



To: Members of Planning and Zoning Commission

Date: November 5, 2020

Initiated By: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director
Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner

Re: Bridge Street District Process Amendments

Summary

Staff is seeking additional informal feedback on a potential future Zoning Code amendment regarding Bridge Street District review process and the inclusion of an Amended Final Development Plan review option. This was discussed and generally deemed appropriate at the October 1, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

BSD Amended Final Development Plan

As you recall, the updated BSD Code includes a three-step review process established for new construction and modeled after the provisions for Planned Districts:

- 1) Concept Plan (required in the BSD, required based on certain criteria in the PUD)
- 2) Preliminary Development Plan
- 3) Final Development Plan

In the 2019 Code update, the eligibility and scope of projects that qualify as a Minor Project was narrowed to reflect the name 'minor'. However, following the adoption of the updated review process regulations staff recognized a need for the addition of an Amended Final Development Plan process, which would allow for the modification of already developed sites and buildings and is also a process included in the PUD provisions and likely a majority of the applications reviewed by the Commission. In the PUD provisions, any application, regardless of how major or minor, that has previously been reviewed as a Final Development Plan is eligible for an Amended Final Development review.

In the BSD provisions, this option only exists if the modification can fit within the Minor Project Criteria (attached). One such example is the McDonalds application that the Commission recently approved. The application was filed prior to the Code being in place and as such was eligible for a Minor Project Review, however due to waiver requests for building materials also required Commission review and approval.

Under the current standards, a substantial site or building modification to an existing

commercial site would require the same level of review as new construction, which is very cumbersome, time consuming and costly for the applicant and staff. Staff is currently in discussions with potential applicants desiring to make substantial upgrades to the exterior façade of their buildings; however, there is a sense that the process in place (3 steps) may deter the owners from moving forward with the improvements. In order to streamline the review timeframe and ensure the scope of the review process matches the scope of a proposed project, staff recommends the inclusion of an AFDP process in the BSD review process.

Included in your packet are the review criteria for the Amended Final Development Plan in the PUD process (same as the Final Development Plan), also included are the criteria for the Minor Project Review eligibility and review process in the BSD Code and the Final Development Plan Criteria in the Bridge Street District. Staff is requesting the Commission to comment on the two review criteria in the PUD vs. the BSD as well as the eligibility criteria for the Minor Project (which is permitted to be reviewed by the Administrative Review Team)

Recommendations

Staff requests feedback from the Commission in terms of the existing criteria as well as the eligibility of qualifying for a Minor Project versus an Amended Final Development Plan.