

WEBVTT

2

00:00:22.890 --> 00:00:45.299

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): Okay, now is a good time. It's any Hello, everyone. My name is Jackson Napier, and I'm a senior associate of public engagement at Spur. Thank you so much for joining us for this digital discourse today. Many of you here today are spur members. So thank you so much for your support. If you're not a member. I encourage you to join the spurs, ongoing work and using education, policy, analysis, and advocacy to make our cities and region

3

00:00:45.300 --> 00:00:53.760

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): a more prosperous, sustainable and equitable places to live. Your financial support enables us to continue our work, including the hosting of programs like today's.

4

00:00:54.180 --> 00:01:22.190

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): you'll find more information about membership online@spurred.org slash. Join. Our next pro public program is scheduled for June twentieth. At 1230 Pm. It is titled. The proof is in the water touring the Silicon Valley advanced Water Purification Center to learn how valley water is already producing, drinking ready water, and to discover how recycled and purified water fits into a sustainable future for the growing region.

5

00:01:22.190 --> 00:01:29.930

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): But today's digital discourse, and why you all are here is titled The Stairway to affordability. How we can diversify multi-family housing.

6

00:01:30.650 --> 00:01:54.460

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): building code circulation requirements to California profoundly shape the size, quality, accessibility, and location of new multi-family housing. As the State looks at ways to address its need for more housing. Interest in the construction of multi family housing is growing. Most of the developed world outside of the United States and Canada, with the exceptions of New York City and Seattle, allow single staircase multi family housing up to 6 stories.

7

00:01:54.460 --> 00:02:01.769

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): So today you'll hear from panelists from various backgrounds to discuss how such housing can safely deliver more diverse, multi-family housing options.

8

00:02:01.920 --> 00:02:13.210

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): And today we are joined by a fantastic group of panelists. First up, we have Michael Alliance. Michael is the founder of large lab, part architecture and urbanism, studio part, think and do. Tank

9

00:02:13.240 --> 00:02:27.799

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): focusing on research and policy, decarbonize low energy buildings and climate, adaptive urbanism. Michael is also an activist writer and an award winning architect, specializing in mass timber, social housing, bowel group and and eco districts.

10

00:02:28.230 --> 00:02:40.390

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): He serves on the board of Seattle's new passive house social Housing developer, Pda. He is a graduate of Virginia Tech, and became a passive house consultant in 2,010. His professional experience includes work

11

00:02:40.390 --> 00:03:08.510

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): in both the Pacific, Northwest and Germany. Next up we have Stephen Smith. Steven is the director of the center for building in North America a 501 c. 3 nonprofit founded last year to study and advocate for building code reform and other construction related policies. He's been working with advocates across the United States and Canada to reform building codes, that redistrict single stair apartment buildings, and this working on a research report about the high cost of elevators in North America to be published later this year.

12

00:03:09.200 --> 00:03:38.179

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): Next up we have Eduardo Mendoza. Eduardo was the policy director for the livable Communities initiative and a professional city planner based in Los Angeles. He's an active member of Santa Monica, forward and parking reform network. Mendoza received his masters in planning from the USC's Christ School of Public policy. He's a current board member for abundant housing, La. Or up on the housing, La C. 3 and C. 4. He's the acting board chair for inclusive Santa Monica, and former Board chair for the Transportation and Equity

13

00:03:38.530 --> 00:03:53.990

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): and Elections Committees on the Palms Neighborhood Council. Mendoza is also a demographer who has worked with Children's Hospital Foundation, Lucille Packard Foundation, Haynes Foundation, and whose work has been featured on publications such as C. Escape and Slight Magazine.

14

00:03:54.160 --> 00:04:16.629

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): and today's discussion will be moderated by Francis Anderson. Francis is the author of Common ground multi-family housing in Los Angeles, published by Angel City Press. She co-produced 40 years in building community a short film about the nonprofit Housing Development Community Corporation of Santa Monica, and she is currently researching, affordable housing as a fellow of friends of residential treasures. Los Angeles.

15

00:04:16.630 --> 00:04:28.699

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): for many years Anderson hosted Kerw's DNA design and architecture radio show and produce the current affair show which way, la, and to the point, she writes a regular newsletter for Casey

16

00:04:28.730 --> 00:04:42.409

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): Rw. And she supports the creation of programming at Helms bakery district honors include the Esther Mccoy, award from the Architectural Guild of Usc. School of architecture for her work, educating the public about architecture and urbanism.

17

00:04:42.710 --> 00:04:46.360

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): Common ground has been shortlisted for a forward reviews, award.

18

00:04:46.460 --> 00:05:04.949

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): And last, but not least, we want this to be an interactive conversation employment, spending as much time engaging with you all, so I encourage you to use the chat box to share your thoughts with each other and the speakers, and I also encourage you to submit any questions that you may have, but just in the Q. A. Panel it should appear as a button at the bottom of your screen, or if you're using the mobile app. It'll be at the top.

19

00:05:05.050 --> 00:05:15.630

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): And then within the next few days we'll be sharing a copy of the recording the Transcript and the chat with everybody who's registered, and with that, Francis, I will turn it over to you to get us started.

20

00:05:16.380 --> 00:05:42.389

Frances Anderton: Well, Jackson, thank you so much, and I really, I have to praise you for just setting this conversation up so well, and you know I wish you were. You were doing this. you very kindly. Read out my bio, and you will have heard from Jackson that I've really been in the journalistic end of covering housing, and it's actually on completing the book. Common ground, multifamily housing in Los Angeles, that I feel my education has really started

21

00:05:42.390 --> 00:06:09.990

Frances Anderton: mit Ctl. And and one of the ways in which that education has really started is that shortly after its publication I got to know Eduardo Mendoza, who is one of the speakers today, and it's from Eduardo and Derek Sage Horn, that I learned so much more about this topic of today's conversation, namely, namely, stairways, and and how a stairway can lead to affordability. Excuse me for mangling your pun that Jackson 2

22

00:06:09.990 --> 00:06:26.130

Frances Anderton: but But I have to say, being located here in Los Angeles, I had for years thought that one of the most restrictive and and sort of onerous of our of our code requirements for parking minimums. I I admittedly, had not fully

23

00:06:26.130 --> 00:06:51.019

Frances Anderton: appreciated how much the stair also had a role to play or the second step. So so I'm at just super excited to learn from the next 3 speakers coming up in the next 40 min of conversation. So the way this is going to unfold is each of our 3 speakers is going to present on the topic for about 7 to 10 min, and once they have completed those

24

00:06:51.020 --> 00:07:17.049

Frances Anderton: mit Ctl and presentations, we'll the 4 of us will go back and forth for for a little while, and then we will throw the floor open to questions which will be moderated by Jackson. So anyway, we're going to hear different dimensions of this theme about the single stair. Why, it is why it matters so much to try and get rid of the second stack. What's accomplished by doing so. And how does it? 2

25

00:07:17.130 --> 00:07:24.940

Frances Anderton: impact affordability in multi-family housing, which is something we all understand we need to accomplish.

26

00:07:25.040 --> 00:07:35.780

Frances Anderton: So we're going to turn first to Michael Eliison with Lark Lab. He's already been introduced. And so with that I'm going to throw to Michael to tell us

27

00:07:35.920 --> 00:07:44.709

Frances Anderton: why we need to deal with this, and why our standards are so different from those found globally. Michael, over to you.

28

00:07:45.730 --> 00:07:51.770

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: good afternoon. Thanks, Francis. Thank you for the introduction. we get on the slides. Can you guys see them?

29

00:07:53.330 --> 00:07:54.220

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: All right?

