Mark Davis
652 SE Washington Street
McMinnville, OR 97128

April 3, 2021
McMinnville Urban Renewal Advisory Committee
230 NE Second Street
McMinnville, OR 97128

Dear Chair Gowell and Members of the Committee:
As a member of the Project Advisory Committee that reviewed the McMinnville City Center Housing Strategy, I remain concerned about the accuracy of the pro formas included in Appendix E of that document. I do not believe they reflect what is financially realistic in McMinnville, nor do they meet the first project purpose stated on page 5: "Identify desired housing types appropriate to the city center context that meet needs across the income spectrum."

I remain supportive of the general concepts contained within the Strategy document. I served as the developer for the Housing Authority of Yamhill County's Village Quarter project on Third Street and strongly believe in bringing more quality, high-density housing projects to the downtown area. I also understand that not all such housing will be "affordable", but believe it should include units affordable to all income levels as referenced in the purpose statement above.

Appendix E contains two prototypes of downtown development, one larger full-block project with ground floor retail (designated with the letter 'A') and the other a half-block 3-story apartment building (designated by the letter 'B'). Each prototype has a base case pro forma and 3 additional pro formas changing parking and/or height restrictions to test feasibility.

On prototype A monthly rents range from $\$ 2795$ to $\$ 2140$ for units between 703 and 716 square feet. They show these tiny units being affordable to persons above $126 \%$ to $165 \%$ of Area Median Income (AMI). What they don't tell you in their table is that these units only meet these AMI percentages if 4 persons live in them. Here are the AMI percentages broken out by household size for each of the four rental pro formas:

|  | A1 | A2 | A3 | A4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Monthly Rent | $\$ 2,795$ | $\$ 2,350$ | $\$ 2,290$ | $\$ 2,140$ |
| 1-Person AMI \% | $235 \%$ | $198 \%$ | $193 \%$ | $180 \%$ |
| 2-Person AMI \% | $206 \%$ | $173 \%$ | $169 \%$ | $158 \%$ |
| 4-Person AMI \% | $165 \%$ | $138 \%$ | $135 \%$ | $126 \%$ |

While it is theoretically possible for four persons to live in a 700 square foot apartment unit, more realistically they would be occupied by singles and couples whose income would have to be about twice the area median to be affordable to them. On a practical level we might suggest they would be desirable units for people working downtown in lodging and food services. The draft Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) shows these jobs pay on average $\$ 18,591$ per year, meaning the units wouldn't be affordable even if 4 workers pooled their income to rent one of them.

Prototype B suffers from a similar defect as it also uses the 4-person AMI to make it look more affordable. At least these units at 990 square feet make some sense for four people (B4 provides miniscule 673 square unit apartments that are totally impractical at that occupancy). The biggest problem I have with this prototype is the base case (B1) is supposedly based on current code.

The consultants claim that B1 can be built on a lot measuring half a block and provide 24 apartment units in a 3 -story building that can also accommodate 37 parking spaces. While this report was being drafted Creekside Homes was removing an old mobile home park on First Street (a half-block lot between Johnson and Irvine) and constructing a 16unit apartment complex with 23 parking spaces called McMinnville Glen: https://creeksidehomes.net/mcminnville-glen-16-unit-multi-family-building/

The website claims they designed a "building that would maximize the income potential for this site based on land use codes and the size of the property." If it was possible for them under current code like this report claims to add a third story ( 8 more units) and 14 additional parking spaces on this site, why wouldn't they do it? There certainly is plenty of demand for additional apartment units. I happen to believe that Creekside Homes experience is more reflective of current code and further, that these new apartments rent in a typical range for McMinnville, not the inflated rents shown in the pro forma.

Given the current budget crunch the City is facing I realize that it is not possible to pay the consultants to provide pro formas more reflective of McMinnville development costs and rents. I also understand from communication with the Planning Director that potential downtown housing projects might be more likely if the code changes called for in the Action Plan were adopted, and that approval of the City Center Housing Strategy would aid in their adoption.

