



TOWN BOARD WORK SESSION MEETING

June 22, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.

Town Board Chambers

301 Walnut Street, Windsor, CO 80550

The Town of Windsor will make reasonable accommodations for access to Town services, programs, and activities and will make special communication arrangements for persons with disabilities. Please call (970) 674-2400 by noon on the Thursday prior to the meeting to make arrangements.

GOAL of this Work Session is to have the Town Board receive information on topics of Town business from the Town Manager, Town Attorney and Town staff in order to exchange ideas and opinions regarding these topics.

Members of the public in attendance who have a question related to an agenda item are requested to allow the Town Board to discuss the topic and then be recognized by the Mayor prior to asking their question.

AGENDA

1. Downtown Parking Regulations
Staff presentation: Paul Hornbeck, Associate Planner
2. Minimum Exterior Standards for Non-Residential Metal Buildings
Staff presentation: Paul Hornbeck, Associate Planner
3. Mobile Food Vending
Staff presentation: Paul Hornbeck, Associate Planner
4. Future Meetings Agenda



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 22, 2015
To: Mayor and Town Board
Via: Scott Ballstadt, AICP, Director of Planning
Kelly Arnold, Town Manager
From: Paul Hornbeck, Associate Planner
Subject: Review and discussion of draft downtown parking regulations
Item #s: Work Session 1

Background:

This Municipal Code amendment is proposed in response to a need for parking regulations targeted specifically to downtown Windsor. Current parking regulations are applied the same for all properties, regardless of their location within Town. This one-size-fits-all approach does not recognize the unique nature of downtown. Recent building additions and improvements downtown have shown a growing momentum in downtown but have also shown the current parking regulations to be overly burdensome and difficult for properties owners to meet. The intent of this amendment is to give greater flexibility and more options to property owners to allow for continued investment downtown. The amendment is also consistent with the recognition nationwide on the impacts parking requirements place on development, as seen in the article from the American Planning Association attached for reference.

The consulting firm Fehr & Peers completed the Downtown Windsor Parking Study in 2012. To gauge perception of parking downtown, surveys of downtown business owners, employees, and visitors were conducted and, in general, responses indicated that parking is only a problem on occasion. The study found that non-event days are not reaching the capacity of the parking system and that current parking supply was about 40% underutilized during such times. The study also found that the overall parking supply is slightly less than what the Municipal Code would require for all current uses, indicating a disconnect between the current parking requirement and actual parking demands. Therefore, the study recommended the need for a strategic adjustment of the parking requirements in the Municipal Code.

To adjust the parking requirements downtown, this proposed amendment would create a Downtown Parking District which coincides with the Downtown Development Authority boundary. If adopted, the parking situation downtown would need to continue to be monitored to ensure the code works as intended and no new problems arise.

The key points of the proposal are as follows:

- Parking ratio of 2 spaces/1,000 square feet for all commercial uses
- Exemption provided for the first 1,000 square of additional space added
- A parking credit is given for adjacent on-street parking at a ratio of 1 space/25 feet of street frontage
- A certain percentage of parking can be provided off-site within 1000 feet, based on building square footage
- New buildings and additions over 20,000 square feet must submit a Parking Management Plan
- A change of use does not require additional parking unless the change is from residential to commercial

The existing parking code will remain in effect for areas outside of the Downtown Parking District and remains substantively the same except for the following changes for consistency with the downtown regulations:

- The maximum distance for off-site parking is increased from 500 feet to 1,000 feet
- Off-site parking requires a Town approved parking agreement rather than a parking easement
- Off-site parking must be paved and connected to the subject parcel with sidewalks

The entirety of the proposed parking code is listed below, with the Downtown Parking District starting on page three:

Sec. 16-10-30. - Off-street parking requirements.