30

00:07:54.290 --> 00:08:09.839

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: So I'm an architect really involved around housing eco districts. Private adaptation The climate crisis plays a huge role in my thinking on housing, you know. Here in the Northwest we had the wildfire smoke season. Now it's a yearly thing you guys in California as well

31

00:08:09.840 --> 00:08:26.970

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: heat dome flooding. We don't have any pets of house mandates in the country. We don't have enough cooling centers. I feel like our industry is really unprepared with how we think about this, and also thinking about how we kind of look into the future, how our city is going to warm up. How do you different urban morphologies react under different kind of heating conditions? And

32

00:08:26.970 --> 00:08:34.809

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: this is a Math and Basel. You know the center is going to be the heart hottest with that ever need island effects. But different kind of building forms react different ways to the he. This

33

00:08:34.809 --> 00:08:48.280

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: some of the interesting things the island bow, the block and valve primitive blocks, buildings perform really well in these kinds of environments. If we look back on the history of development in the Us. And in Europe, they're actually not that different. This is Projectsburg in Copenhagen.

34

00:08:48.280 --> 00:09:09.149

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: print perimeter block buildings for the story, 4 to 6 stories, lots of trees, lots of green space. but these are really thin buildings, and also very narrow buildings. And so there's more room for trees. There's more room for blue, green infrastructure. But the only

way that these buildings can really pencil the only way that these buildings should really work is because they only have one stamp. These were required to have 2 stairs. They start to get

35

00:09:09.150 --> 00:09:20.940

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: significantly larger. Think about where development is in the Us. Today. This is kind of a standard building. 5 over one planners will play fun games to modulate the facade so that it doesn't look so big we'll use different materials. But

36

00:09:21.210 --> 00:09:34.200

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: in the fact, these end up being mostly studios and one bedrooms, maybe you'll have some 2 or 3 bedrooms in the corner. The process takes forever. It takes a lot of capital. You have to assemble several parcels. This building is 5 over one relatively non-existent, the rest of the world.

37

00:09:34.380 --> 00:09:46.020

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: So talk a little bit about community access, how you enter your unit and how that it influences kind of a number of things double up in corridor. This is that 5 over one that you see this is pretty much ubiquitous in the Us. At this point

38

00:09:46.020 --> 00:10:12.980

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: quarter down the middle units on either side. It's fairly efficient, but you can't really get a lot of large units in here instead of like 3 studios which rent for \$1,500. You'd have to have a 3 bedroom that rents for 4,500 or more, and you're not going to find a lot of families that can really afford that. Also, if you live on the loud side of the street, you don't get any your spite from From the noise of pollution from the street. If you live on the south or west, you don't have the opportunity to cross ventilate. So there's some climate adaptation issues that start to come with this.

39

00:10:12.980 --> 00:10:27.230

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: This is a typical double in a corridor building. This is in Portland, thanks to Ankara moisten again. This is all studios, one bedrooms, and then here at the Corners, we've got our special larger units. So there's not a lot of economic and a good social mix of residence as well

40

00:10:27.330 --> 00:10:44.880

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: a single loaded corridor. It is much more common in Europe corridor, and the end can be exterior interior and the units on on either side. You have the opportunity for daylight on multiple sides, cross ventilation. This isn't a super efficient floor plan, and a lot of people in the us associate this with like motels from the fiftys and sixties, and so we don't really see it very often.

41

00:10:44.900 --> 00:10:54.239

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: this is a single loaded corridor by group in Vienna again. Exterior corridor. That functions also as kind of have your space for all the residents and all the units.

42

00:10:54.240 --> 00:11:18.669

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: Our double loaded sorry dual aspect, so light on multiple sides, cross ventilation. But the the workforce of urbanism the world over, except for the U.S.A. And Canada, is the point access block the single single State building. This is an an incredibly efficient building, very efficient for plate in funny enough way, it induces more unit variety and larger units. You're limited, typically in the number of units that you can have accessing your core, us there.

43

00:11:18.670 --> 00:11:37.929

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: And so you aren't squeezing in as many studios in one bedroom as possible. You really start to fill in that space with larger units opportunities for cross ventilation. You can stack the bedrooms on the quiet side of the street. you can get daylight on multiple sides as well. Seattle's still out the Us. Allows 3 story buildings pretty much everywhere. It's in the Ibc.

44

00:11:37.930 --> 00:11:54.079

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: Seattle's had a 50 year history with this almost in the seventies under the Ubc. The council came in and said, look, we'll allow single-stare buildings unlimited height. So sprinkler smoke, protection or or open exterior stair, and a max of 4 units per floor

45

00:11:54.080 --> 00:12:13.839

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: in the eighties. The city downs on much of the city council said, look, we'll take this. This typology will reduce it down to just the Max of 6 floors. again, a Max of floor units per floor. And this kind of typology really exists to today, we can build up to 6 stories one to 4 units per floor. Sprinklers

46

00:12:13.840 --> 00:12:31.670

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: travel access to requirements. But the Us. Is really an anomaly in in how we do our our buildings in most of Europe and most of Asia, you can go significantly taller with single State buildings. Majority of the EU doesn't even sprinkler building. So we're already taking way. More steps

47

00:12:31.670 --> 00:12:45.279

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: then then Europe in a in a lot of ways Canada is even more restrictive than us. They only allow up to 2 floors. I have heard that there may be some news on

that in the next week or so. So we're we're really like this outlier, right? Fire doesn't burn differently here, but we kind of act like it does.

48

00:12:45.570 --> 00:13:13.849

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: And of course you would think that there's a massive safety benefit that comes with those dual aspects, but the reality is, sprinklers are effective everywhere. single stair buildings are just as effective and clearing residences to as buildings with 2 exits. you don't have as many units per staircore. It's really easy to get out, especially if it's under 6 or 8 floors. All of these buildings on the left of this diagram are all these countries, with the exception of Canada, allow taller point access blocks than we do, and again, most of them don't require sprinklers.

49

00:13:13.950 --> 00:13:25.969

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: So how does this kind of induce the the better units? So if you have a maximum envelope that you can go, but you're limited to the number of units. Right? You're really going to maximize the the area of those units so you can get 3 bedroom units.

50

00:13:25.970 --> 00:13:50.920

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: You can get a variety of units. You can get cross ventilation. You get light on on multiple sides, right? These are things that we don't really see in our most differently buildings in the Us. Because of that double loaded cord, or it really restricts that kind of the freedom as a designer. And I think it also significantly restricts the quality of life for residents. You want to live in a unit that only has a tiny window 50 feet away from you, which is kind of the the, the direction that the Ibc is pushing these buildings

51

00:13:50.920 --> 00:14:13.279

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: in Seattle when comparing the different units even in these buildings. So if you're taking a typical 2 bedroom unit in a double loaded corridor in the Us. Let's say it's a thousand square feet. It's got 2 bedrooms, you know. You only get windows on one side. Maybe if you're lucky you'll get them on the corner. But if you look at that same building in Europe. Say, Germany or Switzerland. Right? You're gonna have a a floor plate that's relatively thin.

52

00:14:13.280 --> 00:14:32.010

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: You have apple space for your kitchen living, dining, but also that safe size unit, right? This is a thousand 50 square feet. This is 950 square feet. You're getting an additional bedroom. You're getting a much more livable and functional kind of kitchen living, dining space. You get cross ventilation. It's a radically different way of thinking about living

53

00:14:32.060 --> 00:14:56.980

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: and Seattle. We can stack 2 of those single to stare conditions on the same lot next to each other. but in the rest of the world there's no limitation. So this is a really wonderful project in venture tours. So in Ti to mass timber, passive house Member Bruno is the architect. This is actually 20, if we highlight the core. This is 20 singles air conditions all stacked together. So it's a radically different way of thinking about it.