I do not want my objections to the deficiencies in Appendix E to stand in the way of code changes or future downtown housing projects. I would ask that the motion recommending adoption of the Strategy include a statement that the pro formas in Appendix E do not represent the current economic realities in McMinnville. Thank you for considering my thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely,
//S//
Mark Davis


## McMinnville Central City Housing Study: Initial Policy Analysis Results

## January 2020

## McMinnville Central City Housing Study The Project Problem

Jun 2020 _ McMinnville \$336K

- McMinnville has "Arrived"
- Limited housing options
- Little growth in supply
- Residents priced out
- 24\% of McMinnville renters spend over 50\% of income on rent

OPPORTUNITY
Capitalize on Market Strength to Expand Housing Options:

- Add homes to enable people to live in McMinnville's downtown
- Affordable units that enhance the neighborhood


## McMinnville Central City Housing Study

Sensitivity Testing of Possible NewZone Standards

## Intro to AMI (Area Median Income) for McMinnville, Yamhill County, OR

AREA MEDIAN INCOME: Calculated by HUD annually for different communities. By definition, $50 \%$ of households within the specified geographic area earn less than Area Median Income (AMI), and $50 \%$ earn more. AMI is adjusted based on household size and used to determine the eligibility of applicants for federally and locally funded housing programs.

- LOW-INCOME: Describes households earning at or below 80\% AMI.
- VERY LOW-INCOME: Describes households earning at or below 50\% AMI.
- EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME: Describes households earning at or below 30\% AMI.

|  | 1-Person Household |  |  | 2-Person Household |  |  |  | 4-Person Household |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Level | Annual Income | Max. Affordable Monthly |  |  |  | Max. Affordable Monthly |  |  | nual ome |  | x. <br> dable <br> thly |
| 120\% AMI | \$ 57,01 | \$ | 1,425 | \$ | 5,160 | \$ | 1,629 | \$ | 1,450 | \$ | 2,036 |
| 100\% AMI | \$ 47,513 | \$ | 1,188 | \$ | 54,300 | \$ | 1,358 | \$ | 67,875 | \$ | 1,697 |
| 80\% AMI | \$ 38,010 | \$ | 950 | \$ | 43,440 | \$ | 1,086 | \$ | 54,300 | \$ | 1,358 |
| 50\% AMI | \$ 23,756 | \$ | 594 | \$ | 27,150 | \$ | 679 | \$ | 33,938 | \$ | 848 |
| 30\% AMI | \$ 14,254 | \$ | 356 | \$ | 16,290 | \$ | 407 | \$ | 20,363 | \$ | 50 |

## McMinnville Central City Housing Study Sensitivity Testing of Possible NewZone Standards

Intro to AMI (Area Median Income) for McMinnville, OR


- Allows for quantification of the suitability for workforce housing


## McMinnville Central City Housing Study

Alternative A with $4^{\text {th }}$ option:
Complete remove parking requirements


# McMinnville Central City Housing Study 

## Sensitivity Testing of Possible NewZone Standards

## Prototype A: Mixed Use on Full Block (For Sale)



REDUCE PARKING REQUIREMENTS Don't require more than one parking space per home.


MAXIMUM HEIGHT
Build to the maximum height permitted.


REMOVE PARKING REQUIREMENTS Completely remove the requirement for off-street car parking.


# McMinnville Central City Housing Study 

Sensitivity Testing of Possible NewZone Standards
Prototype A: Mixed Use on Full Block (For Rent)


REDUCE PARKING
REQUIREMENTS Don't require more than one parking space per home.


MAXIMUM HEIGHT
Build to the maximum height permitted.


REMOVE PARKING REQUIREMENTS Completely remove the requirement for off-street car parking.


## McMinnville Central City Housing Study

Alternative B with 4 options:
Including reduction in home size


# McMinnville Central City Housing Study 

Sensitivity Testing of Possible NewZone Standards
Prototype B: Stand-Alone Residential on Half Block (For Sale)


REDUCE PARKING REQUIREMENTS Don't require more than one parking space per home.


MAXIMUM HEIGHT
Build to the maximum height permitted.


REMOVE PARKING REQUIREMENTS Completely remove the requirement for off-street car parking.


| Sensitivity test | $6$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Home size (sf) | 990 | 990 | 990 | 673 |
| Parking spaces / home | 1.54 | 1.0 | 0.66 | 0.66 |
| Building Height (Floors) | 3 | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| Price per home | \$365,000 | \$355,000 | \$347,000 | \$242,000 |
| Monthly payment | \$2,170 | \$2,110 | \$2,060 | \$1,440 |
| AMI | 128\% | 124\% | 121\% | 85\% |
| Annual income needed | \$86,760 | \$84,260 | \$82,440 | \$57,400 |
| \# of homes in building | 24 | 36 | 56 | 66 |

# McMinnville Central City Housing Study 

Sensitivity Testing of Possible NewZone Standards
Prototype B: Stand-Alone Residential on Half Block (For Rent)


REDUCE PARKING REQUIREMENTS Don't require more than one parking space per home.


