Meeting Notes	
reFORM	**reFORM Design Standards Subcommittee Meeting** December 4, 2013; 1:00 p.m. County/City Building, Room 113
Members in Attendance:	Pat Anderson, Cathy Beecham, Jon Carlson, Curt Donaldson, Tim Gergen, Dave Johnson, JoAnne Kissel, Rick Krueger, Don Linscott, Sam Manzitto, Michelle Penn, Scott Sullivan, Lynn Sunderman, Derek Zimmerman, Zach White. Dennis Scheer absent
Others Present:	Marvin Krout, David Cary, Ed Zimmer, Brandon Garrett, Christy Eichorn, Stacey Hageman, Michele Abendroth (Planning Department)

I. Welcome – David Cary

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. Cary welcomed those present.

II. Meeting Purpose and Materials – David Cary

Cary stated that Brandon Garrett will provide an overview of the zoning changes for corridors and centers and review the B-1 zoning district. Garrett will then provide a summary of clarifications and modifications for corridors and standards. Hageman will review the clarifications and modifications for the building design standards.

He noted that at the Zoning Barriers Committee meeting prior to this meeting, the members were concerned about the disconnect between the two subcommittees. Staff will provide more information to the two groups to help bring the discussions together.

III. Review Proposed Zoning Changes that Correspond with Design Standards in Corridors and Centers, and Review Proposed B-1 Zoning District – Brandon Garrett

Garrett stated that one of the objectives of the design standards was to designate areas where the design standards would apply. The basics are that centers are B-2, B-5 and H-4; corridors are B-3 and H-2. There are no design standards proposed for R-T, O-2, O-3, H-3, I-1, I-2 and I-3. We are rezoning the B-1 and H-1 districts. We have decided to apply the design standards to zoning districts because it is straightforward. Other approaches such as overlays may be confusing. Properties will be rezoned to align with the desired design context.

Garrett noted that a big piece of the rezoning is notification of the property owners.

Zimmerman stated that part of this is rezoning areas of existing developments so they would have to be part of design standards in some fashion and asked when the standards would come into play. Garrett stated that everything is grandfathered on day one. When a center is redeveloped, we would look at the design standards then. Zimmerman asked if only one building in the center is going to be redone but nothing else if that is the only building that has

to conform. Garrett stated that it would just be that one building that would have to meet the standards. Zimmerman asked if the building would have to meet the articulation standards. Hageman stated that if they are redeveloping the property at more than 50% of the assessed value, then they would have to meet the standards. Zimmer added that the Downtown Design Standards have the 50% requirement, and it also looks at what is feasible for what is on the ground today.

Krueger commented that he asked Hageman to review a development at 14th & Yankee Hill Road, and it met most of these standards, but not all of them. He likes his design, and it is important to him to impose his vision on the site. It makes him very uncomfortable that he would have to modify the entrance and some other things. When we market these developments, we make it simple. This is important, and these design standards do make a difference.

White stated that he understands what Krueger is saying. The more restrictions you put on something, there is the potential for less creativity.

Krueger commented that when we apply for a permit, then we go over to Planning for covenants review and design standards.

Johnson stated if the Planning Director doesn't approve a development, then they can go to the Urban Design Committee.

Zimmerman stated that a denial by the Planning Director carries a lot of weight with those public bodies. Krout stated that is partly because we don't say 'no' very often. Penn stated that as a member of the Urban Design Committee, there are a couple things that they have voted 'no' on, and the City Council has then approved it. She finds it hard to believe if there is good design that these standards couldn't be met. If we have rules, some people think rules put you in a box, but she looks at it as being more creative.

Krueger stated that he is taking all the risk on a development, so he believes he should be able to have it his way. All of these rules are discretionary. He follows all the rules today, and none of these have to do with life safety.

Sullivan stated that he believes there should be less work and decisions on the Planning Director. A case in point is Krueger's development mentioned earlier. He already has his site designed and approved, and the last thing he wants to do is change midstream, so he asked if those can be grandfathered in.