54

00:14:57.040 --> 00:15:15.379

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: And if we were to take some of the the kind of concepts of how this works in Germany, I think there are opportunities for significant cost savings. I took a typical bedroom, a typical project in Seattle, a multi-family project and compared it to a courtyard from the to your block building in Hamburg. really staying

55

00:15:15.390 --> 00:15:33.180

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: occupant density. 60 bedrooms versus 55, significantly fewer bathrooms and kitchens on the Hamburg building. Their floor plate also ends up being significantly lot smaller. So there's more room for a larger courtyard. Your units aren't looking into other units as closely as you typically see in the Us.

56

00:15:33.210 --> 00:15:58.049

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: And if we take that cost savings which is about 12,800 square feet per floor, and multiply it by the number of you know for us on a typical building, let's say, at 6 floors times our construction costs, and say \$375 per square foot. If we could build the Harvard building this potential savings here, you know, 20 to 28 million dollars. Okay, this has, like 6 more elevators than you would find in a typical building. But the cost of 6 elevators is not

57

00:15:58.050 --> 00:16:17.599

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: yet, Steven. We'll talk to this later 28 million dollars. So I think that there's some really interesting cost benefits that can come with this, the larger courtyard, better good blue, green infrastructure less surface area, much lower embodied carbon as well. So these kind of these knock on effects to how we plan our buildings that have all of these kind of tentacles touching everything else

58

00:16:17.890 --> 00:16:29.559

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: here at large lab we're working on a kind of a prototype maximizing what we could legally do here in Seattle. So, taking the concept of the the the spy spanner to units on once their core

59

00:16:29.560 --> 00:16:48.230

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: and instead of doing a bunch of studios with maybe a little bit of variation on the corner, just doing family size units. We can go up to 6 floors we can do maze on

it on the ground floor to give us that extra little bit of height. And so we get a building that's like full of families and co-working spaces with workspaces and and very little circulation. So it's like a radically

60

00:16:48.230 --> 00:17:13.869

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: different way of thinking about how to do the building. We can put all of the bedrooms on the quiet side of the building, which is great because it's on an arterial, ample daylight cross ventilation, climate, adaptive units. Oh, by the way, we're going to try to do mass timber and passive house and we'll see if we'll have any success with that. So this is weird thing with the way that we're redeveloping our cities right? We we re-zone areas that already have multi-family housing. I call it urban cannibalism. It's not really the greatest way to do this.

61

00:17:13.869 --> 00:17:26.789

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: And so you get like this hodgepodge of old buildings and new buildings. Again, you can see that that's historic development with these small lots, one or 2 stories, but when it gets redeveloped. They have to pull together several lots because the

62

00:17:26.790 --> 00:17:56.659

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: fuel stare requirement really makes it so that these single state buildings aren't feasible right? And then we have these huge buildings, tiny courtyards, not a lot of economic and social mixing. you might also know there's not a lot of green space in this right. If we think about how Eco districts are developing in Europe. there's ample green space. There's room for blue, green infrastructure. There's room to deal with storm, water, mitigation, and flooding. These are almost all point access blocks here on the street, here on the material, you've got a more commercial and denser housing again. These are all

63

00:17:56.660 --> 00:18:19.819

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: single-stare buildings, you know, and then there's a school and a daycare. It's a much more different way of thinking about not just buildings themselves. But how those buildings interact with each other, and the different kind of urban environments that they make, and the effects of that has to do with the climate adaptation. And so, if we compare 2 of the projects, there are 2 buildings, one in Europe and one in the Us. Right. This is a double eded corridor here in Seattle.

64

00:18:19.820 --> 00:18:33.359

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: wild high number of units, but it's almost all studios and one bedrooms. There's not a lot of blue, green infrastructure. Here. We're using the courtyard for parking. Okay, it means we don't have to have underground parking. But this, the parking is still an issue. This is a a

65

00:18:33.720 --> 00:18:40.929

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: double point. Access block project in in Munich courtyard is used for blue, green infrastructure spaces for people to meet.

66

00:18:41.040 --> 00:19:05.080

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: There's playgrounds. There's a diversity of units in here. It's not all just studios and one bedrooms is family size units, and you can see that that building depth, that floor plate is significantly narrower than it is in the Us. Version. Here in Seattle we have 4 plates that are approaching 9,100 feet deep. I have a a pamphlet, a German pamphlet that was put out by their version of the AI. That talks about extreme building depths approaching 60 feet

67

00:19:05.080 --> 00:19:15.050

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: So this, like this wild diversity, and how we're planning our buildings and the effects of those have. So this is recurring question that half how are our codes affecting our quality of life.

68

00:19:15.050 --> 00:19:41.670

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: Whenever I think of a double order, or my mind always goes to this this thing from the signing But what if our, what if our building codes actually encourage more community oriented buildings? This is a about group of in Vienna, and they start daylight starewell in the middle. All of the units open up directly into this. You can do this anywhere in the Us. With just once there, they're in Covid. They could open up all the doors and get together in this space, and meet and greet each other and celebrate birthdays. that's not really something you can do on the double loaded corridor building

69

00:19:42.000 --> 00:19:53.619

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: and going back to kind of Even modern development in European countries does not have that big 5 over one mentality or concept that you see so much here in the Us.

70

00:19:53.620 --> 00:20:16.340

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: These look like bigger blocks, but these are all separate buildings. This is a 10 story mass timber building. This is a 6 story workforce housing. This is a 6 story bow group market rate housing. So at the block level. You still have that kind of fine grain nature that we love about cities. But our current building codes really prevent us from having. And so, because of that, we we don't have the economic and social mix. We don't have the blue, green infrastructure

71

00:20:16.340 --> 00:20:29.299

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: Our buildings are much more expensive and much thicker. And I think there's also this relation to like the issues with people fighting against housing as well. so I'll stop there. That's all I have for today.

72

00:20:29.340 --> 00:20:50.400

Frances Anderton: Great. Well done, Michael. very interesting. And I definitely have some questions to follow up. But but but before we get to that, I'm going to move over to Eduardo, and who's going to build on what you've already been laying out, because I suspect Eduardo pretty much agrees with with most of the points you made about the sort of livability that's made possible by

73

00:20:50.400 --> 00:21:09.229

Frances Anderton: Mit, Ctl and in your view, getting rid of the second step. But an Eduardo is trying to enact. I guess this change, and is very much involved with the legislative efforts to to steer us in the one stair direction. So so, Eduardo, over to you, tell us how you are trying to apply 200

74

00:21:09.250 --> 00:21:15.479

Frances Anderton: your knowledge of of code to creating a more livable Los Angeles.

75

00:21:16.040 --> 00:21:22.279

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: Thank you for that introduction. yes, 1 s. Let me.

76

00:21:22.540 --> 00:21:24.860

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and we'll we'll get it going.

77

00:21:25.020 --> 00:21:31.879

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So Hello! Everyone again. My name is Ed Mendoza from the policy director with the Global Communities Initiative

78

00:21:31.910 --> 00:21:36.949

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and thank you for having me here today to speak to you about the positive effects of stairway reform

79

00:21:37.200 --> 00:21:47.829

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: before I begin speaking about all the way single stair layouts, help buildings. I can first, briefly, give you a little bit of context about my organization who we are and what we're advocating for.

80

00:21:48.830 --> 00:22:10.430

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So the level communities initiative is a housing advocacy group that advocates for multiple reforms and housing and transportation. our housing niche within the sphere is centered on improving upon the goat form of our mixed use, multi-family construction and advancing goals, such as greater accessibility, affordability and resiliency in new development.

81

00:22:11.240 --> 00:22:21.829

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: our group is composed of various experts in the field of housing and transportation. We have professors and senior planners as well as community leaders and organizers leading our effort.