(a) **Buildings and Uses outside of Downtown Parking District.** Off-street parking space shall be provided for buildings and uses outside of the Downtown Development Authority boundary as follows:

- (1) **Applicability.** Provision of parking space shall not be required for uses in existence as of the date of enactment of this Section but shall be required for any expansion of such use by the addition of primary floor area or other special expansion of building use or property use generating new parking demand.
- (2) **Location.** Parking areas shall be provided upon the same lot containing the use for which they are required or on separate lots or structures located within a one-thousand-foot radius of the lot containing the use for which they are required. A Town-approved parking agreement is required for all off-site parking. This agreement shall run with the land and shall be recorded with the County Recorder. All shared parking lots must be paved. All shared parking lots and shared parking structures shall have sidewalk connections to the subject property.
- (3) **Surfacing.** All parking lots which are designed to be used for employee parking, visitor parking, customer parking and tenant parking, and all interior drives connecting such parking lots, which are designated for multifamily uses, business uses, commercial uses, industrial uses, offices and places of assembly shall be paved with asphalt or concrete. In addition, all parking lots must also conform to all of the following requirements:
 - a. Each parking space shall be identified by striping using paint or other durable application;
 - b. Shall conform to all Town landscaping guidelines and requirements;
 - c. Shall be constructed to allow for proper drainage;
 - d. Shall be designed so as to prevent vehicles from backing into any public or private street; and
 - e. Shall not provide ingress or egress any closer than twenty-five (25) feet from any intersecting street or alley right-of-way line.
- (4) **Screening.** Every off-street parking area, other than that provided for a single-family residence, shall provide a planting screen, landscaped fence or wall at least four (4) feet in height along any side abutting or fronting on a residential

district. Plans for such screening shall be submitted to the Planning Department for referral to the Planning Commission for approval before installation.

- (5) **Standard dimension.** *Each individual parking space shall be at least nine (9) feet wide by twenty (20) feet long and, if covered, shall have a minimum height clearance of seven (7) feet.*
- (6) **Determination of need.** *The number of parking spaces required shall be based upon the anticipated parking demand of individual uses and shall be as designated for specific uses and situations as follows:*

<i>Use</i>	<i>Parking Requirements</i>
<i>Single-family residence</i>	<i>2 spaces per dwelling unit</i>
<i>Multifamily dwelling residence</i>	<i>1.5 spaces per unit</i>
<i>Public assembly facilities, provided for seated audiences (churches, theaters, auditoriums, etc.)</i>	<i>1 space for every three seats</i>
<i>Elementary schools (If the elementary school includes an auditorium, the auditorium requirement above shall govern if it is greater.)</i>	<i>2 spaces for every classroom</i>
<i>Junior and senior high schools</i>	<i>Auditorium requirement above or 1 space for every 5 students of maximum occupant capacity</i>
<i>Hospitals</i>	<i>1 space for every 2 beds</i>
<i>Clinics</i>	<i>5 spaces for every practitioner on the staff</i>
<i>Industrial uses</i>	<i>1 space for every 2 employees</i>
<i>Commercial office</i>	<i>1 space for every 300 square buildings feet of Gross Leasable Area (“GLA”)</i>
<i>Retail stores, customer service establishments, shopping centers and other similar uses</i>	<i>1 space for every 250 square feet of GLA</i>
<i>Eating and drinking establishments</i>	<i>1 space for every 200 square feet of GLA, plus 1 space for every 2 employees, computed on the maximum service capacity</i>
<i>Hotel or motel</i>	<i>1 space for every room to be rented, plus 1 space for every 2 employees, computed on the maximum service capacity</i>

- (7) **Uses not enumerated.** *In any case where there is a question as to the parking requirements for a use or where such requirements are not specifically enumerated, the Planning Commission shall convene a public hearing to determine the appropriate application of the parking requirements to the specific situation, applying the criteria set forth above and in keeping with sound land use planning principles.*

- (b) **Downtown Parking District Requirements.** *The Downtown Parking District (“District”) is hereby defined as the area falling within the boundaries of the Windsor Downtown Development Authority, as the boundaries currently exist and as may later be amended*

pursuant to the statutory powers of the Windsor Downtown Development Authority. Within the District, off-street parking spaces shall be provided as follows:

- (1) *A change of use is not required to provide new or additional parking except when a residential use is converted to a non-residential use. In such cases parking must be provided on-site in accordance with Section 16-10-30(b).*
 - (2) *Building additions under 1,000 square feet and/or the provision of outdoor seating are not required to provide new or additional parking. This exemption shall be applied on a cumulative basis to each property within the District, and 1,000 square feet shall be the total exemption for any and all construction, expansion or modification projects within the property, whenever occurring. Mixed-use projects containing residential units may add up to 1,000 square feet of commercial use and up to 2 residential units without adding parking.*
 - (3) *New buildings and additions to existing buildings of between 1,001 and 20,000 square feet will require 2 parking spaces per 1000 square feet of new or additional floor area.*
 - (4) *New buildings and additions to existing buildings of over 20,000 square feet shall submit a Parking Management Plan (“Plan”) at the time of application. The Plan shall outline the project’s total parking demand, shared parking agreements, parking management strategies, and transportation demand management programs. The Planning Commission shall convene a public hearing to review the Plan and shall determine if the proposed parking is appropriate for the specific situation, subject to a maximum of 2 parking spaces per 500 square feet.*
 - (5) *The area measured for purposes of this sub-section (b) shall include the entire Gross Leasable Area of a building, as defined by Section 16-2-20.*
 - (6) *On-site parking requirements may be provided on another lot or structure containing shared parking availability within 1,000 feet of the subject property, subject to the following:*
 - a. *Up to 80% of the on-site parking requirement may be provided on an off-site lot or structure for new buildings up to 5,000 square feet and additions containing 1,001 to 5,000 square feet.*
 - b. *Up to 50% of the on-site parking requirement may be provided on an off-site lot or structure for new buildings between 5,001 and 10,000 square feet and additions containing 5,001 to 10,000 square feet.*
 - c. *Up to 25% of the on-site parking requirement may be provided on an off-site lot for new buildings between 10,001 to 20,000 square feet and additions containing 10,001 to 20,000 square feet.*
- A Town-approved parking agreement is required for all off-site parking. This agreement shall run with the land and shall be recorded with the County Recorder. All shared parking lots must be paved. All shared parking lots and shared parking structures shall have sidewalk connections to the subject property.*
- (7) *For every 25 feet of the subject lot’s public street frontage, building additions between 1001 and 20,000 square feet shall receive a credit of one (1) parking space against the requirements of this sub-section (b).*
 - (8) *Improved lots containing on-site parking ratios exceeding 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet are permitted to remove on-site parking spaces in excess of that ratio (“Excess Parking Spaces”), so long as an on-site parking ratio of no less than two*

(2) spaces per 1,000 square feet is maintained. Remaining Excess Parking Spaces may be applied toward new buildings or building additions. New building construction or building additions may be built over Excess Parking Spaces, and are eligible for the provision of required parking spaces in accordance with subsection (5) for any new square footage added.

(9) The following table will be used for new residential units when building additions are (a) larger than 2,000 square feet and/or (b) add more than 2 new residential units:

All Residential Uses	Required parking
1-bedroom unit	Minimum: 1 space per unit
2-bedroom unit	Minimum: 2 spaces per unit
3-or-more-bedroom unit	Minimum: 2.0 spaces per unit
Additional guest-parking [See Note]	1 space per 8 dwelling units in addition to the minimum off-street parking spaces.

Note to Table 1: On-street parking spaces abutting the property line(s) of the primary building containing housing units may apply a ratio of 1 space per 25 feet of the subject lot's street frontage for streets within the District toward the guest-parking requirement.

The Planning Commission was presented the code amendment at a work session on May 20, 2015, and expressed support for the changes.

Scheduling

If the Town Board agrees with the proposed code language, staff anticipates the following schedule for adoption:

- 7/15/15 – Planning Commission recommendation
- 7/27/15 – Town Board first reading of the ordinance
- 8/10/15 – Town Board second reading of the ordinance

Releasing the Parking Brake on Economic Development

The following article comes from the May 2015 issue of the American Planning Association's Planning magazine:

Releasing the Parking Brake on Economic Development

Cities flourish with reduced parking requirements.

By Brian Canepa and Joshua Karlin-Resnick

The cost is invisible to consumers and policy makers, but every developer knows just how much parking requirements figure into any pro forma.

The minimum requirements in place in most municipalities — one to two spaces per residential unit — add an estimated six to 16 percent to per-unit costs through a combination of construction expenses and the opportunity costs of using a limited development envelope on car storage rather than revenue-generating living space.

