

STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE

BRIDGE STREET DISTRICT CODE UPDATE AND DESIGN GUIDELINES

Meeting Notes

March 19, 2019

Attendees: Russ Hunter, Miguel Gonzalez, Vicki Newell, Roger Ansel, Terry George, Bill Wilson, Rob Bailey, Jane Fox, Mike Brehm, Dan Ferdelman, John Woods, and Chris Amorose Grooms

Staff: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Thad Boggs, Logan Stang and Chase Ridge

Consultant: Leslie Oberholtzer, Codametrics

The meeting began at 8:05 am.

The following summarizes the key topics discussed at the meeting:

- Reviewed the code sections on Building Types, Neighborhood Standards, Open Spaces, Site Development, and Signs.
- A number of details regarding individual building types was a predominant topic of discussion.
- Recent changes to the Fee-in-Lieu of open space requirement was highlighted (this is to be incorporated into the revised code).

Review Comments:

- Brief overview of building types and how they fit within Bridge Street District Code.
- Discussed how the “rear” of building types are treated. Concerns were raised about whether too much detail has been removed and the quality of the exterior would be diminished. We discussed the intent of moving these details to the guidelines to allow for more flexibility and how the real estate market impacts the design results.
- Discussed the use of Code vs. Guidelines and how they work together. We discussed providing a reference guide to easily refer between the Code and the Guidelines for applicants, staff, and/or Board and Commission members.
- Reviewed the difference between the revised building types and how those are applied, particularly as it relates to the design of the ground story. Discussed how the Guidelines supplement the Code requirements. Need to follow-up on whether there are ground story requirements outlined in the shopping corridors, as well as ensuring the Code and Guidelines encourage more visual interest and human scale at the ground story.
- Discussed the height changes in the Mixed Use building type regarding the floor-to-floor requirements and how to handle that with slope/grade changes. Staff will follow-up whether an additional requirement could be added in the Code to account for this, but also discussed that a Waiver would be appropriate in these situations.



- Discussed building entrances and how to account for the required number of doors without providing specific locations at the final development plan stage. Discussed the goal of allowing more flexibility with each tenant to be more creative with their particular entrance.
- Discussed the change to overall height of the Parking Structure building types. Concerns were raised with the reduction in number of floors based on surrounding buildings as well as existing buildings. Staff is to follow-up on whether the roof counts as a floor, as it is open on top.
- Staff needs to verify the required separation between the Apartment building type and other residential uses/building types.
- Discussed and confirmed that the Code allows for and encourages a varied front setback for Single Family attached.
- Discussed the desire to ensure setback and/or buffer protections are in place with regard to development that will be in proximity to the Indian Run single-family neighborhood.
- Discussed the revised open space requirement for civic uses. Concerns were raised about whether the number should be higher, or whether it was assumed civic uses would inherently provide open space as part of their programming, thus not requiring significant provision. If that was not the assumption, then more should be required/provided for civic uses.
- Staff highlighted recent changes to the subdivision standards and alerted the group that the open space requirements would be replicated within the BSD Code for the Fee-in-Lieu option.
- Discussed the requirement of providing a variety of open spaces in residential developments. Staff needs to clarify whether this applies to residential only (such as Tuller Flats) or includes mixed use development as well.
- Concerns were raised about the minimum development standards within the Parking Structure requirements related to the entrance/exit widths and turning radius. Staff agreed to review the requirements to allow for flexibility in width and radius to eliminate design issues identified with the construction of several garages in Bridge Park.
- Discussed how a change of use within the 20-foot minimum occupied space of a garage is handled, and whether that impacts the parking calculations for the garage. Staff is to clarify how this should be handled.
- Reviewed the service and loading areas discussion from the previous meeting. The recommended resolution was the use of alleys as the best solution.

The meeting concluded at 9:45 am.