82

00:22:23.230 --> 00:22:35.970

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So that was a little bit of an intro, nor at Thelci. Now I'm going to talk to you about my here today. and how we found that single server all the instrumental and changing how how, we might, you know.

83

00:22:36.140 --> 00:22:40.870

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: change. I was still the housing in in California and and nationwide.

84

00:22:41.480 --> 00:22:46.769

Frances Anderton: And I just interject 1 s. Everybody here, Eduardo. Your voice was a little quiet to me.

85

00:22:48.270 --> 00:22:53.600

Frances Anderton: perhaps perhaps just you might need to speak more directly into the

86

00:22:54.150 --> 00:23:06.399

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: alright. Alright! So a great challenge in La is finding how we can leverage out more builders and players in the market, and how we could a lot more places to build and make building timelines faster.

87

00:23:06.550 --> 00:23:14.460

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: And la land tends to be very expensive. And typically, if you want to develop, you most likely also have to assemble land as well.

88

00:23:14.890 --> 00:23:18.809

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: However, assembling land in La is also very expensive, and time consume

89

00:23:18.910 --> 00:23:34.159

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: in 2,018 a report found that land acquisition premiums normally reached up to 40% in in the La, and the time needed to assemble land was substantial enough to act as a constraint towards a housing construction

90

00:23:34.670 --> 00:23:55.419

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: in La. Though we, currently the bulk of of info multi-family developers tend to be well capitalized developers that can afford the cost of land assembly, or any cost. Inefficiency that contemporary building brings to so issues regarding land assembly may not be an immediate or pressing problem with with them.

91

00:23:56.020 --> 00:24:09.649

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: however, the the same cannot be set for smaller developers or contractors attempting to move up the valley chain. These are people that are building a to use, or 4 plexes as well as homeowners or small commercial property owners

92

00:24:09.670 --> 00:24:17.290

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and community line for us, or mission-driven developers where land assembly does pose a significant barrier to to construction.

93

00:24:18.540 --> 00:24:26.909

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So today we are seeing multiple obstacles towards the construction of housing that single stairs reform may be able to address.

94

00:24:27.060 --> 00:24:36.179

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: The first are sites that cannot be developed because they may be too small, or sites where, how the housing market may not be able to support profitable development

95

00:24:36.650 --> 00:24:48.020

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: as well as areas where land assembly is unfeasible, due to the high cost of land and time needed to assemble such land so like in La. Think of, you know, places like Beverly or Melrose.

96

00:24:48.420 --> 00:25:03.729

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: Second, is our with local opposition contemporary development patterns that tend to destroy and replace granular built forms and neighborhoods so like what people think of as mom and pop buildings.

97

00:25:03.810 --> 00:25:19.329

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and that typically for men's local opposition. It's also the aesthetics and function of new multi-family buildings that that kind of some people. you know, it could be issues of over parked buildings in in Tod areas

98

00:25:19.350 --> 00:25:25.160

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: or half acre buildings that wall themselves off from the surrounding uses of a neighborhood.

99

00:25:25.610 --> 00:25:32.070

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: And then, lastly, is the somewhat lack of unit of layout variation in the development.

100

00:25:32.250 --> 00:25:36.469

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: a new construction that tends to favor one beds and studios, etc.,

101

00:25:36.730 --> 00:25:48.740

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and also have a prevalence of windowless bedrooms and and such developments, and that may not be the best fit for for homeown, for home ownership options as well as

102

00:25:48.800 --> 00:25:51.029

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: families with with with children.

103

00:25:53.240 --> 00:26:07.119

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So our plan at the Lci, and with single stair in mind, has come to address some of these topics by looking to ways to promote and encourage new methods of construction, utilizing best practices found in some places in the Us. And the world.

104

00:26:07.230 --> 00:26:12.259

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: You know, we're advocating for policies that incentivize granular parcel by parcel development.

105

00:26:12.380 --> 00:26:25.149

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and we believe that single steroid form will be, will allow us to design buildings that that are unit dense and and are able to compete with existing development. Feasibility thresholds on a unit per acre basis

106

00:26:25.320 --> 00:26:35.019

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: single sar will be able to better the efficiency of of building layouts. we believe that they will. They will make them more feasible to build on a more diverse range

107

00:26:35.030 --> 00:26:40.990

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: of of sites and provide a better range of unit diversity.

108

00:26:41.330 --> 00:26:51.270

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: also, by locking the ability to streamline development on a parcel by parcel basis. We believe that that all locks new ways to promote architecturally rich housing.

109

00:26:51.330 --> 00:26:58.739

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So instead of wrapping a building with whatever facade cladding the developers are required to use today.

110

00:26:58.840 --> 00:27:12.570

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: developers may be able to spend a little bit more money on it at the front facade of a building to make them more steepetically pleasing. Single-star would also facilitate housing that is, parking free or parking light on smaller parcels.

111

00:27:12.650 --> 00:27:24.499

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: where building parking would be in feasible or act as a massive constraint today. So parking free housing connects kind of like a mechanism to also lower rent and and increase transit use

112

00:27:24.750 --> 00:27:29.549

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and this kind of a locks, a new paradigm of housing construction. We believe

113

00:27:29.790 --> 00:27:39.720

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: that, you know, if if we're bettering these these these types of buildings, and we're, you know, creating parking light buildings that you know we're we're

114

00:27:39.920 --> 00:27:53.300

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: it kind of works towards you know, tying everything together with mobility, infrastructure improvements. For you know that first, last mile connection to, you know, transit projects that are popping up all over the the region.

115

00:27:55.460 --> 00:28:05.939

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: so, from what I just explained, I want to take you through a couple of slides so you could get a better picture of what I'm talking about and benefits that we can potentially get with single circuit construction.

116

00:28:06.160 --> 00:28:15.039

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: today. It's not impossible to to build on unconsolidated sites. There are different ways to build dense housing, rich dense housing.

117

00:28:15.080 --> 00:28:17.700

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: on, on larger parcels. In the city.

118

00:28:17.770 --> 00:28:24.540

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: however, there are trade offs that are significant and definitely impact the livability and frequency of of new development.

119

00:28:25.490 --> 00:28:29.710

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So here are some examples of single parcel construction in La.

120

00:28:31.490 --> 00:28:53.390

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So you see a common theme in all of these layouts. like Michael kind of explained in his last presentation. There's a or a spine that runs through all the The the building Units in these buildings also tend to be small, like variety. have Lyndalus bedrooms that have only access to one set side of the street or or side of light.

121

00:28:53.620 --> 00:28:57.089

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: they also lack, tend to like cross ventilation.

122

00:28:57.190 --> 00:29:03.029

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and so they kind of fermented over dependence on air conditioners versus passive cooling

123

00:29:03.410 --> 00:29:10.569

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: also, staircases eat up space on the front of the building, so it forces units to look to the side of the building

124

00:29:10.660 --> 00:29:23.050

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: also makes it very difficult to fit commercial space on the ground floor. So mixed use buildings aren't really feasible on these type of layouts. also, unit proximity to adjacent properties is also very tight.

125

00:29:23.220 --> 00:29:30.819

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So if you live on the second floor, on one of these buildings and an adjacent building goes up. You're kind of out of luck with getting sunlight.

126

00:29:30.980 --> 00:29:36.769

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: And this has both profound political and fiscal impacts of the feasibility of these type of developments.

127

00:29:37.080 --> 00:29:54.740

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: Developers may refuse, build on lots other than corner lots facing the street, because they may fear that, you know, if they build on, you know a little of a block, their their units. What to value. Once an adjacent building goes up blocking views for their tenants, and, you know, blocking it aligned as well.

