

**AGENDA REPORT
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
December 20, 2018**

SUMMARY

A request by Engineering Surveys & Services (agent) on behalf of Hamlet Limited Partnership and Joseph Tosini (owners) for approval to rezone 45.14 acres of property from PD (Planned Development) zoning to 3.31 acres of M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood), 21.53 acres of M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor), and 20.3 acres to R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) zoning. The subject site is located at the northwest and southwest corner of Scott Boulevard and Smith Drive. (**Case #24-2019**)

DISCUSSION

The applicants are seeking to rezone approximately 45.14 acres of property from a PD district to a mix of residential and commercial zoning. Currently the site has a valid PD plan for the portion of the acreage that permits commercial uses which were formerly identified as O-P and C-P prior to the adoption of the Unified Development Code (UDC) in 2017. The PUD portion of the acreage does not currently have a valid development plan at this time. The PUD plan expired 5 years following approval of the original PUD plan in 2000. If this application is approved, the requested rezoning would remove the site from a PD zoning designation and all associated development plans would no longer be valid.

In addition to the requested rezoning, a preliminary plat for the property has been submitted for consideration as case #23-2019. Referencing the proposed preliminary plat, the requested zoning for the site is M-N for lots 1 & 2, M-C for lots 3-11, and R-MF for lots 12-15.

Background

The site's current planned district zoning was originally approved on February 21, 2000. The zoning included the previous designations for planned developments, which were PUD (Planned Unit Development), O-P (Planned Office District) and C-P (Planned Commercial District). PUDs were typically used when a development was intended primarily for residential uses, O-P for those intended for office uses, and C-P for commercial developments. Upon the adoption of the UDC in March 2017, the prior individual planned district names were replaced with a single planned district designation - PD for Planned Development. For the purposes of this report, the previous zoning designations may be used to reference the distinct parts of the existing zoning ordinance and the existing plans; however, to be clear, the site's current zoning is PD only.

The existing planned district zoning ordinance that was approved in 2000 (Ord. #16361) is still valid, and it includes a list of permitted uses, which is standard, as well as additional restrictions and regulations. The ordinance with all exhibits is included as Attachment #6. The exhibits to the ordinance include statements of intent (SOI) for each of the three planned districts and are where the general list of permitted uses and restrictions can be found. Exhibit A is the SOI for the O-P, Exhibit B references the PUD, and Exhibit C refers to the C-P. There is also an Exhibit D, which includes additional stipulations and conditions for the development.

The PD zoning ordinance (Ord. #16361) did not itself approve a development plan for the site. In December 2000, a PUD Plan (Attachment #8) for approximately 22.58 acres was approved for single and two-family dwellings along the east half of the north property line (generally consistent with Lot 14 of the proposed preliminary plat). Additionally, this 2000 PUD Plan showed multi-family units on the west portion of the site and townhomes along Smith Drive to the south. Pursuant to the former zoning

ordinance, a PUD Plan became null and void after five (5) years of development inactivity. Given that no further development action was pursued upon the 22.58 acres following its approval, the PUD-12 plan for Westbury Village, as of December 2005, was deemed to have expired and was no longer valid. There has been no attempt since to re-activate the PUD Plan. It is important to note that pursuant to Section 29-1.9(f) of the UDC, the zoning provisions of Ord. #16361 for the PUD 12 and all the requirements included within that ordinance still apply to the site at this time - the PUD Plan may be expired, but the underlying zoning is still valid.

Following up the PUD plan approval, an O-P/C-P plan for Westbury Village was approved in April 2001 (Attachment #7). This plan included approximately 33,000 sq.ft. of office uses, 173,000 sq.ft. of commercial uses, and 13,000 sq.ft. of residential uses. This plan has not expired, as O-P and C-P plans are not automatically voided after 5 years. The site could be developed as shown on the existing development plan provided it meets current technical requirements associated with infrastructure installation. However, if a major amendment to the 2001 plan were requested the plan would need to comply with all current UDC requirements.

The request under consideration is to rezone the entire property to standard zoning designations, not planned development zoning. If approved, this would void the existing planned district ordinance and all remaining development plans for the site, and the site would be permitted to develop using the permitted uses within the Table 29-3.1 of the UDC (Attachment #5) and would be subject to all of the UDC regulations.

Zoning

Changes in zoning are evaluated from several perspectives, the first being how the zoning correlates with the city's Comprehensive Plan (Columbia Imagined) and its future land use designation. The Comprehensive Plan identified the subject site within the following three land use categories: Commercial District for the C-P zoning, Employment District for the O-P zoning, and Neighborhood District for the PUD zoning. These designations are reflective of the site's currently entitled land uses.

