Ryan,

The attached handout is from a Gary Huff email dated April 4, 2012.

If the parties are going to assume that a certain number of units will be for residents who are 55+ years, then the County must require the developer to commit, via covenants running with the land, that the units "assumed" to be senior units will be specifically identified in deed covenants as "seniors only" units, and that only seniors age 55+ can reside in the units.

We expect that such covenants will be a condition of granting any permit to the developer.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick
Third Alternative for Point Wells SEIS Addendum

- Alternative shall examine means of achieving reductions in project’s trip generation and compare to 8,250 trip limit in Shoreline’s traffic analysis/Point Wells subarea plan.

- Include an explanation of the derivation of Shoreline’s trip limit and a discussion of how implementation of mitigation suggested in Richmond Beach Road study achieves LOS standards.

- Assume 3,081 units (reduction from 3,500 addressed in SEIS).

- Variations within alternative:
  
  a) General unit mix and phasing plan from Expanded TIA (page 6).

  - 317 senior units
  - 20,000 SF health/fitness club
  - 24,762 SF general office
  - 7,500 SF medical/dental
  - 30,000 SF specialty retail
  - 26,300 SF supermarket
  - 18,000 SF quality restaurant(s)

  If the parties are going to assume that a certain number of units will be for residents who are 55+ years, then the County must require the developer to commit, via covenants running with the land, that the units “assumed” to be senior units will be specifically identified in deed covenants as “seniors only” units, and that only seniors age 55+ can reside in the units.

  b) Same as (a), but assume that 40% of residents will be 55+ years.

  c) Same as (b), but with a minimal commercial/retail component.

  - 7,500 SF medical/dental
  - 10,000 SF specialty retail
  - Resident-only recreation center
  - Eliminate general office, most of specialty retail, supermarket and restaurants