Meeting Notes	
reFORM	**reFORM Design Standards Subcommittee Meeting** October 23, 2013; 11:30 a.m. County/City Building, Room 113
Members in Attendance:	Cathy Beecham, Jon Carlson, Curt Donaldson, Dave Johnson, JoAnne Kissel, Rick Krueger, Don Linscott, Sam Manzitto, Michelle Penn, Dennis Scheer, Lynn Sunderman, Zach White, Derek Zimmerman. Pat Anderson, Tim Gergen, Scott Sullivan absent.
Others Present:	Marvin Krout, David Cary, Ed Zimmer, Brandon Garrett, Christy Eichorn, Stacey Hageman, Sara Hartzell, Michele Abendroth (Planning Department)

I. Welcome – David Cary

The meeting was called to order at 11:32 a.m. David Cary welcomed everyone and introduced the Planning Department staff working on this effort.

II. Meeting Purpose and Materials – David Cary

Cary briefly reviewed the agenda for today's meeting. He noted that we will be working on the centers today and how the standards work or don't work.

III. Explanation of Feedback Sheet – David Cary

Cary stated that there is a feedback sheet about the center standards and requested that each committee member complete the sheet.

IV. Overview of Center Standards – Brandon Garrett

Garrett stated that the purpose of center standards is to establish design standards to encourage commercial and mixed use developments that are attractive, pedestrian-oriented, and enhance nearby neighborhoods. There are three strategies to accomplish this: Designate specific areas where design standards will apply; Establish standards that make commercial and mixed use development more walkable; Create building design standards that make development more aesthetically pleasing.

V. Center Standards Exercise – Committee and Staff

a. Each group will be given materials to work on a center site to apply the proposed Center Site Design Standards

b. A planner will be assigned to each group for questions and guidance

c. Each planner will "report out" the results of the exercise from their group to the committee

d. Committee comments and questions

Garrett explained the group exercise that the committee members will be participating in. The purpose of the exercise is to learn how to apply the center standards. He described the assumptions for the exercise as follows: the pedestrian-oriented route will be along a private street; single user of 170,000 sq. ft. or two users equal to that; the center will include 250,000+ sq. ft.; residential and hotels will not be incorporated; surface parking must be adequate; 1 stall per 300 sq. ft.; and access points to arterials are pre-determined. The site is approximately 20 acres, and the scale is 1"=40' or ¼"=10'. He stated that the groups will have approximately 60 minutes to complete the exercise and noted that a planner will assist each group.

Each of the three groups completed the exercise, and the planner in the group reported on the group's work.

Hageman stated that her group first had the two smallest big boxes oriented them so that they were still visible from the street with a large parking field in between them. The pedestrian oriented route would be connecting to both access points. There are a lot of smaller uses along the pedestrian oriented route to meet the two-sided requirement and some kind of larger building on the corner.

White stated that this brings up a lot of issues with access and where the pedestrian oriented route needs to be. He gets concerned about parking and the great amount of density. From the development perspective, he is not sure how that works out from a cost standpoint. Johnson stated that we need to be careful that the pedestrian oriented route doesn't necessarily mean that's where people are going to walk in the development from. That's where we're trying to orient the building frontages to. Once you're in the shopping center, the design standards are trying to get the buildings to engage the street front rather than engaging the parking lots. White stated that he would like to orient the parking in front of the building rather than behind. You can get your 60% this way. It's a lot more restrictive than just having a permitted use.

Eichorn stated that her group was doing fine until they got to the 60% rule and they were challenged with that. Beecham stated that she is not sure that we want to discourage more pedestrian routes. If we want to encourage the pedestrian, maybe there is a way to reward people for adding more instead of penalizing them. Johnson noted that the pedestrian oriented route isn't just necessarily where people are going to walk. It's where you want that

street front, where you want 60% of that route to have buildings on both sides. He thinks we can have very nice corridors that aren't necessarily the pedestrian oriented route. Beecham asked how we encourage that. Linscott stated that the 60% rule is going to be a real detriment in laying this out.

Scheer stated that we need to find a way to accomplish the goals of the pedestrian oriented route. He finds it disturbing that we are turning our backs on the existing context of the residential neighborhood. As we talk about design guidelines, he asked if there is a way to emphasize the pedestrian oriented route but also make substantial goals and objectives for the context. It seems that we are designing the new thing without thinking about the existing thing.

Cary stated that there were a lot of questions in his group about the context of the site so it was difficult to get going. Another thing they worked on is drainage on the site and if that takes away from the usability of the site. They ended up with the L shape of the pedestrian oriented route. The drive aisles are where you would interact with the neighborhood.

Carlson noted that one of things they talked about was facing the blank walls with other shops. They felt they needed smaller footprints to make it work. White stated that this site has a lot of buildings and seems congested. Carlson stated that once you get out of your car, you want to create as many stopping opportunities as possible. Zimmerman stated that if it is too high density, then he will avoid that site. White stated that you need to have a lot more end users on a project like that. Penn stated that if this is too many stores, why are we trying to create this pedestrian route? That is part of the experience of what happens on the street. You want to create an experience of going from point A to point B.

Krueger stated that there is a big road around and asked if there a way to use the right-of-way. Then you could front an office building with some angled parking and then you are not looking into the back sides of the big parking field. Krout stated that you could get some credit for that being a pedestrian oriented route. The angled parking raises some Public Works questions. Krueger questioned why you can't do angled parking on public property. Krout stated that we may have Public Works come in and talk to the Committee about that.

Kissel asked how they arrived at the 60% rule. Krout stated that it came about through trial and error. It seemed to be reasonable, and they were trying to back away from the more restrictive standards. Garrett added that one of the charges was to create measurable standards rather than just descriptive standards. If you break it down to smaller units like 30%, then it really just scatters the site.

VI. Complete Committee Response Worksheet – Committee

Cary asked the Committee members to complete their worksheet and give it to a staff member.

VII. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

VIII. Wrap Up

Cary noted that the next Design Standards Committee will be on November 6.

Cary thanked the members for their attendance.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

M:\plan\Design Standards 2012\Committees\Design Standards Committee\131023\Minutes.docx