Requirements for retail uses are often much higher. A recent study by the Transportation Research Board found that parking was oversupplied in mixed use districts by an average of 65 percent, meaning that between four and 10 percent of the added costs — likely much more for nonresidential uses — are pure waste.

Developers and planners in Petaluma, California, can attest to the power of eliminating this form of forced waste. Fifteen years ago, Petaluma's Theatre District was marked by surface parking, vacant lots, and derelict industrial buildings. Planners considered it a prime opportunity to extend and reinvigorate its downtown with a mixed use district anchored by a multiscreen cinema. In the end, easing parking requirements in the area became crucial to making that vision a reality.

Instead of forcing the developer, Basin Street Properties, to provide as much as one space per 50 or 100 square feet of bar or restaurant, the city allowed the company to determine how much parking was reasonable. Considering the on-street parking supply in the area and how the project's different uses might have different periods of peak parking demand, the developer settled on one space per 300 square feet across the project.

Vin Smith, a planning consultant who represented Basin Street in the planning and entitlement process, says the project would "absolutely not" have penciled out without the city's flexibility on parking. "We easily saved a floor or two of parking garage construction," Smith says. At a price tag of roughly \$20,000 per space, that means the reduced parking requirements saved as much as \$3 million.

Little more than a decade later, it's obvious that the now built-out Theatre District provides a compelling argument for that kind of flexibility. The area is alive on Friday night: Residents are arriving home from work, office workers are heading to happy hour, and people are walking to catch a movie at the 12-screen Boulevard Cinemas, a meal at Bistro 100, or to find something sweet at MoYo's Frozen Yogurt Lounge. Smith, who lives in the area, says the parking supply is well used but not overloaded.



A critical time

For the last century or so, cities have been struggling with the paradox of parking: Cars need large amounts of space, but making room for them comes at a direct cost to the vibrancy that makes the people in the cars want to come in the first place.

A 2013 study called "The Effects of Urban Fabric Changes on Real Estate Property Tax," by researchers at the University of Connecticut, estimated that Hartford dedicates 15 percent of CBD land area — more than 7.5 million square feet — to parking. If each office worker needs 250 square feet of building space (a conservative estimate), that means the city could accommodate 30,000 additional sorely needed jobs if that land were dedicated to one-story office buildings rather than car-storage space.

The same study estimated that if the amount of land dedicated to surface parking had stayed the same as it was in 1950, the annual loss to government coffers would equal nearly \$22 million in Hartford, \$6.5 million in nearby New Haven, and \$3 million in Arlington, Virginia.

The story is doubtless the same in many cities across the country, and the lost economic activity is all the more damaging in an era of tight municipal budgets. Even as the economy recovers from the 2008 financial crisis, every underused parcel in a city's downtown represents a costly missed opportunity.

Economic development is a central charge of local elected officials and their appointees, and their strategies often take the form of tax breaks for companies that promise a short-term infusion of jobs. Getting parking right might be a more dependable and longer lasting form of economic development.

Consider the examples of Ann Arbor, Michigan; Columbus, Indiana; and Sacramento, California. These three cities — of different sizes, with different development contexts, and in different parts of the country — have each reduced or eliminated off-street parking requirements downtown and in mixed use areas, yielding a range of benefits.

In some places, lifting onerous parking requirements has made infill development more financially viable, opening the door to projects that renew derelict buildings or activate what were previously inactive hardscapes or garbage-strewn lots. For others, it has simplified the development process, speeding the pace of revitalization.

In no cases have the reduced requirements led to the parking shortages or economic losses that are frequently feared.

Sacramento's sea change

Developer Michael Heller says that for years, Sacramento was a large central city with lofty, progressive ideals but conservative parking practices that more or less matched those in the suburbs, where land was plentiful enough to make it easy to surround a building with a sea of parking at a reasonable cost. Where land was much scarcer, the requirements led to either scaled down ambitions or time-consuming, costly, and highly political efforts to waive parking requirements and make projects viable.

"On one side of their mouths, everyone at the city was espousing green principles and encouraging transit-oriented development, but on the development-application processing side, you had to deal with this antiquated code," Heller says. "You got pulled in two directions."

