

## ATTACHMENT 4

### Consultant Identified Issues and Methodology

The study by the consultant identified four major problems that impede accomplishing the special purposes of the Ordinance.

- Undefined terms
- Standards embedded in the definitions and inconsistent and conflicting standards
- Lack of distinction and clarity of applicability among provisions applying to the RM-16, RM-32 and RM-48 districts
- Constraints on the ability to achieve the maximum densities

Five tasks were undertaken in the assessment of the City of Gardens Ordinance as follows.

1. Field Reconnaissance. The purpose of the reconnaissance was to obtain an overview of the various contextual conditions of areas governed by the City of Gardens standards and to identify potential issues or opportunities that should be addressed.
2. Case Studies. This project included the performance of case studies of approved City of Gardens' projects. Ten projects were selected by staff and included representative examples of projects governed by the RM-16, RM-32 and RM-48 regulations.
3. Focus Groups. Nine focus group sessions were on held on May 6, 7, and 8, 2003 for the purpose of evaluating the City of Gardens Ordinance. Participants included architects, developers or builders from City of Gardens' housing developments, and affordable housing providers or advocates. A total of 30 persons participated in the focus groups.
4. Detailed Critique of City of Gardens Ordinance. A detailed critique including related code sections was prepared and revised following receipt of comments from the COG Review Committee, attendees at the public workshop held on January 14, 2004, and staff comments.
5. Resident Survey. Questionnaires were distributed to the residents of eight of the ten projects that were the subject of case studies. The purpose of the questionnaires was to document residents' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their housing units.