MAXIMUM HEIGHT
Build to the maximum height permitted.


REMOVE PARKING REQUIREMENTS Completely remove the requirement for off-street car parking.

| Income Needed | BI:EXISTING POLICY | B2: REDUCE PARKING | B3: MAXIMUM HEIGHT | B4: SMALLER HOMES | AMI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$100,000 | 24 homes | 36 homes | 56 homes |  | 100\% |
| \$80,000 |  |  |  | 66 homes | 80\% |
| \$60,000 |  |  |  |  | 60\% |
| \$40,000 |  |  |  |  | 40\% |
| \$20,000 |  |  |  |  | 20\% |
| \$- |  |  |  |  | 0\% |

## McMinnville Central City Housing Study <br> Key Findings



Downtown McMinnville is an attractive place to be, but housing production has lagged expectations. Parking requirements may be the single largest obstacle preventing new housing from being developed here.

- Reducing required off-street parking allows smaller sites to develop that would be infeasible to develop otherwise due to space needed to provide parking
- Larger sites can fit more homes at lower price points if off-street parking requirements are reduced
- Allowable maximum height can only be attained when parking requirements are reduced to I per home, or less on sites smaller than a full block
- Eliminating off-street parking requirements entirely for retail helps with the feasibility of mixed-use developments



## Prototype A: MU on Full Block



## A1

## Existing parking standards.

Max out development potential based on existing parking requirements.


## A3

## Maximum height.

Build to the maximum height permitted and allow parking area to stay the same.


## A2

## Reduced parking standards.

See how much development is possible with a parking reduction to one space per unit and none for retail.


## A4

No parking.
Build to the maximum height allowed and provide no parking.

## McMinnville Prototype A1

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

## Lot area

Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Use
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking Structure
Total parking spaces
Landscaping and open space area
PROJECT COSTS
total costs
Land Costs
Hard Costs
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking

Soft Costs
Other Costs
Demolition Costs
Site Development Costs
Brownfield Remediation Costs
Water Quality Controls
Additional Infrastructure

48,000 sf
1.10 acres

27,601 sf
20,399 sf
4 stories
1.59 FAR


| 99.64 | $1.50 /$ per unit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25.33 | 4.00 | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/$ per room |

125
0\%
$(21,989,753)$
$(924,960) \quad \$ 19 / s f$
$(16,133,527)$
$(12,153,209) \quad \$ 230 / s f$
$\begin{array}{crc}(1,139,641) & \$ 180 & / s f \\ - & \$ 0 & / s f\end{array}$
$\$ 0 / s f$
\$0 /sf
\$0 /sf
$\begin{array}{lll}\$ 0 & / s f \\ \$ 0 & / s f\end{array}$
\$43,636 /space
$(4,907,266)$
$(24,000)$
$(24,000)$



RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price | N/A | N/A /sf |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 2,794 | $\$ 3.90$ /sf |
| Retail rent (sf/year) | $\$$ | 20.00 | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Industrial (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $11.4 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $12.0 \%$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $19.8 \%$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | 1.71 |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $\mathbf{1 0 3 \%}$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | $\$$ | - |
| \%of Project Costs |  | $\mathbf{0} \%$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable studio | 227 | $0 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $164 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $115 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | 965 | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 6 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | 650 | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9 \%}$ |
| Studio | $\mathbf{5 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 6 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{7 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 5 \%}$ |

## McMinnville Prototype A2

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

## Lot area

Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Use
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking Structure
Total parking spaces
Landscaping and open space area
PROJECT COSTS
TOTAL COSTS
Land Costs
Hard Costs
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking

Soft Costs
Other Costs
Demolition Costs
Site Development Costs
Brownfield Remediation Costs
Water Quality Controls
Additional Infrastructure

48,000 sf
1.10 acres

19,178 sf
28,822 sf
7 stories
2.37 FAR

| Gross | Net |
| :---: | :---: |
| 98,997 | 89,097 |
| 6,320 | 5,688 |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | 8,364 |
| - | 113 |


| 124.37 | 1.00 | $/$ per unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/$ per room |



| $(34,228,560)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(924,960)$ | \$19 /sf |
| $(25,619,624)$ |  |
| $(22,769,246)$ | \$230 /sf |
| $(1,137,636)$ | \$180 /sf |
| - | \$0 /sf |
| - | \$0 /sf |
| - | \$0 /sf |
| - | \$0 /sf |
| - | \$0 /sf |