All that changed in 2012. The city eliminated parking minimums in its Central Business and Arts and Entertainment districts, reduced minimums in some other parts of the city, and allowed developers to reduce those already lower requirements with programs and facilities that encouraged access by non-auto modes. The changes were rooted in a study that found that even at peak times, between 40 and 65 percent of spaces were unoccupied in five focus areas in central Sacramento.

The reforms have led to a sea change in the development process. Under the old regime, most developers found they simply did not have the land to build all the required parking and would instead apply for a waiver. Processing it would take anywhere from four to eight months and often ended up being a "lose-lose situation," says Greg Sandlund, an associate planner for the city who played a key role in the city's parking-requirement overhaul.

The planning commission and city council denied just one parking ratio waiver between 2000 and 2010, which meant that "the community got worked up and the development was delayed," even though the parking that was ultimately provided was far lower than the code required. "It became a game that only the sophisticated knew how to play," Heller says. "It wasn't a genuine process and it took a lot of time and money."

Today, the city's parking code aligns with the visions espoused in the general plan, allowing planners to simply enter "no planning issues" (that is, no planning problems) on applications for projects that are looking to build the amount of parking developers think is needed to compete in the marketplace. Heller points to two developments to explain how the code update changed his business.

In the mid-2000s, his company built the Midtown Art Retail Restaurant Scene, a block-long, mixed use, adaptive-reuse development in a thriving neighborhood just a few blocks east of the California state capitol. Heller says it has 55,000 square feet of retail and office space, which means the parking regulations required roughly 150 dedicated parking spaces on a parcel that was already built lot line to lot line, with no room to add vehicle storage.

Heller cobbled together agreements with five small lots near the building to account for some of that parking and had to go to the planning commission to waive the rest of the requirement. The process was "a lot of work" and ultimately delayed the project by several months, he says.

Today, Heller is moving forward on another adaptive reuse project about a mile to the southwest, next to a light-rail station, called the Ice Blocks. With 60,000 square feet of office space, 50,000 square feet of retail, and 150 housing units, the project would have required more than 500 parking spaces under the old

regulations. Instead, Heller is providing two spots for every three residential units and minimal parking for the office and retail space, and he will be implementing a robust transportation demand management program to encourage people to come to the site by other modes. The project is moving forward quickly, spared the expense and delays that had been a part of the previous process.

"The city really listened to us on this topic and took bold measures to embrace true green principles in the new parking code," Heller says. "I tip my hat to staff on this because the city is now teed up for real growth with a framework for progressive, thoughtful infill projects."

Sacramento's development market is still stuck in a post-economic-crisis slump, having built just 200 housing units last year, but Sandlund says that sparing developers from building millions of dollars' worth of unneeded parking has helped move more projects into the pipeline. "I don't think there's been an explosion of development, but if anything, at least the parking code isn't getting in the way of development," Sandlund adds.

There is evidence that larger economic impacts are right around the corner. One proposal that entered the pipeline last year was the i15 project, a proposed eight-story mixed use development with 96 residential units, more than 5,000 square feet of ground-floor retail, and zero on-site parking. The regulatory changes have also had a major impact on things like tenant improvements. Whereas transforming a retail space into one suitable for a restaurant, with higher parking requirements, would have required a lengthy trip through the waiver process, such improvements can be made by right today.

Columbus kicks the rules to the curb

Those unfamiliar with Columbus, Indiana (pop. 45,000), have no reason to suspect this small city would be on the cutting edge of parking policy. But in 2008, it eliminated parking requirements in its downtown district. The change was part of a larger effort to revitalize the area, and its implementation amounted to a "non-event," rooted in a "shared understanding of where downtown was going," says planning director Jeff Bergman, AICP.

"There was a feeling at the time that the local government, through the zoning ordinance, didn't have nor really could have enough information to accurately regulate parking downtown, not without potentially causing some sort of negative consequence," he says. Without reliable metrics, the city decided to leave these decisions to the market.

Bergman notes that the change has allowed developers and planners to focus on other aspects of projects, instead of getting hung up on whether a project was going to meet its parking requirements. This has led to better developments that reflect the true vision of developers and the needs of their tenants.

As an example, Bergman points to a regional headquarters for the First Financial Bank, in the southwest corner of downtown. The combined bank branch and office building development opened in 2014 with 62 surface parking spaces, built to accommodate the anticipated needs of employees traveling to the office for regular meetings.

