5.3.2 Mixed-Use Concept along East Garvey

The mixed-use development concept proposed for the East Garvey neighborhood would represent a very different scale of development from that envisioned at Garvey / Atlantic. This concept, sited on the south side of Garvey Avenue between Sefton Avenue and Rural Drive, provides an example of live-work townhouses. These three-story units would provide space for small studios, shops, or offices on the ground floor with living quarters above. In this specific concept, additional residential-only units would be constructed in the rear of the property.

This characteristics of this prototype are:

- Site size – 1 block, 0.61 acres
- 12 live work units @ 1600 SF per unit
- 4 residential-only units at 1300 SF per unit
- Total building area – 25,680 SF
- Floor-area ratio – 0.91
- 25 units per acre
- Parking:
  - 2 residential spaces per unit – 32 residential spaces
  - 8 guest spaces for live/work units
  - Overall – 2.5 spaces per unit

The site plan for this prototype (see Figure 5-2) illustrates its relationship to the surrounding area. Buildings are set back 5 feet from the property line to create a 15' minimum sidewalk width (see Figure 5-3). Parking is accessed from the rear of the property, along an existing alley. Unbuilt portions of the site have been

Figure 5-2. Site plan for live-work townhouses in East Garvey.

Figure 5-3. Cross-section through mixed-use concept for East Garvey.

landscaped. As shown in Figures 5-3 through 5-6, the live-work units would be organized to provide public and private entries as well as private open space for each unit. Units in the rear of the property would be stepped back from the alley in order to better integrate with adjacent single-family residential neighborhood.

The live-work lifestyle concept would be well suited to East Garvey. Along this portion of Garvey, existing commercial uses are less intense than further west in Downtown. Small shops and studios would provide an opportunities for creative artists and entrepreneurs with small businesses to live right over their workspace.

Figure 5-7 illustrates the type of architectural detailing and interest in design which projects in Downtown Monterey Park should exhibit. Details including awnings, balconies, arbors, and building setbacks provide residents and pedestrian passersby with an appealing backdrop for their activities. This isometric drawing also illustrates how private development can be integrated with the public realm, showing a curb bump-out at a bus stop, street furniture, and landscaping.

Keyser Marston Associates (KMA), a real estate and economic analysts with experience in Monterey Park, completed a pro forma development feasibility analysis of this prototype project. KMA collected information from multiple sources to analyze the project, including market data reports, recently proposed projects, and cost factors for new development. The full pro forma is attached to this Plan as Appendix C.

The analysis estimated that this type of development would cost approximately 10% more to construct than existing home prices in the area. However, new development in area with little recent development (such as Monterey Park) can often attract a premium in purchase price over existing development. Furthermore, as housing prices continue to rise this type of project will be increasingly attractive to developers, particularly on unimproved or poorly improved properties such as those that are common along East Garvey.

Figure 5-4. Ground floor plan detail.

Figure 5-5. 2nd floor plan detail.

Figure 5-6. 3rd floor plan detail.

Figure 5-7. Isometric drawing of prototype project along East Garvey, highlighting architectural detailing and relationship to public realm.

5.4 Application of Design Guidelines to New Commercial Development

While the development standards and design guidelines in this chapter are focused on mixed-use development, commercial development without a residential component in Downtown Monterey Park should also address the livable communities objectives contained in this Plan.

In terms of the application of this Plan to commercial development in Downtown, *all* of the Design Guidelines (Section 5.2) apply to commercial development as well. In addition, commercial developers should consult the existing Design Review Guidelines.

Of the development standards (Section 5.1), only Standard III-B, regarding pedestrian orientation of development and front setbacks, is applicable. For additional standards, refer to the Code requirements of the underlying zone.

5.5 Recommendations for Existing Commercial Development

In addition to new development, whether mixed-use or entirely commercial, existing commercial development in Downtown Monterey necessarily forms a major component of the livable communities Vision. A number of minor, low-cost improvements are available to property and business owners in order that can create a more cohesive, attractive Downtown that will attract additional patrons to the area.