Per the Comprehensive Plan, Commercial Districts can contain "a variety of citywide and regional retail uses," as well as office and high-density residential uses to support said commercial uses. Employment Districts may contain offices as well as convenience retail and other commercial uses such as day care and restaurants. Finally, Neighborhood Districts could permit a range of residential uses, as well as "a limited number of nonresidential uses that provide services to neighborhood residents". The proposed zoning designations sought with this request could reasonably fit within the context of any of these Comprehensive Plan land use designations for the site.

However, when giving further consideration to how this property and the proposed zoning changes correlate with the Comprehensive Plan it should be noted that the Plan provides specific examples of the types of commercial development that would be consistent with the commercial district designation. One example given cites how the Columbia Mall would be consistent with commercial district designation, but also references the site as a regional shopping destination. Given the characteristics of the subject property, applying such an intense use as being equivalent does not appear to be an accurate description of how this site would develop.

The Comprehensive Plan; however, provides further guidance on how the intensity of commercial developments, in part based on their locational characteristics, can be scaled to fit within their immediate surroundings. In terms of the location and scale of the subject site, staff believes a "marketplace" designation would be more accurate description of the type of commercial development likely to be occurring on the site.

In addition to future land use categories, the Comprehensive Plan includes a list of goals and associated policies that may also provide guidance when evaluating a requested land use change. However, it should be noted that not all of the goals may apply in all instances. In this case, the “Livable and Sustainable Communities” goal is most applicable, and it includes four policies, which are attached (Attachment #10). In summary, the policies are 1) Support diverse and inclusive housing options, 2) Support mixed-use, 3) Facilitate neighborhood planning, and 4) Promote community safety.

Policy Two (support mixed-use) primarily addresses the desire to establish nodes of commercial activity in proximity to residential uses. This goal furthers the desire to provide walkable neighborhoods that provides accessible services to surrounding neighborhoods, in contrast to past development practices of creating large homogenous blocks of single-family dwelling areas. This type of development pattern has resulted in the concentration of commercial services in shopping areas that have included “big-box” development.

This policy also points out that care should be taken when considering the location of these smaller-scale commercial uses adjacent to neighborhoods. Ideally, there would be a transition from the most intense to least intense uses (i.e. commercial to higher-density residential to low-density residential uses) that would help support the commercial services offered. In situations where significant buffers are present (such as on the south portion of the subject property where a stream buffer and preservation easement exist), commercial uses could adjoin single-family residential.

It should be noted that Columbia Imagined recognized that a planned district may still be necessary to ensure that these use transitions are properly implemented under certain conditions. However, since adoption of Columbia Imagined in 2013, new neighborhood protection standards have been adopted as part of the UDC providing additional protections between incompatible uses. These protections will be discussed in further detail later in this report.

The proposed M-N zoning located south of Smith Drive on Lots 1 & 2 abuts existing R-1 zoned single-family development to the south. This proposed zoning is viewed as appropriate given its proximity to the surrounding residential uses and the fact that M-N zone is meant to provide commercial shopping and services in or near residential uses. M-N zoning is generally seen as compatible with low-density residential areas. Furthermore, the presence of a substantial buffer to the south, which includes a stream buffer and preservation area, provides a substantial setback between any development of these lots and the residential properties to the south.

Lot 3 shares some of the same characteristics of Lots 1 and 2, but is requested to be zoned M-C. Generally a corner lot at a major intersection such as Smith and Scott is suited for uses that require higher visibility and more auto-oriented access. This zoning would allow a wide variety of commercial uses that are shown in the Table 29-3.1 (Attachment #5) of the UDC. Given the same buffering circumstances on the west side of the lot (a stream buffer and preservation easement), M-C could likely be suitable at this location. However, staff believes this lot may be more appropriately zoned M-N given its adjacency to existing R-1 zoned property to the west and the amount of additional M-C that is also being proposed. Another factor contributing to the belief that M-N zoning is more appropriate are the residential uses directly east of the site on the east side of Scott, a situation that exists for the entire 45.14 acre site.

Lots 4-11, which the applicant has requested be zoned M-C, are mostly located with frontage along Smith and/or Scott, with the exception of two larger lots, Lots 10 & 11, that are located behind the outlots. Again, this zoning would allow a wide variety of commercial uses. It should be noted that some of the uses permitted per the requested M-C zoning are uses currently prohibited by the existing PD zoning. These uses include, but are not limited to hotels, lumberyards, bars, and gas stations. Per the UDC, the Mixed Use - Corridor (M-C) zone is appropriate for commercial activities that may be suited to

areas of high visibility and may tend to be more auto-oriented, and generally located at intersections of major roadways such as Scott (a major arterial street) and Smith (a neighborhood collector street).