Parking was a non-issue during the development approval process. And the limited parking approach has been successful from the developer's perspective.

The Cole, a four-story mixed use residential building across the street, is another development that has gone up since the regulatory change. The project wrapped around a redevelopment authority-sponsored parking garage that was already going up on the same block, and the developer was able to negotiate with the authority to reserve 200 spaces for use by the 146 residential units in the new building.

Developer Matt Griffin, who led the effort for the Buckingham Companies, says the Cole shows that eliminating parking requirements does not mean developers will stint on parking. In the case of the Cole and infill projects in other places, it has simply meant he has had the flexibility to provide only the amount of parking that his company thought was truly needed for the developments to succeed.

"Most jurisdictions are coming around to the point that at least for multifamily projects, it's our business, and if we underpark ourselves, we're going to destroy our primary cash flow," Griffin says.

Ann Arbor at the forefront

Although it is near the epicenter of the auto industry, Ann Arbor was an early trendsetter in minimizing the role of parking in the development equation; it eliminated most of its downtown parking requirements in the 1960s. Coupled with a long-standing commitment to building publicly owned and managed structured parking and pricing it at market rates, the lack of requirements laid the groundwork for what is one of Michigan's most vibrant downtowns. Ann Arbor boasts retail occupancy rates that are among the highest in the state and a mere three percent residential vacancy rate.

According to the city's zoning code, downtown projects that adhere to the letter of the code are not required to provide any parking, and those that exceed floor-area limits are required to provide just one space per 1,000 square feet of additional floor area, far lower than typical requirements.

Susan Pollay, executive director of the city's Downtown Development Authority, says the low requirements have had a direct impact on the city's development environment. "There has been a strategy that from the beginning [eliminated] parking at the heart of our zoning, so we've been able to build a strong downtown core," she says.

Over the years, developers have steadily gobbled up surface parking lots for projects. Of late, the focus has been in the area around East Washington and South Division streets. On that corner, Pollay says, a small building surrounded by surface parking was recently replaced by a 10-story residential building with a grocery store and fast-food restaurant on the ground floor and far less parking than zoning codes typically require.

Next door, another residential high rise went up on a lot with a low building and surface parking lot. Across Washington, the McKinley Towne Center filled in its driveway with a new retail building to create a steady, active street front along East Liberty Street.

Across downtown, at the corner of Huron and Ashley streets, a recently built mixed use residential high rise with minimal parking will soon be joined by a new hotel that will provide no parking, replacing another low-density development surrounded by a sea of asphalt. There is plenty of parking in a city-owned parking garage down the block.

The University of Michigan's tens of thousands of students, faculty, staff, and supporters provide a sizable and steady market for Ann Arbor businesses, which are located close to the campus. But the city shows that the fears that drive policy makers to err on the side of oversupplying parking are largely unfounded. If a tight parking supply really limited an area's economic potential, Ann Arbor businesses would be struggling, university or not. Instead, despite high parking prices and long wait lists for garage permits, the development market could scarcely be hotter.

"Apartments are filled to the brim," Pollay says. "If parking was the driving factor, that wouldn't be the case because none of them are providing parking at the rates that would typically be required."

An idea spreads

Buffalo, New York, may soon become the next example — and the biggest to date — of what can happen when a city takes parking out of the development-review process. At press time, the city was about to become the first in the country to eliminate parking requirements citywide, in hopes of spurring development on some of its many surface parking lots.

The change was part of a zoning code update that was focused on revitalizing the city's downtown, which today contains two parking spaces for every job. City officials saw those parking spaces as a massive opportunity.

"People walked around downtown and saw all this surface parking that is ample and underpriced and said, 'We want development here, we want buildings here,'" says Daniel Hess, an associate professor of urban and regional planning at the University of Buffalo who has studied the city's zoning code reform process.

That a Rust Belt city like Buffalo has eliminated parking minimums is evidence that we have come a long way in how we think about downtown development. The idea that providing ample parking was the key to

economic success has begun to give way to the realization that too much parking can cause economic stagnation. Sacramento, Columbus, Ann Arbor, and, soon, Buffalo are leading examples of how much economic development potential is sitting right under many cities' tires.