5.4.1 Recommendations for Existing Development Built Up to the Sidewalk

Much of the development along the major streets of Downtown is already reasonably pedestrian-oriented in that it has been built up to the sidewalk. For these buildings, the most beneficial improvements address the attractiveness of shops and the overall building to potential customers walking down the street. Guidelines for improving the street frontage of existing commercial development include:

- Provide attractive window displays avoiding clutter and storage of merchandise against windows.
- Avoid blocking storefront windows with excessive signage or furniture placed up against the windows. Potential customers will be more likely to enter a store where they can see what's inside.
- Building signage should specifically indicate the type of service or good sold inside.
- Install "unifying" architectural elements along the building or series of buildings such as awnings or a single style of signage in order to establish a recognizable pattern of storefront design along the street.
- Maintain the attractiveness of the building façade by periodically washing grime from windows and walls, and applying new paint if the existing is chipping.
- Clean the sidewalk in front of the building, removing trash and wiping up spills.
- Consider updating the façade architecture.
- No window signs shall exceed four square feet of 15 percent of the window area whichever is less.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Existing Development with Parking along the Sidewalk

For development that is not built up to the sidewalk but instead has its parking along the sidewalk, the storefront recommendations listed in Section 5.4.1 still apply. In addition, improvements recommended here make it easier for pedestrians to get from the sidewalk to store entries and more pleasant to walk along the parking lot. Guidelines for improving parking lots include:

- Install landscaping between the sidewalk and the parking lot. This will create a more pleasant pedestrian environment on the sidewalk.
- Ensure that clear pathways exist through the parking lot between the sidewalk and store entries, inviting pedestrians to shop in the stores.

5.4.3 Education and Code Updates

The City needs to develop educational programs, stronger codes, and enforcement programs to ensure that the overall vision of the Mixed-Use and Pedestrian Linkages Plan is carried out in all areas along the corridor.

Appendix A. Acknowledgements

Mixed-Use and Pedestrian Linkages Steering Committee

Walter Beaumont
Joyce Chan
David Garcia
Richard Kwok
Ryan H. Lee
Paul Perez
Patricia Reichenberger
Johnny Thompson
Roger C. Werbel
Edward Wong

Monterey Park City Council

Sharon Martinez, Mayor
Mike Eng, Vice Mayor
Betty Tom Chu, Council Member
David T. Lau, Council Member
Benjamin "Frank" Venti, Council Member

Monterey Park City Staff

Chris Jeffers, City Manager
Brian Dowling, Redevelopment Project Manager
Ray Hamada, Planning Manager
Amy Ho, Transportation Manager
Kelvin G. Tainatongo, Director of Economic Development

Consultant Team

Gruen Associates, Prime Consultant:
Elaine V. Carbrey, AIA AICP, Project Manager
Andrew Mondschein, AICP
Roland Genick, AICP
Jennifer Hsu
Michelle Ball
Alfred LaFave
Jing Zhou
Matthew Parrent

Ki Suh Park, FAIA FAICP, Partner-in Charge

Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Transportation Consultant:
Bryan Mayeda, Project Manager
Vikki Li

Viggen Davidian, Principal-in-Charge

Murakawa Communications, Outreach Consultant:
Trisha Murakawa, Principal and Project Manager
Monica Ortiz

Diana Ho, Diana Ho Consulting Group
Genoveva Arellano, Arellano Associates

Keyser Marston Associates, Inc., Market Analysis
Cal Hollis, Principal
Kevin Engstrom

Appendix B.
Traffic Analysis

Monterey Park Mixed-Use and Pedestrian Linkages Study
Level of Service Summary - Future Conditions with Land Use Scenario 1
With "Low Cost" and Signal System Improvements