$(7,659,975)$
$(24,000)$
$(24,000)$


RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price | N/A | N/A /sf |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 2,350 | \$3.28 /sf |
| Retail rent (sf/year) | $\$$ | 20.00 | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Industrial (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 1 . 6 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0 \%}$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $\mathbf{2 0 . 3 \%}$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $\mathbf{1 0 3 \%}$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | $\$$ | - |
| \%of Project Costs |  | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable studio | 227 | $0 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $164 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $115 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | $\mathbf{8 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 9 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | 650 | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 6 \%}$ |
| Studio | $\mathbf{5 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{7 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8 \%}$ |

## McMinnville Prototype A3

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

## Lot area

Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Use
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking Structure
Total parking spaces
Landscaping and open space area
PROJECT COSTS
TOTAL COSTS
Land Costs
Hard Costs
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking

Soft Costs
Other Costs
Demolition Costs
Site Development Costs
Brownfield Remediation Costs
Water Quality Controls
Additional Infrastructure

48,000 sf
1.10 acres

18,756 sf
29,244 sf
7 stories
2.45 FAR
$\left.\begin{array}{cc}\text { Gross } & \text { Net } \\ 102,965 & 92,668 \\ 6,315 & 5,683 \\ - & - \\ - & - \\ - & - \\ - & - \\ - & - \\ - & 8,225 \\ - & 120\end{array}\right]$ /acre
125.32

- $\quad$ - 1000 sq ft
- $\quad$ - $/ 1000$ sq ft
- $\quad$ - 1000 sq ft
- $\quad$ - $/ 1000$ sq ft

$$
-\quad-\quad / \text { per room }
$$

${ }^{-}$
0\%

| $(35,406,757)$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $(924,960)$ | $\$ 19$ | $/ s f$ |
| $(26,517,998)$ |  |  |
| $(23,681,850)$ | $\$ 230$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| $(1,136,696)$ | $\$ 180$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| $(1,699,452)$ | $\$ 43,076$ | $/$ space |

$(7,939,799)$
$(24,000)$
$(24,000)$


Site Layout


RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price |  | N/A | N/A /sf |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 2,293 | \$3.26 /sf |
| Retail rent (sf/year) | $\$$ | 20.00 | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Industrial (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0 \%}$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $\mathbf{2 0 . 3 \%}$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 . 6 4}$ |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $\mathbf{1 0 3 \%}$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | \$ | - |
| \%ofProject Costs |  | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable studio | 227 | $0 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $164 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $115 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | 925 | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 9 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | 650 | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 6 \%}$ |
| Studio | $\mathbf{5 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{7 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5 \%}$ |

## McMinnville Prototype A4

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

## Lot area

Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Use
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE

| Residential |  | - | - | / per unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Office |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Industrial |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Public |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Educational |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Hotel/Motel |  | - | - | / per room |
| Parking Structure |  | - |  |  |
| Total parking spaces |  | - |  |  |
| Landscaping and open space area |  | 0\% |  |  |
| PROJECT COSTS |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ | $(87,438,841)$ |  |  |
| Land Costs | \$ | $(924,960)$ | \$19 | /sf |
| Hard Costs | \$ | $(66,613,657)$ |  |  |
| Residential | \$ | $(60,606,893)$ | \$230 | /sf |
| Retail | \$ | $(2,909,047)$ | \$180 | /sf |
| Office | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Industrial | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Public | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Educational | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Hotel/Motel | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Parking | \$ | $(3,097,718)$ | \$40,019 | /space |
| Soft Costs | \$ | $(19,876,224)$ |  |  |
| Other Costs | \$ | $(24,000)$ |  |  |
| Demolition Costs | \$ | - |  |  |
| Site Development Costs | \$ | $(24,000)$ |  |  |
| Brownfield Remediation Costs | \$ | - |  |  |
| Water Quality Controls | \$ | - |  |  |
| Additional Infrastructure | \$ | - |  |  |



RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price |  | N/A | N/A /sf |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 2,136 | \$3.04 /sf |
| Retail rent (sf/year) | $\$$ | 20.00 | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Industrial (sf/year) | N/A | /sf (triple net) |  |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $11.6 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $12.0 \%$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $20.4 \%$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | 1.65 |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $\mathbf{1 0 3 \%}$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | $\$$ | - |
| \%of Project Costs |  | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable studio | 227 | $0 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $164 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $115 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | $\mathbf{9 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 4 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | 650 | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 5 \%}$ |
| Studio | $\mathbf{5 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{7 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 6 \%}$ |

## Prototype B: Stand-Alone Residential on Half Block



B1
Existing parking standards.
Max out development potential based on existing parking requirements.