128

00:29:55.060 --> 00:30:09.199

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and also residents in these buildings may also just the finally fight new adjacent housing. If it means that their source of light and air will be taken away. That's kind of like a new phenomenon that's been going on. La, I don't know if you followed what happened with the Eastern Columbia Building.

129

00:30:11.660 --> 00:30:13.559

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: so you know

130

00:30:13.770 --> 00:30:23.679

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: it. They're also pretty bad in in terms of open green space These side yards are about 3 to 5 feet wide, so you can't really do much in those spaces.

131

00:30:23.970 --> 00:30:33.400

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So you know, on on the top right picture, you could kind of see why it would, you know, kind of suck if you lived on the lower floor of of of one of these buildings.

132

00:30:35.710 --> 00:30:36.490

Yeah.

133

00:30:36.800 --> 00:30:37.880

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So you know.

134

00:30:38.040 --> 00:30:52.780

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: a lot of questions come up and a lot of planners, you know. They they think, you know. Well, you know, if you can't develop, you know good buildings on these single lots, then we should, you know. consolidate lots, or we should like look towards solving land assembly.

135

00:30:53.020 --> 00:31:00.630

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and you know, is it even worth it to to try to build good buildings on on single smaller parcels in in the city.

136

00:31:02.080 --> 00:31:08.389

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So what? While you know, we, we recognize that single ser reforms, not a silver bullet or a panacea housing.

137

00:31:08.580 --> 00:31:16.619

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: It sure helps a lot in how a building can be developed and completely challenges. You know, standards and beliefs in how

138

00:31:16.980 --> 00:31:19.480

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: buildings function on on smaller lots

139

00:31:19.890 --> 00:31:32.519

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: with single stair units are no longer forced to face the side of a building. Therefore a side yard is no longer necessary, and if one were to eliminate a side yard requirement. the options of building layouts increases dramatically.

140

00:31:32.580 --> 00:31:46.929

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: For example, the area typically used for the placement of the first and second staircases which are located at the front and rear of the buildings, in addition to the side yard setbacks to be repurposed to allow for additional units that faces street

141

00:31:47.520 --> 00:32:02.759

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and all the space dedicated to the narrow side yard slot along the periphery of the building. Can I be consolidated onto central court yards to provide brain open space while it's not simultaneously giving up on a square footage and for usage efficiency.

142

00:32:03.330 --> 00:32:14.240

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and all our majority of units could be capable of providing multiple angles of some way and air circulation. You're no longer restricted to facing your neighbor, that is, maybe you know, 6 feet away

143

00:32:18.020 --> 00:32:19.070

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: next slide.

144

00:32:19.110 --> 00:32:33.449

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: So in in in addition, because you're also saving space on, on, on, on hallways building efficiency tends to be higher. You're allowed more rentable square footage and different types of unit bed bath. Configurations with light are now possible.

145

00:32:33.630 --> 00:32:56.309

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: units share less neighbors. Acoustic privacy between units is improved, and again, all units have significantly higher degrees of light and air. So in this drawing we have a layout that roughly has the same density as buildings built today in

in Los Angeles, however, it holds a significant increase in rentable square footage per floor as well as a higher building efficiency

146

00:32:57.990 --> 00:33:05.659

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: in la. We also have a problem on sites where land is very expensive and where existing businesses are also very successful.

147

00:33:05.770 --> 00:33:24.509

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: if land assembly is impossible or very difficult. Usually we won't get, you know, any housing built at all. if a landowner decides that they want to build something on their land today, it's incredibly difficult to facilitate construction due to our rules that favor and our tailored towards a land assembly.

148

00:33:25.130 --> 00:33:36.129

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: But, however, again, single Sar opens up the ability to modify and build a dense and and well designed buildings that facilitate the construction of of.

149

00:33:36.800 --> 00:33:37.570

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: you know

150

00:33:37.930 --> 00:33:53.779

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: buildings that that I can cancel out today this building floor play, it still maintains an acceptable density of about 170 dwelling units per acre. whilst also maintaining the light and error attributes from the drawing of from the last line that I showed a couple of slides ago.

151

00:33:54.120 --> 00:34:07.120

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: We've got about a minute, Mike.

152

00:34:10.790 --> 00:34:16.059

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: in la! Developers have found a way to fit about 3 units on these small sites.

153

00:34:16.070 --> 00:34:29.399

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and they kind of they need these type of buildings. Work that code over, the units produce may not be the best, such as these that take up the entire floor plates of the building. The building efficiency is also bad.

154

00:34:30.250 --> 00:34:36.010

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: however, with single server form and with strategic changes in our planning development design standards

155

00:34:36.050 --> 00:34:50.590

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: we could allow up to 16 units on such a constraint site. That's 5 times density, and you'd still get cross ventilation, light and air, you know they could be control of living one. Beth is about 700 square feet studios are still about 350

156

00:34:51.330 --> 00:35:15.309

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: these are really, see the you're you're lines breaking up. Edward, and we really we really should wrap. Oh, yeah, and that's that's pretty much it. I'll wrap it up with saying, these buildings already exist. And yeah, we we should. We should keep on pushing. The the buildings do exist.

157

00:35:15.470 --> 00:35:40.409

Frances Anderton: yeah, with with that, the second step. Exactly. Right. Great. Great. Okay. Well, now, we're going to move on to the mechanical version of elevation, which is elevators, and and I'm excited to here now from Stephen Steven Smith for the Center for building in North America. Who's going to talk about the next frontier, which is elevators over to you.

158

00:35:40.410 --> 00:36:02.739

Stephen Smith: Thank you. I appreciate it all right. So my name is Steven. I'm the director at the Center for Building in North America. do research and advocacy around building codes and related issues. you've heard a lot about stairs, And you know fundamentally, the problem with the second stare is the room that it takes up and the cost that it imposes. But this all applies equally to anything

159

00:36:02.740 --> 00:36:22.350

Stephen Smith: you know any sort of circulation, whether it's vertical or horizontal. and the 2 major types of vertical circulation are stairs and elevators. So once you've solved the the stair problem, you're still sort of in North America. You're left with another problem, which is elevators. and it's a little different. it's not.

160

00:36:22.410 --> 00:36:36.829

Stephen Smith: it's not. It's not that we require more elevators. In fact, we typically require less. but it's the the the cost of them and to some extent the size they take up. So you can see here, you know, this is a typical you know.

161

00:36:36.940 --> 00:37:03.110

Stephen Smith: typical like vertical circulation core somewhere in Europe, probably Spain or Germany. you can already see there's something that's a little unusual here which the the stairs open which is not allowed in the United States. But I'll focus on the elevator now. So to illustrate the problem. Here is a social housing project in This is in the Canary Islands. and it's a 3 story building.

162

00:37:03.110 --> 00:37:32.030

Stephen Smith: and it's made up of a number of different cores. So it's it's made up of these little cores each have 2 apartments on either side. Here's the circulation, one apartment, 2 apartment, each 2 bedroom apartments. So there are 3 stories. So there's 6 units per core, and 4 of the units are above the ground. 2 of them are on the ground. So we have really 4 units served by one elevator, which is incredibly uncommon in America.

163

00:37:32.030 --> 00:37:49.149

Stephen Smith: And the problem that this would pose in the United States. So so this is like a 54 so 54 unit complex, 9 different cores, 9 different elevators, 9 different staircases, although, you know, each unit only has access to one stair, one elevator.