Study Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Future w/Scenario 1		Future w/Scenario 1 w/Low Cost Imprvs [a]		Future w/Scenario 1 w/Improvements [b]	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1 Atlantic Blvd and Hellman Ave	AM	1.035	F	1.147	F	0.976	E	0.876	D
	PM	0.938	E	1.183	F	0.969	E	0.869	D
2 Atlantic Blvd and Emerson Ave	AM	0.744	C	0.895	D	0.895	D	0.795	C
	PM	0.806	D	1.165	F	1.165	F	1.065	F
3 Atlantic Blvd and Ralphs Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.533	A	0.619	B	0.612	B	0.512	A
	PM	0.698	B	0.905	E	0.893	D	0.793	C
4 Atlantic Blvd and Garvey Ave	AM	0.788	C	0.895	D	0.844	D	0.744	C
	PM	0.740	C	0.942	E	0.942	E	0.842	D
5 Chandler Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.628	B	0.739	C	0.739	C	0.639	B
	PM	0.715	C	0.903	E	0.843	D	0.743	C
6 Ynez Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.624	B	0.725	C	0.656	B	0.556	A
	PM	0.905	E	1.075	F	0.873	D	0.773	C
7 McPherrin Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.329	F	1.413	F	1.048	F	0.948	E
	PM	0.750	C	0.909	E	0.792	C	0.692	B
8 Ramona Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.506	A	0.582	B	0.582	A	0.482	A
	PM	0.699	B	0.856	D	0.856	D	0.756	C
9 Garfield Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.944	E	1.107	F	1.027	F	0.927	E
	PM	0.963	E	1.240	F	1.174	F	1.074	F
10 Garfield Ave and Avondale Ave	AM	0.470	A	0.562	A	0.525	A	0.425	A
	PM	0.750	C	0.970	E	0.857	D	0.757	C
11 Garfield Ave and Emerson Ave	AM	0.727	C	0.887	D	0.887	D	0.787	C
	PM	0.776	C	1.096	F	1.096	F	0.996	E
12 Garfield Ave and Hospital Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.492	A	0.595	A	0.595	A	0.495	A
	PM	0.637	B	0.830	D	0.830	D	0.730	C
13 Garfield Ave and Garfield Medical Dr. (Hampton Ave)	AM	0.618	B	0.719	C	0.719	C	0.619	B
	PM	0.711	C	0.899	D	0.899	D	0.799	C
14 Garfield Ave and Hellman Ave	AM	0.748	C	0.871	D	0.871	D	0.771	C
	PM	0.927	E	1.185	F	1.185	F	1.085	F
15 Alhambra Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.074	F	1.167	F	1.120	F	1.020	F
	PM	1.058	F	1.291	F	1.221	F	1.121	F
16 New Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.717	C	0.779	C	0.779	C	0.679	B
	PM	0.816	D	0.939	E	0.939	E	0.839	D

Notes
[a] Improvements primarily include restriping approaches to provide additional/exclusive turn lanes.
[b] Includes low cost and signal system improvements.
Level of Service Analysis Per Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) Method.

Monterey Park Mixed-Use and Pedestrian Linkages Study
Level of Service Summary - Future Conditions with Land Use Scenario 2
With "Low Cost" and Signal System Improvements

Study Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Future w/Scenario 2		Future w/Scenario 2 w/Low Cost Imprvs [a]		Future w/Scenario 2 w/Improvements [b]	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1 Atlantic Blvd and Hellman Ave	AM	1.035	F	1.139	F	0.971	E	0.871	D
	PM	0.938	E	1.139	F	0.935	E	0.835	D
2 Atlantic Blvd and Emerson Ave	AM	0.744	C	0.890	D	0.890	D	0.790	C
	PM	0.806	D	1.145	F	1.145	F	1.045	F
3 Atlantic Blvd and Ralphs Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.533	A	0.604	B	0.597	A	0.497	A
	PM	0.698	B	0.855	D	0.843	D	0.743	C
4 Atlantic Blvd and Garvey Ave	AM	0.788	C	0.885	D	0.835	D	0.735	C
	PM	0.740	C	0.914	E	0.914	E	0.814	D
5 Chandler Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.628	B	0.730	C	0.730	C	0.630	B
	PM	0.715	C	0.878	D	0.816	D	0.716	C
6 Ynez Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.624	B	0.719	C	0.649	B	0.549	A
	PM	0.905	E	1.059	F	0.856	D	0.756	C
7 McPherrin Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.329	F	1.404	F	1.039	F	0.939	E
	PM	0.750	C	0.892	D	0.774	C	0.674	B
8 Ramona Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.506	A	0.570	B	0.570	A	0.470	A
	PM	0.699	B	0.824	D	0.824	D	0.724	C
9 Garfield Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.944	E	1.100	F	1.023	F	0.923	E
	PM	0.963	E	1.210	F	1.145	F	1.045	F
10 Garfield Ave and Avondale Ave	AM	0.470	A	0.595	A	0.535	A	0.435	A
	PM	0.750	C	1.124	E	0.919	E	0.819	D
11 Garfield Ave and Emerson Ave	AM	0.727	C	0.900	D	0.900	D	0.800	C
	PM	0.776	C	1.113	F	1.113	F	1.013	F
12 Garfield Ave and Hospital Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.492	A	0.603	B	0.603	B	0.503	A
	PM	0.637	B	0.838	D	0.838	D	0.738	C
13 Garfield Ave and Garfield Medical Dr. (Hampton Ave)	AM	0.618	B	0.726	C	0.726	C	0.626	B
	PM	0.711	C	0.907	D	0.907	E	0.807	D
14 Garfield Ave and Hellman Ave	AM	0.748	C	0.874	D	0.874	D	0.774	C
	PM	0.927	E	1.180	F	1.180	F	1.080	F
15 Alhambra Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.074	F	1.125	F	1.097	F	0.997	E
	PM	1.058	F	1.205	F	1.143	F	1.043	F
16 New Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.717	C	0.776	C	0.776	C	0.676	B
	PM	0.816	D	0.920	E	0.920	E	0.820	D