White stated that the developer should be able to have his vision on a site and allow more flexibility. Once you put rules down, he feels that it limits creativity. Trends change, things change, and he doesn't see a need to do a lot of the stuff right now.

Anderson stated that she thinks that is why we are here because trends do change and things do change. We have to keep these things viable. We also have to think about having more density because we can't continue on the mode we are.

Garrett explained the new proposal for the B-1 "Neighborhood Retail District". This is a late developing piece to the reFORM package. reFORM proposes to rezone all existing B-1 to other districts (mainly to B-3). This proposal is for a new zoning district named B-1, which is much different than current B-1 or B-3. Lighter uses are allowed and would exclude auto-related uses. There is transitional zoning between commercial and residential. Typically it is surrounded by residential neighborhoods and is on local streets rather than arterials. The new B-1 district would have a 35' height limit and would apply corridor design standards and the same sign regulations as R-T.

Beecham stated that a lot of B-1 is going into B-3, but there are some areas that are different, and we need to treat them different. Krout commented on the 35th and O Street site that was the post office and is now an office store. This is a tool for rezoning when someone comes in with an unusual request. Eichorn added that it is a tool that could be used in lieu of a zoning agreement. If there is a district that has lighter uses, it is good for the neighborhood, and it could be good for the developer.

Zimmerman asked what type of uses are allowed in this district. Garrett stated that there are many allowed uses such as retail, office. Carlson stated that if there is someone who wants to put in a restaurant, it's a less scary choice for them.

Johnson stated that he believes this is a positive step. He believes it can be called B-1, and the land use attorneys will figure it out.

Sullivan asked if all the areas identified are small commercial areas already. Garrett stated that you will find that there is an old commercial building and then next door is a house that is zoned commercial that may or may not be in commercial use.

Johnson stated that part of what may go with this would be properties that are directly adjacent, and you may be able to increase the density.

Gergen stated that if you look at the sign standards, it might help to keep those areas viable instead of being turned over to other uses.

a. Fill out feedback sheet

Garrett requested the members to complete the zoning changes worksheet.

IV. Review Topic Summaries, Clarifications, and Modifications Sheet for Corridors and Centers Design Standards (Including Zoning Changes and Screening and Landscaping) – Brandon Garrett

Garrett reviewed the corridors and centers clarifications and modifications made as a result of committee discussions. He stated that on streetscapes, there wasn't much discussion on this topic. A point of clarification is that the street tree placement is an average of 50 feet, not necessarily every 50 feet.

There was general support of the corridor site development standards. A point of clarification is that corridor standards may be used instead of center standards when requested on sites of 10 acres or less and less than 500 feet in depth. A modification is that for centers that are smaller in size and are applying corridor standards, there is an option for plazas to count toward the net frontage length requirement, but not require plaza space on the site.

Gergen asked if the streetscape can get narrowed when they have to put in decel lanes off a primary street. Garrett stated that the streetscape should mirror that curb. If you are cutting out a decel lane in a right-turn lane, then you need to step off 8 feet to get the planting strip in there. Krueger stated that one of the things that came up in their meeting with Public Works is the sight line distance. The issue is if you are in the sight triangle if you are in the turn lane. Garrett noted that Hoskins pointed out that by achieving the streetscape, you are actually gaining some space for cyclists.

Garrett stated that center standards are more complex. Creating the pedestrian-oriented route (POR) helps create that sense of place and helps people be comfortable. A point of clarification is that site standards allow for large boxes to be counted toward the 90% net frontage length along the POR if adjacent to the POR. For example, liner buildings on the side of the larger store could be fronted to the P.O.R. and the floor area of the big box can be counted toward the 90% frontage requirement. In addition, 60% of the "Net Frontage Length" of the POR must be two-sided (buildings or plaza space facing each other). The Net Frontage Length is the length of the POR on both sides of the street measured at the Build-to Zone, subtracting out all of the interruptions such as driveways, easements, and setbacks. There was consensus that something needs to be done with centers to make them more pedestrian-friendly. There were disagreements and maybe some confusion about the site development standards for centers. The responses were mostly supportive, and there was some leaning towards the standards being strengthened, but flexibility was a major concern and should not be sacrificed. A majority felt that the proposed standards were flexible enough. Another clarification is that 10% of the floor area in a center is allowed to be located on pad sites completely detached from the POR. Also, the Planning Department will be responsible for administering new design standards.