Lots 3-9, which are all proposed as M-C zoning, would also be directly across the street from existing R-1 or R-2 zoned lots developed with residential uses (with the possible exception of the property to the west of Lot 3, which could be considered underdeveloped). While this does not preclude these lots from being zoned commercial, it is worth noting that the current O-P/C-P plan considered additional mitigation in the form of a berm along the street frontages for Scott, and Lot 9 of the preliminary plat, which is also across from residential on Smith, was designated residential, not commercial. A berm was discussed during the review period with the applicant and adding it to the preliminary plat, for instance, is an option but is not required and would be considered a developer imposed restriction.

It is important to note that the PD zoning includes several restrictions on the property that are meant to mitigate the impacts of the proposed uses on the surrounding properties, such as the previously mentioned berm. While this is one of the benefits of planned development zoning, some protections that are similar to those in the O-P/C-P area have now been incorporated into the City's UDC. While berms are not a requirement to screen the Scott frontage, more landscaping is now required along street frontages than in the past. The UDC requires an 80% opaque landscaping buffer screen when parking is within 25 feet of the property line. The new UDC also requires street trees for every 40 feet of roadway frontage. The prior code had no opacity requirements, allowed parking lots to be within 20 feet of the property line, and only required 50% of the parking lot to be screened when it was within 20 feet of the property line. The former code also had no street tree requirements (although the existing development plan appears to include them). It should be noted that under the current UDC if a parking lot is not within 25-feet of the property line, the only landscaping required along the street frontage would be the street trees.

There are other protections in the UDC that are similar to restrictions in the existing PD ordinance. The existing site is subject to commercial and residential design guidelines (Attachment #6, pg 11). The UDC has incorporated some basic design guidelines for commercial and multi-family developments, which include design requirements to enhance entries into buildings, require a minimum amount of windows, and require variation in wall planes to provide visual interest.

Landscaping requirements have also been enhanced in the UDC. Notwithstanding the previously discussed berm, the landscaping for the proposed site will be similar in scope and scale to the existing O-P/C-P plan. In some cases, it will provide more landscaping, such as along the north property line that is adjacent to existing residential uses. Previously, a buffer would have been required, for example, between those uses and a proposed multi-family use only if a parking lot was near the property line. Now, the UDC requires 80% opaque property edge buffering between multi and single-family uses regardless of the presence of a parking lot. Other screening measures in the UDC include the screening of dumpster locations and rooftop mechanical units.

While the new UDC has addressed many of the design-related matters that were considered "supplemental" requirements of the planned district zoning, the most significant difference between the proposed zoning and the existing zoning would be the removal of specific land use restrictions. As can be seen in the table at the end of this report and within the existing zoning ordinance (Attachment #6), the planned district zoning prohibited many specific uses on the site, and included a specific list of uses that would be permitted in each district.

In the PUD zoned areas, the requested R-MF zoning would not result in dramatic changes as most residential uses are currently permitted, but the existing location restrictions would be removed and other non-residential uses would be allowed, such as day care centers. The more dramatic change would be within the C-P to M-C zoning area. Currently, the C-P area permits uses that were previously

allowed within the C-1 and C-2 zoning districts, which roughly correlate to today's M-N and M-DT districts (although not exactly).

With the zone change to M-C, many of the existing prohibited uses would be allowed within the M-C portions site. This includes gas stations, hotels, and lumber yards. The C-P zoning on the corridor along Scott currently allows retail uses, restaurants, and alcoholic beverage sales by the package. The change to M-C would allow more intense commercial uses, which could include those previously mentioned, but also vehicle repair, commercial parking lots, and adult retail. It is important to note that some of these uses have additional use standards. Taking adult retail as an example, the use-specific standards restrict hours of operation and limits signage. It is worth noting that use-specific standards apply to many of the uses in the UDC, and further restricts some of the uses based on other factors. The applicant also submitted supplemental information (Attachment #2) to point out the use-specific standards that may apply to uses that may not currently be permitted.

If the requested M-C rezoning involved an existing greenfield site with no adjacent pre-existing uses, a decision regarding the requested M-C zoning would be clearer given the scale of the intersecting major roadways, and the expected traffic levels. Furthermore, since the original O-P/C-P plan was approved in 2001, there have been significant land use and infrastructure changes within the surrounding area.

The site shares characteristics with a location that could support a more regional, auto-oriented development given its location along an arterial street that intersects with a collector. However, it also shares characteristics of a "marketplace" node, generally defined as a commercial area located on the edge of established neighborhoods that provides services more tailored to immediately adjacent residents. The site's location and dual characteristics, however, do not carry with it an automatic designation of M-C zoning, especially when weighed against the impacts that such a designation may create upon the existing development.