Notes
[a] Improvements primarily include restriping approaches to provide additional/exclusive turn lanes.
[b] Includes low cost and signal system improvements.
Level of Service Analysis Per Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) Method.

Monterey Park Mixed-Use and Pedestrian Linkages Study
Level of Service Summary - Future Conditions with Land Use Scenario 3
With "Low Cost" and Signal System Improvements

Study Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Future w/Scenario 3		Future w/Scenario 3 w/Low Cost Imprvs [a]		Future w/Scenario 3 w/Improvements [b]	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1 Atlantic Blvd and Hellman Ave	AM	1.035	F	1.147	F	0.977	E	0.877	D
	PM	0.938	E	1.191	F	0.976	E	0.876	D
2 Atlantic Blvd and Emerson Ave	AM	0.744	C	0.892	D	0.892	D	0.792	C
	PM	0.806	D	1.167	F	1.167	F	1.067	F
3 Atlantic Blvd and Ralphs Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.533	A	0.619	B	0.612	B	0.512	A
	PM	0.698	B	0.907	E	0.895	D	0.795	C
4 Atlantic Blvd and Garvey Ave	AM	0.788	C	0.900	D	0.848	D	0.748	C
	PM	0.740	C	0.956	E	0.956	E	0.856	D
5 Chandler Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.628	B	0.738	C	0.738	C	0.638	B
	PM	0.715	C	0.909	E	0.850	D	0.750	C
6 Ynez Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.624	B	0.733	C	0.664	B	0.564	A
	PM	0.905	E	1.092	F	0.889	D	0.789	C
7 McPherrin Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.359	F	1.453	F	1.054	F	0.954	E
	PM	0.750	C	0.926	E	0.810	D	0.710	C
8 Ramona Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.506	A	0.596	A	0.596	A	0.496	A
	PM	0.699	B	0.888	D	0.888	D	0.788	C
9 Garfield Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.944	E	1.137	F	1.056	F	0.956	E
	PM	0.963	E	1.290	F	1.210	F	1.110	F
10 Garfield Ave and Avondale Ave	AM	0.470	A	0.604	B	0.550	A	0.450	A
	PM	0.750	C	1.052	F	0.905	E	0.805	D
11 Garfield Ave and Emerson Ave	AM	0.727	C	0.882	D	0.882	D	0.782	C
	PM	0.776	C	1.122	F	1.122	F	1.022	F
12 Garfield Ave and Hospital Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.492	A	0.603	B	0.603	B	0.503	A
	PM	0.637	B	0.854	D	0.854	D	0.754	C
13 Garfield Ave and Garfield Medical Dr. (Hampton Ave)	AM	0.618	B	0.726	C	0.726	C	0.626	B
	PM	0.711	C	0.923	E	0.923	E	0.823	D
14 Garfield Ave and Hellman Ave	AM	0.748	C	0.881	D	0.880	D	0.780	C
	PM	0.927	E	1.207	F	1.207	F	1.107	F
15 Alhambra Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.074	F	1.164	F	1.123	F	1.023	F
	PM	1.058	F	1.300	F	1.229	F	1.129	F
16 New Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.717	C	0.775	C	0.775	C	0.675	B
	PM	0.816	D	0.949	E	0.949	E	0.849	D
Number of Locations at LOS E or F		6/16		14/16		11/16		6/16	

Notes
[a] Improvements primarily include restriping approaches to provide additional/exclusive turn lanes.
[b] Includes low-cost and signal system improvements.
Level of Service Analysis Per Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) Method.