On screening and landscaping, the majority of the committee members expressed support of the changes. Areas of concern included adding more parking lot trees, requiring trees as well as a fence between commercial and residential zoning districts, and applying screening to automobile sales lots. Staff heard the comment that the existing parking lot tree requirement is adequate. Staff also heard that parking and snow removal could be an issue if trees were required in the side yard next to residential. An option for putting the buffering trees on the residential property, if the residential property owner was amenable, was discussed favorably among the group. Finally, although most people thought that automobile sales areas should be screened, the display should be low and not block the majority of the automobile on display. A modification is to allow for an option for required buffer trees to be placed on adjacent residential

property per an agreement with property owners. A point of clarification is to allow buffer trees to count toward parking lot required trees.

Garrett noted that the design standards are proposed to be applied by zoning district. Corridors would be B-3, H-2, and a new B-1 district. Centers would be B-2, B-5, and H-4. In order to apply standards in highly visible and appropriate areas, some zoning is proposed to be changed. The initial proposal included rezoning some areas from I-1 to H-2. Based on some feedback from property owners, that piece of the proposal has been withdrawn. An additional future effort will go into informing and explaining the proposed changes to impacted property owners. All existing B-1 is proposed to change to different districts such as B-3. A new B-1 district with very limited uses is proposed for a small number of locations within neighborhoods.

V. Review Topic Summaries, Clarifications, and Modifications Sheet for Building Design Standards – Stacey Groshong Hageman

Hageman reviewed the clarifications and modifications for the building design standards. She stated that overall everyone as okay with articulation and parking structures. On entrance design, we talked about buildings with multiple tenants, and a modification was made is to have just one entrance meet the entrance requirement. On transparency, the transparent area relates to durable base requirement (3 feet). They are proposing to decrease the percentages proportionately (15%, 40%, 55%). For materials, they are proposing to remove "architectural grade metal" from list and allow metals as accent material unless approved by waiver. For equipment screening, they are proposing to remove ground-level screening requirement and limit the required height of parapet walls. They are also proposing to locate 15 feet from the face of the building and screen with parapet or enclosure.

Sullivan asked why they have the 15 feet requirement if you do a parapet the height of the unit. Hageman stated that the 15 foot requirement is just for rooftop enclosures. Johnson commented that the main point is that we don't want to see rooftop equipment from whatever vantage point you use.

Johnson stated that we haven't talked about impervious coverage and asked if we are doing something like that. Gergen stated that is coming.

Johnson stated that his opinion is that he likes the design standards, but as they pertain to new development. He thinks we will run into problems on a building that is redeveloped. He believes we should look at increasing the percentage of the assessed value. Also, we need to think about drive-throughs that don't go around the building. If you loop on just one side, there has to be some give on the stacking; otherwise, that becomes a very long loop.

VI. Discussion of Final Position Statements for Committee Members – David Cary

Cary stated that next week's meeting is a full Committee meeting. We originally were going to request a final written position statement from each member at that meeting, but we feel that

it will be better to hear the discussion at next week's meeting and then complete the position statement. They would like each member to provide a verbal position statement of 3 minutes or less at next week's meeting.

The next meeting will be a joint meeting on December 11 at 11:30 a.m.

VII. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

VIII. Wrap Up

Cary thanked the members for their time and effort.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

M:\plan\Design Standards 2012\Committees\Design Standards Committee\131204\Minutes.docx