164

00:37:49.150 --> 00:37:57.069

Stephen Smith: The problem that it was was supposed in America is that in the United States to build an elevator, let's say, like roughly

165

00:37:57.070 --> 00:38:19.330

Stephen Smith: a 6 story multi-fam, you know, apartment building code, minimum elevator. No one anywhere builds bigger than the code. A minimum it would be about a hundred \$50,000 in the United States. So this project? Well, this isn't only 3 stories, so it may not be quite a hundred 50,000, but it would be pretty close to 150,000. certainly in a higher cost market it would probably be 150,000, and it would be times not

166

00:38:19.330 --> 00:38:30.369

Stephen Smith: so this would. This would make the project completely infeasible, if if in Spain they had to pay \$150,000 per one of those elevators. It would just eat up an enormous quantity

167

00:38:30.370 --> 00:38:54.699

Stephen Smith: of the budget. in. you know, Western Europe and East a, you know the sort of wealthier countries in East Asia. An elevator. Our 6 star elevator might be about \$50,000. So here's just some examples. Here's like a just a quote from the United States. You have 3 Conne

machine room list elevators. these ones were, I think, 4 and 5 stories 4 and 5 stop elevators. And it was, you know, 5, 5, \$530,000.

168

00:38:54.700 --> 00:39:21.870

Stephen Smith: Divide that by 3. That's actually more than \$150,000. And here is a quote from Switzerland, these are. This is a pair of for stop elevators so pretty similar, but there's 2 instead of 3, and it was including taxes. It was about 65 66,000. So Franks, which is probably, I don't know \$75,000. So each one of them was, you know, 30 something \$1,000 so dramatically, dramatically cheaper than you see in the United States.

169

00:39:22.190 --> 00:39:44.689

Stephen Smith: And this is. This is Western Europe, and this is East Asia. I'm now talking about China, Eastern Europe, the Middle East lowering countries. These are, you know, high income countries. Switzerland is like one of the few countries in the world that's actually wealthier than America. They're still dramatically cheaper. So why is this? Well, at the end. You know the end of the summer I'm going to have a longer report

170

00:39:44.690 --> 00:40:09.330

Stephen Smith: out about this. But here's my Here's my like quick summary. one of the the most immediate issues that you notice is the the the the much larger size. This isn't exactly the scale, but I tried to make it as close to scale as possible in the United States. On the left we have a code, a minimum elevator. Not only does it have to fit a wheelchair, making a full 180 degree turn, which is typically not required in Europe, but it needs to fit a stretcher.

171

00:40:09.330 --> 00:40:16.820

Stephen Smith: a fully extended now 84 foot. What long structure? 84 inches, which is 7 feet

172

00:40:16.820 --> 00:40:35.330

Stephen Smith: previously it was a little shorter. Our structures were like 6 foot 6 foot 4 inches. They made it longer. There wasn't a lot of discussion about that. It made the elevators bigger. So our typical elevator is going to be. It's kind of a capacity of 3,500 pounds and it's going to be a little more than twice

173

00:40:35.330 --> 00:40:53.569

Stephen Smith: the the floor area of one in Europe. The elevators in Europe are designed to fit one person in a wheelchair, quite a large wheelchair, actually, and then one person accompanying them, they cannot make 180 degree turn, although something I'll get into later is you're a lot less likely to actually find another person in an elevator

174

00:40:53.570 --> 00:41:18.750

Stephen Smith: in Europe, because they have far more elevators relative to the number of units and in the United States. Well, when when the elevator the cab is empty, you can turn a wheelchair around. If there's someone actually in the elevator, the wheelchair user probably can't turn around unless they're sort of like chasing them around the the cabin. So it it's not always going to even provide that same level of accessibility. so that's the size

175

00:41:18.750 --> 00:41:40.340

Stephen Smith: something else is our technical code. So there are really 3 safety codes used in the world. Now, the most common one is called the E. N. 81 codes, otherwise on the Iso 8,100 codes. These were historically developed for Europe. and the European Union standardize all their codes. They sort of forced everyone to adopt the same codes.

176

00:41:40.340 --> 00:41:57.600

Stephen Smith: you know, to enable free movement of goods, basically and then the rest of the world has really started using them because they were tried and true. Of the 4 major elevator manufacturers, 3 of them are European. That's kon a tuscope and Schindler

177

00:41:57.600 --> 00:42:22.240

Stephen Smith: and then we have Japan on its own on an island. Do they have their own codes? And then we have the United States of Canada which use this, a 17 code. it's unique. It's more prescriptive than performance space. So it outlines very specifically, you know how big certain components have to be, how much space for us to be in them. The European coast are more performance space, which says it specifies a broad goal, and then it's up to the the company. And then

178

00:42:22.280 --> 00:42:46.540

Stephen Smith: what it called these notified bodies. Essentially these private corporations that have the right to certify elevators and sort of check that they meet the broad goals. there's no safety statistics pretty much anywhere. So like everyone is kind of flying blind, which is a little frustrating, but it is important to know that pretty much the entire world uses these

179

00:42:46.640 --> 00:43:11.729

Stephen Smith: European normal codes. these European codes, except the United States, and it makes it a bit difficult. it raises the cost And then in the United States, not only do we have our own code, but every like. It's seemingly almost every State and Province in Canada has their own little implementation. They're all in different versions. There's, you know, every 3 years they put out a new code. Some States don't

180

00:43:11.910 --> 00:43:33.980

Stephen Smith: pick them up as quickly as others. Some states will make modifications to the code, so it's not even like the straight, you know, 2,016 code in Washington, for example, they've They've altered it a bit, and it's not even just States, there's actually almost 100 what are called authorities having jurisdiction, that is, you know, local authorities who regulate. You know I have their own elevator code, and, you know.

181

00:43:34.010 --> 00:43:53.659

Stephen Smith: regulate elevators. There's almost 100 of them in the Us. And Canada. So it's every state, every province. But then some cities. So in New York State, for example, New York State has an elevator code. The city as an elevator code. The city of Yonkers has an elevator code. The port authority as an elevator code feel like I'm missing one. Maybe I'm not But

182

00:43:53.660 --> 00:44:06.670

Stephen Smith: there is like a there is a ton of different regulation. It's all very confusing. The elevator manufacturers need to alter their products for different states. It costs money, it inhibits competition.

183

00:44:06.670 --> 00:44:07.520

Stephen Smith: you know.

184

00:44:08.020 --> 00:44:20.090

Stephen Smith: typically, you know, the the the proponents will say that there's local factors, you know, influencing things. But an elevator is completely within a building, so the climate shouldn't really matter that much.

185

00:44:20.570 --> 00:44:43.280

Stephen Smith: So then, the third thing we we've got about a minute more, Stephen. Third thing is the labor situation. in Europe. there is a. There is a free movement of labor across the entire European Union. you can hire, you know, from Romania. You can hire people to come to Germany and install your elevators in the United States. It can be a little difficult to even move between States.

186

00:44:43.280 --> 00:44:57.649

Stephen Smith: there's also labor agreements that specify a a far lesser degree of pre fabrication with elevators in the United States. so All of these holes, I think the elevator companies would prefer that they were drilled.

187

00:44:57.890 --> 00:45:18.879

Stephen Smith: you know, factory not on, not actually in the elevator shaft. but there are. There's a labor agreement that specifies that. In fact, these have to be drilled, you know. Some of these hold up to be drill on site. Some of them can be drilled a little bit in a factory and a little bit on site. the consequence. Not only is there cost, we simply don't have elevators and a lot of buildings. This is a Garden Department complex. These are 3 story buildings

188

00:45:18.880 --> 00:45:36.389

Stephen Smith: in the United States. These would never have elevators in Europe. in Western Europe they might be difficult to sell or run departments in a new building. That's 3 stories that doesn't have elevators in the urban setting in America for story buildings will often not have elevators. There's a 5 story building that doesn't have an elevator. They found a loophole, even though technically, it should be required.