Monterey Park Mixed-Use and Pedestrian Linkages Study
Level of Service Summary - Future Conditions with Land Use Scenario 3
With General Plan Improvements and Signal System Improvements

Study Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Future w/Scenario 3		Future w/Scenario 3 w/GP Imprvs [a]		Future w/Scenario 3 w/GP & Sig Imprvs [b]	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1 Atlantic Blvd and Hellman Ave	AM	1.035	F	1.147	F	0.977	E	0.877	D
	PM	0.938	E	1.191	F	0.976	E	0.876	D
2 Atlantic Blvd and Emerson Ave	AM	0.744	C	0.892	D	0.752	C	0.652	B
	PM	0.806	D	1.167	F	0.974	E	0.874	D
3 Atlantic Blvd and Ralphs Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.533	A	0.619	B	0.455	A	0.355	A
	PM	0.698	B	0.907	E	0.674	B	0.574	A
4 Atlantic Blvd and Garvey Ave	AM	0.788	C	0.900	D	0.828	D	0.728	C
	PM	0.740	C	0.956	E	0.900	D	0.800	C
5 Chandler Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.628	B	0.738	C	0.738	C	0.638	B
	PM	0.715	C	0.909	E	0.850	D	0.750	C
6 Ynez Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.624	B	0.733	C	0.664	B	0.564	A
	PM	0.905	E	1.092	F	0.889	D	0.789	C
7 McPherrin Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.359	F	1.453	F	1.054	F	0.954	E
	PM	0.750	C	0.926	E	0.810	D	0.710	C
8 Ramona Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.506	A	0.596	A	0.596	A	0.496	A
	PM	0.699	B	0.888	D	0.888	D	0.788	C
9 Garfield Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.944	E	1.137	F	0.940	E	0.840	D
	PM	0.963	E	1.290	F	1.085	F	0.985	E
10 Garfield Ave and Avondale Ave	AM	0.470	A	0.604	B	0.422	A	0.322	A
	PM	0.750	C	1.052	F	0.703	C	0.603	B
11 Garfield Ave and Emerson Ave	AM	0.727	C	0.882	D	0.742	C	0.642	C
	PM	0.776	C	1.122	F	0.911	E	0.811	D
12 Garfield Ave and Hospital Parking Lot/Driveway	AM	0.492	A	0.603	B	0.447	A	0.347	A
	PM	0.637	B	0.854	D	0.634	B	0.534	A
13 Garfield Ave and Garfield Medical Dr. (Hampton Ave)	AM	0.618	B	0.726	C	0.580	A	0.480	A
	PM	0.711	C	0.923	E	0.718	C	0.618	B
14 Garfield Ave and Hellman Ave	AM	0.748	C	0.881	D	0.738	C	0.638	B
	PM	0.927	E	1.207	F	0.992	E	0.892	D
15 Alhambra Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	1.074	F	1.164	F	1.123	F	1.023	F
	PM	1.058	F	1.300	F	1.229	F	1.129	F
16 New Ave and Garvey Ave	AM	0.717	C	0.775	C	0.775	C	0.675	B
	PM	0.816	D	0.949	E	0.949	E	0.849	D
Number of Locations at LOS E or F		6/16		14/16		8/16		3/16	

Notes
[a] General Plan improvements include six lanes on Atlantic Boulevard and on Garfield Avenue. Also includes low-cost improvements where applicable.
[b] Includes General Plan, low-cost and signal system improvements.
Level of Service Analysis Per Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) Method.

Appendix C.
Pro Forma Analysis of East Garvey Prototype Project

KEYSER MARSTON ASSOCIATES INC.

500 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 1480
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
PHONE: 213/622-8095
FAX: 213/622-5204
WWW.KEYSERMARSTON.COM

ADVISORS IN:

REAL ESTATE
REDEVELOPMENT
AFFORDABLE HOUSING
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

LOS ANGELES
Calvin E. Hollis, II
Kathleen H. Head
James A. Rabe
Paul C. Anderson
Gregory D. Soo-Hoo

SAN DIEGO
Gerald M. Trimble
Paul C. Marra

SAN FRANCISCO
A. Jerry Keyser
Timothy C. Kelly
Kate Earle Funk
Debbie M. Kern
Robert J. Wetmore

MEMORANDUM

To: Elaine Carbrey, Associate Planner
Gruen Associates

From: Cal Hollis
Kevin Engstrom

Date: April 19, 2004

Subject: Downtown Monterey Park Mixed-Use Pro Forma Analysis

Pursuant to your request, Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA) evaluated the development feasibility of a prototypical project (Project) along the Garvey Avenue Corridor (Corridor). As part of this analysis, KMA conducted a brief review of the current market conditions in the area. Based on this review and KMA's experience with similar development proposals in the region, a pro forma analysis was prepared for the Project. The Project evaluated includes:

- 12 live/work units at 1,600 square feet per unit
- 4 residential units at 1,300 square feet per unit
- 24,700 square feet of total building area
- 40 parking spaces

LIMITING CONDITIONS

In preparing this analysis, KMA collected information from a number of sources, including Gruen Associates, which provided the scope and layout of the Project. We have also reviewed market data reports, recently proposed projects in the area and have reviewed our files with respect to developing cost factors for new construction.

