

## **Draft Ordinance Amendments Executive Summary**

Draft ordinance amendments are summarized below with City Council direction items specific for each section. Proposed changes and new sections will be the main focus of discussion at the meeting on July 24<sup>th</sup>.

### **Sec. 117.116A. Special Requirements and Performance Standards in All Employment and Office Park Districts.**

This new section is intended to be the first section of the Employment Districts and is designed to serve as a consolidated section for building and site design standards for all Employment and Office Park (discussed next) districts. Having one consolidated section that addresses building and site design requirements eliminates the need to repeat the same in each use district. The draft contains the *current* design and material requirements but also expands on other materials that are permitted along with the requirements for architectural accenting. In addition, standards for screening of roof top and ground mechanical units and provisions for trash enclosure and site lighting have been added.

This consolidated section provides a one stop location for an applicant to understand what all the requirements are for building and site design for the Employment Districts. The added building design standards reinforces what the city is striving for based on past site plan and building plan reviews and comments. By making expectations clear applicants can be more successful in preparing a quality submittal the first time. Clear and concise ordinances make it easier for an applicant to perform to the city's expectations while providing the city codes that fortify these requirements.

*City Council direction:* Do you support the consolidated building and site design standards for all Employment districts versus repeating these standards within the individual districts?

### **Sec. 117.116B. E-3 Employment (Office Park) District**

Staff prepared a draft E-3 Employment (Office Park) Zoning District classification as an implementation step to the Comprehensive Plan. This zoning district is necessary to implement the Pearson Office Park south of Highway 10 as indicated in the Comprehensive Plan. Generally, this district is similar to the existing employment districts, but focuses on corporate campuses, warehousing/logistics, and light manufacturing. Heavy manufacturing and outside storage are prohibited. In addition, unique to this district, is the provision for full-service restaurants as a conditional use to support the intent of the district and provide a mix of uses, particularly those that support a corporate campus style development.

*City Council direction:* Do you support the new E-3 district? Are there uses you believe are missing or should not be included in this district?

**Sec. 117.144A. Special Requirements and Performance Standards for B-1, B-2 and B-3 Zoning Districts.**

Like the consolidated building and site design section for Employment districts, this new section is intended to be the first section of the Business Districts. This section is designed to serve as a consolidated section for building and site design standards for all B-1, B-2 and B-3 districts. These requirements will not affect the COR. Again, having one consolidated section that addresses building and site design requirements eliminates the need to repeat the same in each use district. The draft contains the *current* design and material requirements but also expands on other materials that are permitted along with the requirements for architectural accenting. In addition, standards for screening of roof top and ground mechanical units and provisions for trash enclosure and site lighting have been added.

This consolidated section provides a one stop location for an applicant to understand what all the requirements are for building and site design for the B-1, B-2 and B-3 districts. The added building design standards reinforces what the city is striving for based on past site plan and building plan reviews and comments. By making expectations clear applicants can be more successful in preparing a quality submittal the first time. Clear and concise ordinances make it easier for an applicant to perform to the city's expectations while providing the city codes that fortify these requirements.

Also, this section adds standards to conditional uses in Sec. 117.114 B-1, Neighborhood Business District and Sec. 117.115 B-2, Highway Business District. This exercise is two-fold. First, this provides general direction when reviewing CUP requests per previous City Council and Planning Commission discussion. Second, this provides an opportunity to review existing Conditional Uses and determine which can be moved to Permitted Uses, based on the developed standards. The overall intent is to try to better address CUP requests in a timely manner. Providing the standards by which a CUP will be reviewed and approved provides better up front direction to applicants, and provides guidance to staff, Planning Commission and City Council. These standards become the conditions for the CUP, however if additional standards are warranted they can be expanded.

*City Council direction:* Do you support the consolidated building and site design standards for all Business districts versus repeating these standards within the individual districts? Do you support the inclusion of standards for conditional uses?