## B3

## Maximum height.

Build to the maximum height permitted and allow parking area to stay the same.


B2

## Reduced parking standards.

See how much development is possible with a parking reduction to one space per unit.


B4

## Smaller units.

Build to the maximum height permitted, provide smaller units, and allow parking area to stay the same.

## Prototype B1

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

## Lot area

Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Use
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE

| Residential |  | 37.08 | 1.54 | / per unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail |  | - | 4.00 | / 1000 sq ft |
| Office |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Industrial |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Public |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Educational |  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
| Hotel/Motel |  | - | - | / per room |
| Parking Structure |  | - |  |  |
| Total parking spaces |  | 37 |  |  |
| Landscaping and open space area |  | 5\% |  |  |
| PROJECT COSTS |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ | $(7,433,889)$ |  |  |
| Land Costs | \$ | $(247,200)$ | \$10 | /sf |
| Hard Costs | \$ | $(5,482,026)$ |  |  |
| Residential | \$ | $(5,296,643)$ | \$200 | /sf |
| Retail | \$ | - | \$180 | /sf |
| Office | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Industrial | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Public | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Educational | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Hotel/Motel | \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| Parking | \$ | $(185,383)$ | \$5,000 | /space |
| Soft Costs | \$ | $(1,692,531)$ |  |  |
| Other Costs | \$ | $(12,132)$ |  |  |
| Demolition Costs | \$ | - |  |  |
| Site Development Costs | \$ | $(12,132)$ |  |  |
| Brownfield Remediation Costs | \$ | - |  |  |
| Water Quality Controls | \$ | - |  |  |
| Additional Infrastructure | \$ | - |  |  |



RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price | N/A | N/A /sf |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 2,718 | \$2.75 |
| /sf |  |  |  |
| Retail rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) | N/A | /sf (triple net) |  |
| Industrial (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 1 . 6 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0 \%}$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $\mathbf{2 0 . 4 \%}$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 . 6 4}$ |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $\mathbf{1 0 3 \%}$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | $\$$ | - |
| \%of Project Costs |  | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable:227 sf studi | 227 | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | 1200 | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 7 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | $\mathbf{8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 2 \%}$ |
| studio | $\mathbf{7 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0 \%}$ |

## Prototype B2

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

Lot area
Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM Use
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking Structure
Total parking spaces
Landscaping and open space area

PROJECT COSTS
TOTAL COSTS
Land Costs
Hard Costs
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking

Soft Costs
Other Costs
Demolition Costs
Site Development Costs
Brownfield Remediation Costs
Water Quality Controls
Additional Infrastructure

| 24,000 | sf |
| ---: | :--- |
| 0.55 | acres |
| 11,239 | sf |
| 11,561 | sf |
| 5 | stories |
| 1.65 | FAR |


| Gross | Net |
| :---: | :---: |
| 39,617 | 35,656 |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - |  |
| - |  |
| 36 |  |
| 990 | sf |



RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price | N/A | N/A /sf |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 2,643 | $\$ 2.67$ /sf |
| Retail rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) | N/A | /sf (triple net) |  |
| Industrial (sf/year) | N/A | /sf (triple net) |  |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 1 . 6 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $12.0 \%$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $20.5 \%$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $103 \%$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | $\$$ | - |
| $\quad$ \%ofProject Costs |  | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable:227 sf studi | 227 | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | 1200 | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | $\mathbf{8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 7 \%}$ |
| studio | $\mathbf{7 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 3 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 6 \%}$ |

## Prototype B3

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

## Lot area

Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

## Use

Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking Structure
Total parking spaces
Landscaping and open space area
PROJECT COSTS
TOTAL COSTS
Land Costs
Hard Costs
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking

Soft Costs
Other Costs
Demolition Costs
Site Development Costs
Brownfield Remediation Costs
Water Quality Controls
Additional Infrastructure

| 24,000 | sf |
| ---: | :--- |
| 0.55 | acres |
| 10,434 | sf |
| 11,886 | sf |
| 7 | stories |
| 2.57 | FAR |


| Gross | Net |
| :---: | :---: |
| 61,715 | 55,544 |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | 102 |


| 37.03 | 0.66 | $/$ per unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sqft}$ |
| - | - | $/ 1000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ |
| - | - | $/$ per room |
| - |  |  |
| - |  |  |
| 37 |  |  |
| $7 \%$ |  |  |


| $(16,491,661)$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $(247,200)$ | $\$ 10$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| $(12,528,172)$ |  |  |
| $(12,343,026)$ | $\$ 200$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 180$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |
| - | $\$ 0$ | $/ \mathrm{sf}$ |

$(3,704,104)$
$(12,185)$
$(12,185)$



RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price | N/A | N/A /sf |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 2,580 | \$2.61 $/$ /sf |
| Retail rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) | N/A | /sf (triple net) |  |
| Industrial (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0 \%}$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $\mathbf{2 0 . 3 \%}$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | $\mathbf{1 . 6 4}$ |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $\mathbf{1 0 2 \%}$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | $\$$ | - |
| $\quad$ \%ofProject Costs |  | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable:227 sf studi | 227 | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | 1200 | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | $\mathbf{8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1 \%}$ |
| studio | $\mathbf{7 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 6 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 2 \%}$ |

## Prototype B4

McMinnville, OR

## BUILDING FORM

Lot area
Lot area
Building Footprint
Parking Footprint (Adjacent)
Height
Floor-area ratio

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Use
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Commercial Parking
Structured Parking
Internal Parking
UNITS AND EMPLOYEES
Housing Units
Average unit size
Employees

PARKING \& OPEN SPACE
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking Structure
Total parking spaces
Landscaping and open space area

PROJECT COSTS
TOTAL COSTS
Land Costs
Hard Costs
Residential
Retail
Office
Industrial
Public
Educational
Hotel/Motel
Parking

Soft Costs
Other Costs
Demolition Costs
Site Development Costs
Brownfield Remediation Costs
Water Quality Controls
Additional Infrastructure


|  | 43.54 | 0.66 | /per unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
|  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
|  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
|  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
|  | - | - | / 1000 sq ft |
|  | - | - | / per room |
|  | - |  |  |
|  | 44 |  |  |
|  | 7\% |  |  |
| \$ | $(13,494,020)$ |  |  |
| \$ | $(247,200)$ | \$10 | /sf |
| \$ | $(10,087,786)$ |  |  |
| \$ | $(9,870,080)$ | \$200 | /sf |
| \$ | - | \$180 | /sf |
| \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| \$ | - | \$0 | /sf |
| \$ | $(217,706)$ | \$5,000 | /space |
| \$ | $(3,146,849)$ |  |  |
| \$ | $(12,185)$ |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |
| \$ | $(12,185)$ |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |



RENTS AND SALES PRICES

| Residential Unit Sales Price | N/A | N/A /sf |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Unit Rent | $\$$ | 1,801 | \$2.68 /sf |
| Retail rent (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Office rent (sf/year) | N/A | /sf (triple net) |  |
| Industrial (sf/year) |  | N/A | /sf (triple net) |
| Hotel/Motel (\$/night) | N/A | /room/night |  |

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

## Rental

| Cash-on-Cash (After Year 3) | $11.6 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| IRR on Project Cost (Unleveraged Return) | $12.0 \%$ |  |
| IRR on Investor Equity (Leveraged Return Before Tax) | $20.5 \%$ |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Year 3) | 1.65 |  |
| Rule of 100 performance (Year One) | $103 \%$ |  |
| Owner |  |  |
| Project Rate of Return | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Return to Equity | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Subsidy |  |  |
| Subsidy Amount | $\$$ | - |
| $\quad \%$ of Project Costs |  | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |


| UNIT MIX |  | MFI Affordability |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home size (sf) | \% of total | Purchase | Rent |
| Affordable: 227 sf studi | 227 | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| 4 bedroom | 945 | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| 3 bedroom | 665 | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 2 bedroom | $\mathbf{8 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 4 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ bedroom | $\mathbf{6 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 \%}$ |
| studio | $\mathbf{5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{6 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 \%}$ |

