

**To:** Planning and Zoning Commission and Architectural Review Board Members  
**From:** Vince Papsidero, FAICP, Director of Planning  
Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager  
Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Current Planning Manager  
**Date:** April 27, 2018  
**Re:** Bridge Street Code Amendment #1 – Detailed Outline

## Summary

Accompanying this memo is a detailed outline of the proposed code changes for administrative procedures and submittal requirements in the Bridge Street District (153.066). This memo provides questions to assist the Planning and Zoning Commission and Architectural Review Board in their review of the proposal.

In summary, the proposal seeks to eliminate certain steps within the review process, specifically the step at which the Administrative Review Team provides a formal recommendation to the Required Reviewing Body and the step at which City Council reviews a Basic Plan for development projects requiring an Economic Development Agreement. In addition, the submittal requirements are revised to be parallel to the requirements for the Planned Unit Development District (concept plan, preliminary development plan, and final development plan).

## Discussion Considerations

The following are suggested discussion questions organized by each subsection of the code amendment. In terms of the discussion scheduled for May 9, 2018, staff proposes beginning at the start of the outline and working through it in chronological order.

### *A. Intent*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code, however, please share any suggested edits or new intent statements regarding the review and approval process (global intent statements regarding the BSD code in general are addressed in the first section of the overall code, which will be a topic of discussion later this year).

### *B. Review Procedure Summary*

- The Summary Procedure Table documents the proposed changes relative to ART and City Council.
- Do the members agree with these changes? And there any other suggested changes to the table that should be shared with the group?

### *C. Pre-Application*

- This is an internal review step involving the applicant and staff.
- While optional, this step is typically followed in almost all applications. There are no changes proposed in this section, however, please share any suggested edits.

### *D. Concept Plan (Work Session)*

- This is a new step in the process, consistent with the approach taken in the PUD district. It provides a formal, non-binding review of a case between the applicant and the Required

Reviewing Body. As proposed it is optional at the discretion of the applicant, although staff currently recommends this step for complex cases (if there is a desire to make this a requirement, criteria must be established because not all projects should be subject to this step – particularly those where this would be redundant with other steps).

- Please share any suggested edits.

#### *E. Preliminary Development Plan*

- This is a new step in the process, consistent with the approach taken in the PUD district (however, it does not provide development rights through a rezoning, as occurs in PUDs). This submittal replaces the Basic Plan and portions of the Development Plan under the current BSD code. By practice, a preliminary plat can be submitted concurrently.
- This step links the development proposal to the City's adopted code and policies (vision plan, area plan) through the formal staff analysis and decision of the Required Reviewing Body.
- At the recommendation of Don Elliott, a provision is included under (1)d that provides an ability to waive this step for minor projects.
- The submittal requirements are summarized here, but are detailed in the example application forms (this provides staff the ability to modify those forms, as priorities change with the Required Reviewing Bodies without amending code). Review criteria are specific and detailed in the code.
- Please share any suggested edits.

#### *F. Final Development Plan*

- This is a new step in the process of the current code, consistent with the approach taken in the PUD district. This submittal combines portions of the Development Plan and all of the Site Plan requirements under the current BSD code.
- This submittal ensures the final details are consistent with code, policies and the Preliminary Development Plan through the formal staff analysis and decision of the Required Reviewing Body. By practice, a final plat can be submitted concurrently.
- The submittal requirements are summarized here, but are detailed in the example application forms (this provides staff the ability to modify those forms, as priorities change with the Required Reviewing Bodies without amending code). Review criteria are specific and detailed in the code.
- Please share any suggested edits.

#### *G. Minor Projects*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code, however, please share any suggested. Staff and Don Elliott are suggesting retaining ART's role in approving Minor Projects (defined in subsection 2) within BSD (excluding the geography of ARB's authority) in order to expedite these smaller projects. ART can "kick up" an application to PZC under specific code provisions (see subsection 3).
- Please share any suggested edits. Does PZC support the role of ART as provided for Minor Projects? Typical cases of late have been outdoor patios.

#### *H. Administrative Departures*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code. Typically these will be handled by the Required Reviewing Bodies, except when a request is associated with a Minor Project that is eligible to be reviewed by ART.
- Please share any suggested edits. Does PZC support the role of ART as provided for Minor Projects? Typical cases include minor changes to setbacks, landscaping or building materials (equal to or better than).

#### *I. Waivers*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code. Please share any suggested edits (the second set of BSD amendments that staff will propose should reduce the need for formal waivers, as a number of provisions will be moved from code and placed within design guidelines).

#### *J. Minor Modifications*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code. Typically these will be handled by the Required Reviewing Bodies, except when a request is associated with a Minor Project that is eligible to be reviewed by ART. Please share any suggested edits.

#### *K. Other Applicable Reviews*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code. Please share any suggested edits.

#### *L. Appeals*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code. Please share any suggested edits.

#### *M. General Provisions*

- There are no changes proposed in this section of the current code. Please share any suggested edits.

### **Recommendation**

This information is provided to guide the discussion at the May 9, 2018 work session. Staff is seeking comments from the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board. Following this joint work session, staff will prepare the formal code amendment to reflect the proposal and any changes agreed to by the two bodies at the May 9, 2018 work session. Following review and recommendation by each body, the code amendment will be submitted to City Council for consideration. Concurrently with this process, staff will be circulating the final proposal to stakeholders within the district.