**Sec. 117.356 Commercial and Industrial Development Off-street Parking.** This amendment expands the list of potential uses, consistent with prior site plan approvals in an attempt to expand upon uses and required parking.

The amendment also provides illustrations of parking stalls and drive aisle standards to assist in interpretation. Different options for paving of parking and drive isles are clarified, including an *option* for the use of pervious pavers provided appropriate soils and site conditions exist. Alternative surface materials may also be considered in the rear yards with an interim use permit.

This draft includes parking lot landscaping requirements to strive for more landscaping and placement of trees within parking lot areas to reduce heat island effect while

improving aesthetics. *Please note that this is not necessarily additional planting requirements, yet provides clarification of landscaping required per parking standards already found in code planted in and/or near the parking lot itself.* Since the work session meeting staff has revised this section to apply only to parking lots of ten vehicles or more. Also, staff is suggesting that the total amount of trees required in parking lots can be located within interior parking areas at 50% of the total with the remaining 50% in the parking lot setback areas. This change was made to address concern over placement and use of islands in parking lots.

Perimeter parking area landscape requirements have been added (for parking lots of ten vehicles or more, which requires sites in business or employment district abutting a street or similar district to provide landscape screening at a minimum of 3 feet in height to screen headlights. Where a business or employment district abuts a residential district a landscape screen of 6 feet in height and 80% opaqueness is required. Another alternative to help meet this standard would be consideration of reduction to the parking lot setback.

Finally a new Minimum Parking Requirement Alternative section has been added for review and input. This new section is intended to require new construction or expansion in Business, Employment and Mixed Use districts to use parking alternatives if proposing parking below or above minimum requirements. Some methods are included as requirements such as accommodating bicycle parking, while others may be as a choice with off-sets to the number of parking spaces required, such as car pool parking. Using these alternatives further supports the overall reduction in the amount of parking provided.

#### Other Considerations:

While preparing draft updates of the parking ordinance staff explored alternatives that may help the city achieve objectives to reduce excess impervious surface and outside storage (include excess parking). Below are some of these alternatives we would like to review with the Planning Commission. These alternatives could be added to the ordinance as a requirement or through an incentive in an effort to balance economic development objectives while also reducing overall costs for new development.

Alternative 1: In an attempt to reduce “over parking” of larger sites such as for office buildings and big box retailers staff would like to discuss with the Commission the use of parking *maximums* for some larger parking lot users (big box retailers, office buildings, larger industrial users) to prevent excess parking. This option could be a requirement of the ordinance or if an applicant wants to add parking beyond the minimum, require mitigation features such as additional storm water management techniques within the parking and drive areas. This not only benefits sites for aesthetic reasons but also reduces the amount of storm water management required.

Alternative 2: In another attempt to discourage over parking of sites staff would like to discuss with the Commission a requirement that any parking areas over the minimum be required to use a pervious paver system. That way, additional parking does not truly expand the amount of impervious surface and actually provides storm water benefits.

Alternative 3: Staff would like to explore expanding upon current storm water management practices by requiring the use of best management practices for storm water

management within parking and drive areas. If this were added storm water credits would apply. This could be used as a tool to address Council's goals of further studying development fees (in this instance, storm water management).

*City Council direction:*

- Do you support the parking lot and parking perimeter landscaping requirements?
- Do you support the alterative parking requirements for reducing or exceed parking minimums?
- Do you support options for “over parking” of larger sites by setting parking maximums.
- Do you support requiring pervious pavers if a site is over parked?
- Do you support expanding storm water management practices within parking lot areas?

#### Draft Consolidated Landscaping Section

A final recommendation that the Planning Commission made was to consider consolidating landscaping into one section to provide more consistency and to limit duplication. A draft has been prepared using current requirements for the B-1, B-2, E-1, E-2 and E-3 districts. In addition to current requirements some new text has been included an introduction; building perimeter landscaping and landscaping maintenance.

*City Council direction:* Do you support the draft consolidated landscaping section?