Code Discussion Issues (thru 08/12/13)

Below is a summary of the more significant code issues that have been brought up by public and/or city council members during the city council study sessions dated July 22, July 29, and August 12, 2013. Council consensus has been reached on some issues and there are a number of issues that warrant further city council discussion and consensus as to direction.

Article 2 Issues

Permit Type Processes. Staff asked to make them more understandable to public.

Article 3 Issues

Table 15.310.040 Use tables, non-residential: **Should Office uses be allowed in CT and IL zones?**

- COUNCIL should provide direction on office uses.

Table 15.320.030: **Minimum density for RS zone:** Consensus is minimum 4 du/acre for R-S zone

Tables 15.320.030 and .040 and section 15.320.050: **Maximum FAR standards** in some or all zones?

- General discussion, but no consensus.

15.320.070: **Impervious surface area**

- Based on "Impervious Area Standards" memorandum from Jon Morrow, Stormwater Program Manager, staff recommends removing the impervious surface area standards from the draft code.

Table 15.320.030; **Garage front setbacks.** Consensus is to leave at 25' for now.

15.320.140 **Fences on alleys.** Consensus is a 6 foot fence with a 3 foot landscaped setback area.

- Is that OK for sight vision purposes with the required 5-ft rear yard setback if there is a fence at 3-ft and an inset garage entrance/exit at 5-feet?

15.340.010 **Bed and breakfasts.**

- Consensus: meals on premises only for guests/employees. No cooking facilities in rooms

15.340.020 **Home occupation.** Consensus: Limit deliveries to small parcel deliveries such as UPS and Fed-Ex .

15.340.060 **Small wind energy systems.** Consensus: add staff language that requires building permit review

15.380. **Development Agreement Authority.**

- Council directed staff amend language clarifying development agreement versus service agreement and to clarify "and all applicable development regulations"

Article 4

15.410 **Streetscape Design**

ISSUES

1. Reduced lane width on local streets
   - Is 20-ft wide street with no street parking workable?
   - Is 24-ft wide street with street parking on 1-side workable?
   - Is 30-ft wide street with parking both sides adequate travel lane?

2. Increased ROW width or shrink it?
   a. Can utilities all go in ROW rather than an easement outside sidewalk?
   b. Can planting strip be reduced in size?
   c. Can house minimum setback be reduced from 15-feet?

3. Planting in strip required (tree and/or landscape)? Who maintains?

4. Rolled curb/gutter allowed or not?

15.420 **Subdivision Design & Block Structure**

15.420.030 **Reverse frontage lot provisions (fences).** Perhaps limit the reverse frontage restriction to 50% of the frontage being fenced and other areas screened with trees/landscaping.

15.420.060 **Direct access to a public ROW.** As drafted, private roads are only OK in courtyard developments with no more than 5 units accessing from them and a maximum length of 100 feet.

QUESTION: Should private roads be allowed in more situations?

Article 5

The area below has not yet been discussed as a unit. Comments below are from earlier discussion of issues in other Articles that relate to Article 5

15.510.050 and 060 and 070 and 080 Citizen concerns re: **Street Type Transparency Requirements**
15.530.030 Citizen concerns about costs and departure provisions re: **Building articulation and roofline modulation.**

15.540 Housing Type Standards. Citizen concerns re
. 020(B) – **minimum façade transparency** and (E) **minimum useable open space** for single family
.040(C and D) **Accessory Dwelling Unit minimum sizes**

15.570.040 Landscaping Types. Citizen concerns that they are out of place in this community.