It should also be noted, that this evaluation is based upon only conceptual development programming. No detailed architect plans have been developed. Further, KMA has standardized the construction and development costs to provide for a consistent analysis. While these costs serve as a baseline for comparison purposes, actual cost may vary widely based on unforeseen conditions, final design elements, and construction materials and finishes.

MARKET CONDITIONS

To gain an understanding of the current market conditions for residential land uses, KMA compiled data from published data sources and reviewed our previous market research conducted for the City. Given the proposed development, KMA only evaluated the market conditions for attached units in the City.

Currently, the for-sale residential market in the region is very strong. Overall, limited new residential development has occurred in the City in recent years. However, a number of new projects have been proposed for the downtown. KMA evaluated some of these projects and found the proposed sales prices were relatively healthy. The pricing for the proposed projects ranged from $200 to $225 per square foot. The total prices range from $250,000 to $395,000 per unit depending on the unit size.

Existing two-bedroom townhomes in the City have sold for approximately $200 per square foot. While the price per square foot is similar to the pricing proposed for the new projects, the total prices for the units are significantly lower at $207,000. Overall, KMA believes new units in the downtown will likely sell for a premium above the sales price per square foot for the existing development in the City. Typically, if no new development has recently occurred, KMA finds a well-conceived project can sell for a 10% premium over existing units.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

KMA conducted a financial feasibility analysis of the Project, which has been summarized below.

Project Description

As previously stated, the Project will include 16 residential units. The units will be a mix of attached residential product and live/work townhomes fronting on Garvey Avenue. The proposed site area is slightly less than two-thirds of an acre.

Cost Assumptions

As shown in Table 1, the construction costs are estimated at $4.18 million, which equates to $261,300 per unit or $171 per square foot. The key cost assumptions include:

1. Site costs of $25,000 per unit, which is in-line with projects of a similar density in the region.

2. No additional parking costs are assumed, as a structure is not proposed for the Project. The parking costs are generally allocated to the site and building shell costs.

3. Building shell costs of $90 per square foot are assumed, which is a typical estimate given the proposed density of the Project. These costs do not consider prevailing wage and are based on the net saleable square footage.

4. The estimated permits and fees are based on other projects KMA evaluated in the City; however, the City would need to review these estimates.

5. The remaining indirect and financing costs are based on typical industry standards.

Revenue Assumptions

As shown in Table 2, the projected total sales revenue for the Project is estimated at $5.42 million, which assumes the following:

Unit	Sales Price	Price/Square Foot	Total
Live/Work - 12 Units	$352,000	$220	$4,224,000
Residential - 4 Units	$299,000	$230	$1,196,000

The average price per square foot for these units is $222, which equates to approximately a 10% premium over the existing residential units in the City. For the purposes of pricing these units, KMA assumed residential pricing for the entire live/work unit. It is our experience that developers of this type of product typically base their pricing on similarly sized residential units in the market area.

Land Residual Value

As shown in Table 3, KMA assumed a reasonable and prudent developer would require a profit equal to 10% of revenues. Assuming a profit of $542,000 (10% of revenues) the supportable land value for the Project is $697,000, which equates to $43,600 per unit or $26 per square foot of land.

SUMMARY

The KMA analysis estimates a land value of $26 per square foot could be supported by today's residential market. As KMA understands the situation, the low end of land values along the Corridor is $25 to $30 per square foot for poorly or unimproved properties, with many properties transferring at much higher values depending on the quality and scope of improvements. Given these land values, the Project may be feasible; however, in all likelihood, the residential market will have to show continued improvement before this occurs. As a sensitivity test, KMA evaluated the land price supported by a 15% increase in the unit sales prices. Based on this analysis, KMA found the proposed Project could support a land value of between $45 and $50 per square foot. At this level of value, the Project would more likely be feasible, given the difficulty in finding unimproved property.