189

00:45:36.390 --> 00:45:53.599

Stephen Smith: and I think that's not. Oh, okay, Another. Another problem with elevators is, we just never get them in old buildings, whereas in Europe there's a large industry of retrofitting them. Here's the Coliseum. This is €200,000 to install an elevator on the call Cm. In America. I can't even imagine how many millions that would cost.

190

00:45:54.010 --> 00:45:54.990

Stephen Smith: that's it.

191

00:45:55.300 --> 00:46:18.930

Frances Anderton: Great, Steven. Well, thank you so much. so we now have about 7 min for us to have a Q&A. And then, if people want to start adding their questions to the chat and be great to hear from you all, I guess I guess I'm super intrigued by a number of things, one of which is how all 3 of you are extremely influenced and inspired by models overseas, particularly in Europe. And

192

00:46:18.930 --> 00:46:34.700

Frances Anderton: you know not gonna complain about those at all. But but I but I am interested. I haven't have many of you about New York where New York doesn't does does doesn't demand the second step. So I guess first of all, quick, I just want a quick response from one of you. What what can we learn from New York.

193

00:46:34.980 --> 00:46:48.949

Stephen Smith: So New York allows a single stair 6 stories. If the building is small, typically a single 25 foot lot it's enabled a lot of small lot development as as as as small as 25 feet. The Standard New York City lot is 25 feet

194

00:46:48.950 --> 00:47:06.960

Stephen Smith: it'd be great to make it a little bigger. It can be a little difficult. The other thing that New York allows is Scissor Stairs, which is the stairs interlock within each other. So even when 2 stairs are required in a residential building, they can sort of like form a helix around each other. Ironically, this was banned in most of the United States after 9 11.

195

00:47:06.960 --> 00:47:32.850

Stephen Smith: But New York never banned the scissors, so I guess the thinking is, you know, the terrace might fly a plane into a 5 over one in Dallas. But New York City is not. That's not gonna happen here. So you can. So yeah, we we have a lot of small out development, and even on slightly larger lots, or maybe a 50 foot lot, even though there's 2 stairs required. They can scissor around each other so you can fit it on a much smaller site.

196

00:47:32.920 --> 00:47:46.629

Frances Anderton: Got it? Got it? Okay? So second question, so I hear the case for getting rid of the setting of skirts there, and I definitely hear the case for getting rid of the double loader corridor, the bane, the bane of life in multi-family housing most definitely.

197

00:47:46.640 --> 00:48:14.630

Frances Anderton: however, I guess I guess I just want to fully understand the connection of this particular code to affordability, because because because in my, you know, in the work I've done covering housing, and and believe me, I do not know as much as you all. But still what I've heard so many rationalizations made for what makes buildings so so unaffordable to build, including so called, affordable housing.

198

00:48:14.630 --> 00:48:36.390

Frances Anderton: And I hear cost of materials, cost of labour, sequence, lawsuits from neighbors and parking, parking, parking, parking. I have to say I don't often hear second stare. So again, quick answer like, Why is this? You, you? Eduardo, did say. It's not the panacea. I heard you say that.

199

00:48:36.390 --> 00:48:47.300

Frances Anderton: but still I still want to understand very quickly. Why is it this, this stair issue? That is the key to affordability. When we've got all these other issues that impact affordability.

200

00:48:47.880 --> 00:49:05.740

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: I think the having single stair opens up again with like unit variation. So you could realistically build like a 2 bed, one bath unit and then have that as a homeowner ship option. And that option just doesn't really exist today. So we're introducing.

201

00:49:05.770 --> 00:49:24.099

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: like, essentially like a lower barrier of entry to to owning a house. And and obviously, if you're going to be, you know, buying a house that might be parking light or parking free on an apartment building, that's it's always going to be competitive versus A, you know, a larger single family home. And in that same city

202

00:49:24.350 --> 00:49:28.780

Frances Anderton: the Michael and Steven. Do you agree? That's the thing that's that's the crux.

203

00:49:30.160 --> 00:49:59.760

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: Oh, I I I was answering a question. I I was a I'll jump in. I I think that the for me, the big thing and it Steven and I worked on a a report on this for his, his center for buildings in North America, the units and a double loaded corridor building have to be really big to get more apartments. and so the affordability really comes down to you get a much bigger apartment. or I guess it's a much. You get more bedrooms in the same size apartment as you do

204

00:49:59.810 --> 00:50:23.109

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: in a double-ed quarter. So the slide I had showed a 2 bedroom that was a thousand square feet versus a 3 bedroom and a point access block. That was 1,000 square feet. So I think it's it's really opening up more livable housing. But they're also it's smaller units. You're not paying for as much common space. It's kind of all of these other little things that happen as well Another one I recently learned about was you could do a pipe and pipe system

205

00:50:23.110 --> 00:50:33.300

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: reduce your plumbing insulation and pipe runs by half so significant, you know, cost savings on the plumbing side as well. So it it isn't a fantasy at all. but there are some interesting

206

00:50:33.300 --> 00:50:38.939

Frances Anderton: tweaks that it does start to open up right, and it improves sort of the capacity to make livable plans. But

207

00:50:38.940 --> 00:51:03.899

Frances Anderton: so so. So what is the status of this? You you will very engage with this issue, but when I've run it by people locally, and I've mentioned it, it's they just put through their hands up and say, it's the fire department that mandates this. And you know they kind of. They've got control over over this kind of safety code. So sort of what is the feasibility of making this change? And where are we at with it?

208

00:51:05.640 --> 00:51:08.110

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: In Washington? State our

209

00:51:08.320 --> 00:51:22.429

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: house? And Santa just passed bills that would allow the State building code to adopt Seattle's legislation effectively statewide. So we could do 6 to 3 buildings single State buildings in Seattle that's since been expanded to

210

00:51:22.440 --> 00:51:36.599

Michael Eliason / Larch Lab: a board that the the the State building code will review and then hopefully adopt one for one what Seattle's requirements are? that had almost no opposition whatsoever. and it passed through both houses with like a 98% pass rate.

211

00:51:36.960 --> 00:51:47.309

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and in California, my, my organization, the Lci, is co-sponsoring with with East Bay for everyone, A. B 835,

212

00:51:47.390 --> 00:51:55.339

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: which is a study bill that would have our State fire marshal study and look at, I guess.

213

00:51:55.450 --> 00:52:01.339

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: Standards of a buildings of single start buildings over over 3 stories tall

214

00:52:01.530 --> 00:52:08.900

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: and and that will be incredibly helpful for them. Local jurisdictions to look at said study and then

215

00:52:08.910 --> 00:52:25.550

Stephen Smith: pursue local implementation strategies. But there's there's a similar bill in Oregon as well as New York State, which has its own building code. Aside from the city and once once these pass my hope is to like commission some work to

216

00:52:25.550 --> 00:52:49.320

Stephen Smith: prove like the current. The current rules didn't have a lot of like complicated fire protection engineering modeling that went into them, but to change that they will, there will be a much higher standard of proof. So my hope is to commission some work. on like smoke spread, fire, spread, and sort of modeling, and compare it to like some of the like. The current codes. They require 2 stairs, but you can have, for example, a dead end corridor that extends

217

00:52:49.490 --> 00:53:01.309

Stephen Smith: in such a way that, like, if a fire breaks out in one part, you only have one option of a direction to go in the current codes. So if you compare that to a single stair, I think the single stair is actually, you know, for a small foot plate, foot

218

00:53:01.370 --> 00:53:25.019

Stephen Smith: floor plate is actually going to turn out to be safer. But there is, you know, once the study those pass, there's got to be quite a lot of resources actually, that go into actually modeling this out because, I don't think in America they're going to accept the fact that they well, they do it elsewhere. They do it in Seattle. It's worked out fine. I think there's going to be quite a lot of pushback, and it'll require some pretty intense work to prove it.

