative do not have alleys. The actual sites in the four neighborhoods do have alleys to some extent - most of the Airport Heights and Rogers Park sites have alleys; in Turnagain and Ocean View there are relatively few alleys. The design solution could be a lot different if selected sites have alley access. The alley would offer a significant array of additional options.

B. Whether a garage ought to be part of the program. In the solution for the Corner Lot, a two-vehicle carport is included in lieu of a garage. Additional storage capacity is included to make up for the lack of a garage. The carport provides most of the protection for vehicles that a garage would provide. At the Infill Lot, a single-vehicle garage is included with the Main House [part of Bldg. D]. Arguments for the garage include: better security; flexibility in use; convenient. Arguments for the carport in lieu of garage: tends to be less imposing and in the way, allowing daylight and views through the carport; flexibility in use in different ways.

#### **PART 5 - Potential improvements or outcomes related to Title 21 code requirements, neighborhood contexts, or other local considerations**

A. setbacks. The Municipality really ought to further relax front setbacks and secondary front setbacks and allow certain trade-offs. The Corner Lot and Infill Lot schemes shown are inside the required setbacks except for the allowed projection of covered porches. If Bldg. A were allowed to be closer to the street than the 20 ft front setback allows, it would pay dividends for every other part of the Corner Lot layout, function and relationship to adjacent properties - larger shared yard, more space between buildings, better daylight exposure to interiors; greater design flexibility.

B. windows to the street. In the era of the Ring doorbell camera it seems less important to have windows to the street. The designer ought to have more leeway to respond to site constraints and opportunities and not be forced to provide windows in places where they're not needed or are of lesser value in consideration of overall site context.

#### **PART 6 - Revisions made during collaboration processes**

A. Members of the panel helped clarify existing Title 21 requirements regarding setbacks, and the position of Corner Lot buildings A and B were modified to suit.

B. Added covered outdoor seating areas adjacent to porch at Bldgs. B and D, per member of the panel in response to input from potential residents.

#### **PART 7 - Code barriers**

A. The designer's position is that the design for both the Corner Lot and Infill Lot are two single-family detached dwellings, which is permitted under current Title 21 zoning code. The Main Houses [Bldgs. B and D] include a separated suite with kitchenette, anticipated to be occupied by the elder generations in each family group. If the municipality ruled that the separated suite was actually an accessory dwelling unit [ADU] - even though it does not have a separate exterior entrance or full kitchen - it would: a. change the classification to a duplex [Bldgs. B and D] with and ADU [Bldgs. A and C]; requiring redundant utility connections and fire-rated separations and sprinklers.

## Part 8 - Cost Estimate

<b>AARP Multi-Generational Housing Development Cost Estimator</b>					
<b>Assumptions</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Bldg. A</b>	<b>Bldg. B</b>	<b>Bldg. C</b>	<b>Bldg. D</b>
Units	6,665	910	2140	910	2705
Bedrooms	12	2	4	2	4
Bathrooms	12	2.5	3.5	2.5	3.5
Garage Area	285				285
Living Area	6,665	910	2140	910	2705
Gross Building Square Footage (GBSF)	6,950	910	2,140	910	2,990
[stairs counted first floor only, typical]					
[covered porches excluded, typical]					
If Condo Will Be Created					
Construction Cost PSF Assumption*	\$240	\$240.00	\$240.00	\$240.00	\$250.00
Rooftop deck			22000		22000
Deck and outdoor storage		25000			
Carport, 2-vehicle			30000		
<b>Subtotal-Buildings</b>	\$1,767,000				
<b>Acquisition Costs</b>					
Land	\$182,000	\$45,500	\$45,500	\$45,500	\$45,500
<b>Subtotal-Acquisition &amp; Rehab</b>	<b>\$182,000</b>				
<b>Construction &amp; Site Costs</b>					
Construction Site Costs	\$50,000				
General Requirements	\$2,500				
<b>Subtotal-Total Construction Costs</b>	<b>\$52,500</b>				
<b>Soft Costs - General</b>					
A&E Design	\$48,000	\$10,000	14000	10000	14000
Condo Setup Fee (if applicable - plug cell B10)					
<b>Subtotal-Soft Costs</b>	<b>\$48,000</b>				
<b>Total Development Cost</b>	<b>\$2,049,500</b>	<b>\$308</b>	<b>\$308</b>	<b>\$308</b>	<b>\$308</b>

**PART 9 - Market assessment [e.g., comparable property sales]**

We can be reasonably assured of a distinct lack of existing similar properties, accommodating three or four generations in separated living units and suites and with substantial shared amenities and options in use. With property costs and interest rates rising steadily the last few years [and maintenance costs, along with], it is getting more difficult for a single person or a couple to afford to own rather than rent.

If two or three generations of a family are able to combine resources toward a purchase, it is still expensive - and the properties available are a compromise solution. There are existing triplexes and 4-plexes on the market, but the floor plan configurations would typically not offer the shared spaces and function/features of these proposed buildings and site amenities; and the available single-family, duplexes and small multiplexes will typically be a few decades old and have condition and maintenance issues attached, to the point they may not be worth putting money into a renovation.

An additional advantage of these Corner Lot and Infill Lot designs are that the Small House could be used as income property if one generation were to opt-out of the shared arrangement; or if fewer generations were part of the ownership group initially.

There would be multiple ways to structure the finances of the ownership group. Perhaps the middle generation could provide most or all of the ongoing mortgage payments, utilities, taxes and maintenance expenses. The elder generation could provide the down payment. The younger generation could supplement the middle generation by splitting the ongoing expenses, later taking over the responsibilities entirely. There will need to be buyout provisions and a clear delineation of responsibility and percentage of ownership. It seems complex, but for generations up to the current era there have been properties in the same family for a century or more and passed down from older to younger generations, where there was cooperation, and a goal of upkeep and carrying as little debt as possible to realize maximum value from the investment.

It is anticipated that the initial construction will be somewhat unadorned -- functional and durable, but not necessarily including high-end finishes. In so doing, the interiors can be customized by the owners in the future and as part of an ongoing process to transform the spaces in a way that will showcase family history and move the experience of the space from a blank canvas to a beloved family home - adding built-ins; upgraded wall, floor and ceiling finishes; and fixtures. At Buildings B and D at the main entry there are 8'-0"-height doors at the main entry and door to the separated suite, and a double-height space at the main entry. The doors could be upgraded with up-cycled antiques and a beautiful vintage-style large light fixture added, for a great first impression and a preview of a rich experience to come within.