Brian Canepa is a principal and chief growth officer at Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates. Joshua Karlin-Resnick is an associate there. They worked on the Sacramento zoning code update and on Petaluma's Theatre District development.

Resources

Image: The i15 multifamily project, now in Sacramento, California's development pipeline, would never have been proposed for a small infill site if on-site parking had been required. Instead, residents with cars will use an adjacent existing public lot; those without cars will have access to Zipcars two blocks away and public transit just a block away. Rendering courtesy D&S Development Inc.

Parking Requirement Impacts on Housing Affordability, by the Victoria Transportation Policy Institute:
www.vtpi.org/park-hou.pdf

Parking in Mixed-Use Districts, by Rachel Weinberger and Joshua Karlin-Resnick, presented at the 94th annual Transportation Research Board meeting in 2015.



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 22, 2015
To: Mayor and Town Board
Via: Scott Ballstadt, AICP, Director of Planning
Kelly Arnold, Town Manager
From: Paul Hornbeck, Associate Planner
Subject: Review and Discussion of possible amendment to Sec. 16-11-70 requiring minimum exterior standards for non-residential metal buildings
Item #s: Work Session 2

Background:

Three recent site plan reviews have brought to the attention of Planning Commission and Town staff the need to consider amending the municipal code to address minimum architectural standards for metal buildings located outside of the Town's Commercial Corridors. Members of the Town Board also indicated during those reviews that they would support requiring architectural enhancements if such requirements were codified.

Town staff has historically requested applicants add some architectural embellishment to metal buildings in order to enhance the building appearance, protect property values, and ensure high quality development. Applicants have typically added architectural features but a number of recent projects have requested approval of metal buildings without architectural enhancements. Outside of commercial corridors, the Municipal Code does not have minimum design standards for non-residential buildings so these projects have been approved. The Town Board indicated they would be in favor of requiring architectural enhancements to metal buildings so staff has proposed amending code section 16-11-70. The use of a wainscot, or veneer, to the lower portion of metal buildings has been successfully implemented on a number of metal buildings throughout Town. Given the success of this treatment, staff is proposing codifying a wainscot requirement as follows:

(b) All non-residential buildings that are not subject to the Commercial Corridor Plan baseline design criteria shall meet the following minimum exterior standards:

(1) Use of metal as the predominant finish material is permitted only when an architectural wainscot is included in the building design. The wainscot shall be installed as follows:

(a) In the Limited Industrial (IL) zone, the wainscot shall extend the entire length of all building facades facing a public or private street.

(b) In the Heavy Industrial (IH) zone, the wainscot shall be applied to the primary entrance to the building, administrative offices, and other portions of the building visible to visitors using the primary building entrance or administrative offices;

(c) All wainscot shall extend a minimum of 36" in height from the building grade;

(d) *The wainscot shall wrap around the adjoining sides of the building for a minimum distance of five (5) feet before terminating, unless the building architecture dictates a lesser distance.*

(e) *Wainscot material shall either be brick; stone or high quality stone veneer; concrete masonry units of an architectural grade, such as split-face, ground face, or fluted block; or any other material that is consistent in terms of high quality, durability, and compatibility with the abovementioned materials.*

The Planning Commission was presented the code amendment at a work session on April 15, 2015, and expressed support for the changes.

Scheduling

If the Town Board agrees with the proposed code language, staff anticipates the following schedule for adoption:

- 7/15/15 – Planning Commission recommendation
- 7/27/15 – Town Board first reading of the ordinance
- 8/10/15 – Town Board second reading of the ordinance



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 22, 2015
To: Mayor and Town Board
Via: Scott Ballstadt, AICP, Director of Planning
Kelly Arnold, Town Manager
From: Paul Hornbeck, Associate Planner
Subject: Review and discussion of draft regulations on mobile food vending as an accessory use
Item #s: Work Session 3

Background:

Mobile food vending, including food trucks and food carts, has grown in popularity throughout the region and country in recent years and Town staff occasionally receives inquiries about what regulations exist in Town for such uses. The Municipal Code does not specifically address mobile vending so this amendment has been proposed to clearly define the use and mitigate potential negative impacts associated with it.