219

00:53:25.230 --> 00:53:27.419

Frances Anderton: But you think the work is worth it.

220

00:53:27.470 --> 00:53:45.840

Frances Anderton: I think it's worth it right? Right? So So, Edward, are you? You spoke, and you did, Michael, as well that you spoke about this issue of Land Assembly and trying to assemble lots of the next door to each other, and you very much made the argument that with the single stair only

221

00:53:45.840 --> 00:54:04.409

Frances Anderton: that would somehow be kind of enabled, or perhaps more, perhaps more attractive to developers who might try and do that land assembly. But again, that's that's also something that's also, I guess, a challenge that is kind of out of the hands of code. When you've got a bunch of sites owned by different

222

00:54:04.410 --> 00:54:20.669

Frances Anderton: property owners, we certainly come up against this in la with with, but they're not playing in the same. They were not playing the sandbox together. They're not interested necessarily in in selling the lot to the, to the neighbor to allow it to be assembled. So so I don't fully understand.

223

00:54:20.760 --> 00:54:33.509

Frances Anderton: Ha! Ha! I I understand the livability argument totally the design argument, but I don't understand sort of in terms of really enabling more of this land assembly. This would help.

224

00:54:34.030 --> 00:54:54.510

Frances Anderton: I think it does the the opposite. It it it. This is an argument against land land assembly, I think. Oh, got it great. Okay, I hear you. I I hear you, Edward. I thought you wanted to put 2 parcels together there. 2 lots. I thought you wanted to put 2 lots together, because that would enable a more generous courtyard.

225

00:54:54.770 --> 00:55:03.920

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: I mean, you could. The thing is, this is like an all in approach, right, if you could get a land assembled building. Good right. But if you

226

00:55:04.010 --> 00:55:21.580

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: are in a neighborhood where you know you may have, you know, 5 different landlords or land owners, and they all quibble, and they don't want to agree. Whatever differences they may have. Then, like in today, you just won't get housing built. And there are. There are plenty of areas in Los Angeles where this is the case right?

227

00:55:21.730 --> 00:55:36.699

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: And sometimes the buildings that do go up on these single parcels. They're just not good. They're either inefficient. They provide bad layouts. They they're just not good, so less of them get built. So this is kind of dressing that and saying, Well, you know, if

228

00:55:36.700 --> 00:56:01.319

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: if you do want to build on your own piece of land. How can you maximize the value out of it? How can you not only make the building profitable, but also make it incredibly livable and a beautiful building that you know you you could be proud of, build right so to your point, and I fully understand you don't want to assemble all these lots and build a big behemoth. Because yes, we have the behemoths going up on the thoroughfares, especially

229

00:56:01.440 --> 00:56:20.000

Frances Anderton: now I will say that there's diamonds in the rough. I do know. We all probably know there are some behemoths where a smart designer, the architect and a supportive developer have actually managed to do something pretty creative, you know, at at scale, and have managed to

230

00:56:20.000 --> 00:56:46.339

Frances Anderton: get rid of the double odor corridors for the most part, and we still nonetheless, using this, the the haven't ha! Including this, the the second step, say, Michael Fullonus, in Santa Monica, did a huge project that comes to mind where he worked really hard to get rid of the double loaded corridor, and he did wind up with with 2 sets of stairs which are external, and he really made them into a he turned lemons into lemonade. I think. So.

231

00:56:46.490 --> 00:56:49.039

Frances Anderton: So is it fair to say that?

232

00:56:49.280 --> 00:57:04.349

Frances Anderton: that that you can do work around. It's kind of frustrating not to have that freedom that they have in the cities where they where they don't have to do this double step second step. But but it is possible to do workaround if you're smart.

233

00:57:05.760 --> 00:57:07.300

Frances Anderton: is that fair to say.

234

00:57:07.410 --> 00:57:25.280

Frances Anderton: yeah. And I think La has a lot of really good examples like, if you look at the work of Michael Malson, right? And Michael and Lucan, I mean, they've I mean, there's a bunch. There's a whole bunch of designers that work very hard, kfa, and some of their projects to I could name. I could name more and

235

00:57:25.600 --> 00:57:38.070

Frances Anderton: sorry I'm talking. I'm now doing a follow up before you've even answered. But I just recall that last week I met a young developer, and he is definitely trying to do livable, livable community scale

236

00:57:38.130 --> 00:57:55.159

Frances Anderton: housing. He doesn't want to go above 3 stories. That's where he wants to be at. He wants to be doing somewhere between, you know, 8 and 15 units But for him the issue is parking. It's parking, parking all the way, and he's sort of less concerned

237

00:57:55.170 --> 00:58:02.180

Frances Anderton: with this, you know. If you had to single out an issue. so again again, I guess I want to understand.

238

00:58:02.680 --> 00:58:11.179

Frances Anderton: Does this trump parking as an issue? Or is it like once you've resolved parking and got rid of the parking minimums. That then you then, now it's the staff.

239

00:58:11.240 --> 00:58:37.690

Stephen Smith: I I I would say that. yeah, I mean, land use issues are typically are bigger, which is probably why, you know, like it's been his career, you know, fixing land use issues in California Los Angeles, and like they're not fixed. But you know, California really no longer has parking requirements. near transit. So like, I think the parking or the parking thing is being solved. And I would say the building code stuff is sort of like the next, like the next thing to tackle in California that next time is now.

240

00:58:37.690 --> 00:58:43.749

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: We have 1 min, Eduardo. You're going to take us out.

241

00:58:43.750 --> 00:59:09.369

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: No, I don't want to do that. I'll comment on the parking, though parking was really was on the forefront. I mean, if you didn't, if you weren't able to lower M. Mandated parking amounts, we wouldn't even be having this conversation like in in in order to create like turn radii, you need a certain width of a building. It's, I think, 42 feet, and if you didn't have 42 feet an hour, you just couldn't have a building at all. And you know.

242

00:59:09.910 --> 00:59:20.560

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: you know everything's done. Conversation finished. That's no longer the case right? So now that we're kind of exploring this kind of like we're revisiting, you know.

243

00:59:20.770 --> 00:59:23.180

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: old forms of construction.

244

00:59:23.340 --> 00:59:39.449

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: We're asking ourselves, how do we make the best out of this right? Do we follow the same paradigm? Do we follow the same like client assembly things that we're kind of doing just kind of taking, you know, eliminating parking, as Hey, you know it is a benefit. Or do we say.

245

00:59:39.580 --> 00:59:46.160

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: let's make really good buildings. Let's make them as efficient as possible. Let's put in families in them, and, you know.

246

00:59:46.670 --> 00:59:48.739

Ed Mendoza / Livable Communities Initiative: create a better built environment.

247

00:59:49.480 --> 00:59:57.190

Frances Anderton: Well, that brings us to our conclusion. Very well, put Eduardo Jackson. It's 1:30 I should hand over to you.

248

00:59:57.520 --> 01:00:18.910

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): Thank you so much. I just wanted to extend my thanks. to our fantastic panelists. Eduardo. Michael Steven. thank you for coming, Francis. Also. Thank you so much for your incredible moderating skills. I really appreciate it. to everyone in the audience. Thank you so much for coming as well. We will be sharing a copy of this recording the chat and transcript

249

01:00:18.990 --> 01:00:34.300

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR Public Engagement (They/Them): in the next couple of days. we'll get this edited down and nice little package for everyone to enjoy. if you have any questions, please do email us at public programs, and I hope to see you all at another spare public event. Soon. Take care, enjoy the rest of your day.

250

01:00:34.420 --> 01:00:36.440

Frances Anderton: Thank you, thank you.