

# PLANNING DEPARTMENT DISCUSSION ITEM REPORT



Date: June 22, 2017

**General Description: Gateway Overlay Corridor Discussion**

Town Council Initiated     Planning Board Initiated     Staff Initiated

## DISCUSSION OVERVIEW:

In April, the Planning Board brought up some areas of their concern regarding the recently adopted Gateway Overlay Corridor. These topics included (1) the interpretation of the triggering criteria for existing development; (2) bicycle parking requirements; (3) shared enclosures/dumpster areas; and (4) lighting apparatus requirements.

In May, Staff discussed the status of researching these items. The Board was informed in brief as nothing conclusive had been fully researched.

In June, the Board decided they wished to have this as an agenda item for discussion.

## STAFF COMMENTARY

As mentioned above, the four topics previously brought up, but by no means the only ones up for discussion are: (1) the interpretation of the triggering criteria for existing development; (2) bicycle parking requirements; (3) shared enclosures/dumpster areas; and (4) lighting apparatus requirements. Below is a brief commentary from Staff's perspective regarding these topics.

### The Interpretation of the Triggering Criteria for Existing Development

Some concern surrounding existing development and when improvements will trigger the development to come into compliance with the overlay has been brought up. As it stands now, at improvements which exceed 50% of the structure's tax value of a 5,000 sf or less structure or exceed 25% of the structure's tax value of a structure greater than 5,000 sf must update landscaping, signage, and pedestrian travel. The Board has brought up that they would like to see this not include the value of interior improvements.

To this end, Staff is stumped. Applying to the tax value of the building, but not to include the interior, is nearly impossible. This is largely because tax value is determined for the whole of the structure.

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND INSPECTIONS

Staff proposes instead to consider physical modification rather than tax value. Looking at percent increase in building footprint or site development as the triggering value would only apply to external modifications leaving out internal. Another option is to leave it as is. Internal renovation which could trigger tax value increases of such a substantial nature usually involve redevelopment of existing structures and in the opinion of Staff should warrant redevelopment of the site as well.

### Bicycle Parking Requirements

The Board brought up a concern with types of bicycle parking, how many spaces, and just general regulation being a bit excessive. Staff went on to propose incentivizing these parking requirements. Maybe look at reducing vehicular spacing or crediting some landscaping with the installation. Still, there is only a minimum of three (3) spaces required and there are many low profile and innovative options for bike racks that are cost effective and that do not take up a lot of space that this may not be a make or break requirement for development.

### Shared Enclosures/Dumpster Areas

Not much was discussed regarding this topic other than a desire to see neighboring properties share enclosed areas for space management and appearance purposes. Staff feels that this would be an easy amendment to the overlay. This could be written so that any proposed development consider placement of enclosure so that when adjacent property is developed the enclosure site could be mirrored or expanded onto the adjacent property. However, this may impact the MB-2 districts setbacks.

### Lighting Apparatus Requirements

This issue for this topic as presented as that the visual example in the ordinance corresponds with the most expensive option from the power company. While providing other samples is one possible fix, this may be an item that does not need fixing. The language in the ordinance already has room for other options of lighting. It say comparable to the image and that the Planning Board has discretion in selection. As such, Staff would recommend leaving this as-is and letting the applicants bring their desired fixtures to the Board for approval during the site approval process.

## WHAT'S NEXT?

The Planning Board should discuss these items and others as they see fit regarding this overlay. Based on their ideas, Staff will provide commentary. Once there is a consensus on how [or if] some of these topics should be amended, we may begin the text amendment process. However, Staff would recommend grouping amendments together if possible in the interest of costs and time involved for both Staff and the public.