The amendment would allow mobile food vending as an accessory use on developed properties that are non-residentially zoned. The proposed language allows for mobile food vending only from private property and not from the public right-of-way, which is consistent with how the Municipal Code is currently applied. Planning staff views the use of public right-of-way for vending as a larger policy decision that could be explored, while the current amendment provides a clear path for business operators to utilize private property.

The proposed code language is as follows:

Sec. 16-10-110. – Mobile Food Vending.

- a) *Mobile food vending is defined as the use of a motorized wheeled vehicle, towed wheeled vehicle, pushcart, or other temporary operation designed and equipped to prepare and/or serve food and/or non-alcoholic beverages. Mobile food vending is permitted, subject to the following:*
- 1) *Mobile food vending shall take place only on a site that has received the appropriate site plan approval and the required site plan improvements comply with said approved site plan.*
 - 2) *Mobile food vending shall operate only with the property owner's continuous permission. Revocation of owner permission shall terminate mobile food vending on the site in question.*
 - 3) *Mobile food vending shall not impede vehicular or pedestrian traffic, parking lot use or circulation, or access to any public right-of-way.*
 - 4) *If left on-site at the end of the business day, all mobile food vending equipment and signage shall be located in an inconspicuous location when not in operation.*

- 5) *Mobile food vending outlets shall not operate between the hours of 2:00 AM and 6:00 AM.*
- 6) *Litter must be picked up and refuse containers must be provided for customers.*
- 7) *Mobile food vendors shall comply with all applicable Town Ordinances as well as state, county, and federal laws and licensing requirements.*
- 8) *All signs associated with mobile food vendors shall be in conformance with Article IX of this Chapter. Additionally, all mobile food vendor signs must be mounted flush against the mobile food establishment, except that one temporary sign for daily specials shall be allowed in accordance with Section 16-9-130(5)c.*
- 9) *Mobile food vending shall not operate, be stored, or parked on public right-of-way.*
- 10) *Mobile food vending taking place at Special Events or in public parks, recreational facilities, or trails is subject to review and permitting by the Parks and Recreation department and is not subject to this subsection.*

The Planning Commission was presented the code amendment at a work session on May 20, 2015, and expressed support for the changes with a few suggestions which have been incorporated.

Scheduling

If the Town Board agrees with the proposed code language, staff anticipates the following schedule for adoption:

- 7/15/15 – Planning Commission recommendation
- 7/27/15 – Town Board first reading of the ordinance
- 8/10/15 – Town Board second reading of the ordinance



FUTURE TOWN BOARD MEETINGS

Work Sessions & Regular Meetings will be held in the Board Chambers unless otherwise noted.

June 22, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session Downtown Parking Regulations Minimum Exterior Standards for Non-Residential Metal Buildings Food Cart as Accessory Use Regulations
June 22, 2015 7:00 p.m.	Town Board Meeting
June 29, 2015	5th Monday
July 6, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Special Meeting – Executive Session
July 13, 2015 5:30 p.m./1 st floor conference room	Board/Manager/Attorney Monthly Meeting
July 13, 2015 7:00 p.m.	Town Board Meeting Kern Board Meeting
July 20, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session Parks, Recreation and Culture Legacy Plan Boardwalk Park Master Plan
July 27, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session Raw water supply planning report
July 27, 2015 7:00 p.m.	Town Board Meeting
August 3, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session
August 10, 2015 5:30 p.m./1 st floor conference room	Board/Manager/Attorney Monthly Meeting
August 10, 2015 7:00 p.m.	Town Board Meeting
August 17, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session Capital Improvement Plan
August 24, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session
August 24, 2015 7:00 p.m.	Town Board Meeting

August 31, 2015	Fifth Monday
September 7, 2015	Labor Day
September 14, 2015 5:30 p.m./1 st floor conference room	Board/Manager/Attorney Monthly Meeting
September 14, 2015 7:00 p.m.	Town Board Meeting Kern Board Meeting
September 21, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session
September 28, 2015 6:00 p.m.	Town Board Work Session
September 28, 2015 7:00 p.m.	Town Board Meeting

Additional Events

July 22, 2015	Chamber Annual Dinner; Island at Water Valley
October 10, 2015	Budget work session

Future Work Session Topics

Development Review Discussion of Commercial/Industrial Preference vs. Residential
Construction Defects