Furthermore, the site directly abuts or is across the street from, residential development, and how the site transitions to these uses is important as well. At over 20 acres in size, the requested scale and mixture of uses within the M-C development area is larger and more intense than what would be expected of an M-N-zoned commercial area. However, it is important to note that when the UDC was adopted the ability to permit certain M-C uses within the M-N district was contemplated via approval of a conditional use. This accommodation was intended to eliminate the need for PD zoning in some circumstances by allowing additional public vetting of specific uses through a public hearing process and final approval by City Council.

Conclusion

Staff has included written comments from adjoining residents, and some are not supportive of the requested rezoning. Their general concerns involve the removal of existing restrictions applied per the PD zoning, potential increase in residential units, and increased traffic. The public hearing associated with this request will provide an opportunity for surrounding residents, some of whom may have been involved in the original zoning discussion, to voice their opinions regarding the proposed change. Ultimately, these comments may factor into the Commission's final decision on this request.

Staff respects the public's concerns; however, its conclusions are based generally on whether the requested zoning would be appropriate and whether it would be compatible with surrounding properties and uses. At the time the site was zoned in 2000, a planned district was used to address concerns with the site, and perhaps to address the shortcoming of the existing zoning at the time. Staff's recommendation is less about which zoning is better (the existing or the proposed), but about whether the requested zoning is appropriate in its own right.

It is important to note that the property is currently entitled to develop with commercial and residential uses, and could still be developed. The applicant is seeking a change in that entitlement, but the City is not obligated to grant that change. The applicant has suggested in their filings that the site cannot be developed as it is currently zoned, although that claim is difficult to substantiate.

It is also important to note that the existing planned district zoning placed additional controls on the site that would not be present in the requested rezoning - principally restrictions on certain uses and additional buffering for the existing residential uses across streets from the development. Staff cannot predict the exact nature of the future uses on the site, but it would be surprising if the site were to be used for a hotel, lumberyard, commercial parking lot, or grocery store that exceeded 45,000 sf. None of these uses are permitted in M-N. Other uses, such as gas stations and drive-through restaurants are permitted as of right in M-C, but are conditional in M-N, which essentially means that the PZC and City Council would have an opportunity to review these types of uses and place conditions on them that would mitigate perceived impacts to surrounding property owners.

Essentially, the current zoning of the site is similar to the proposed zoning in that it allows residential uses along the north and west of the property, commercial nearer to the intersection of Smith and Scott, with less intense uses on the south side of Smith. It differs, however, in that it proposes to remove specific use restrictions and required supplemental buffering. It should be noted that the existing planned district ordinance and development plans could be revised to accommodate the proposed development objectives of the applicant as well as reduce the complexity of the existing ordinance by recognizing existing protections within the UDC and removing some of the similar restrictions that exist within the zoning on this site.

Overall, staff finds that the proposed zoning is generally consistent with the goals and objectives of Columbia Imagined to provide mixed-use areas and a variety of housing choices; however the specific M-C zoning request raises concerns that the proposed zoning may include uses that do not integrate well with the surrounding residential areas, especially those portions of the site that face residential property across a street. The internal lots within the site may better suited to accommodate M-C uses and are, in fact, proposed to be larger lots that would be buffered from the surrounding existing residential uses.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the requested R-MF and M-N zoning map amendment.

Denial of the M-C zoning map amendment.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (ATTACHED)

- 1) Locator maps
- 2) Application materials
- 3) Zoning Graphic
- 4) Surrounding Zoning Graphic
- 5) UDC excerpts
- 6) Existing zoning (Ord. 16361)
- 7) Existing O-P/C-P Plan & Ord.
- 8) VOIDED PUD Plan
- 9) Public comments
- 10) Columbia Imagined excerpts

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Area (acres)	45.2
Topography	Ridge along the northwest corner of property, then slopes to the southeast and sharply to the northwest
Vegetation/Landscaping	Generally tree covered
Watershed/Drainage	Meredith Branch, Perche Creek
Existing structures	Vacant

HISTORY

Annexation date	1994
Zoning District	PD
Land Use Plan designation	Neighborhood District, Commercial District
Previous Subdivision/Legal Lot Status	Surveyed tract, not a legal lot

UTILITIES & SERVICES

Sanitary Sewer	City of Columbia
Water	City of Columbia
Fire Protection	City of Columbia
Electric	City of Columbia

ACCESS

Scott Boulevard	
Location	East side of site
Major Roadway Plan	Major Arterial (Improved & City maintained). 100-106-foot ROW (50-53-foot half-width) required to be dedicated.
CIP projects	None
Sidewalk	Existing, but redevelopment will require Pedway to be reconstructed.

Smith Drive	
Location	South side of site
Major Roadway Plan	Neighborhood Collector (Improved & City maintained). 60-foot ROW (30-foot half-width) required to be dedicated. Existing 66-foot right of way; but additional ROW required near Scott intersection.
CIP projects	None
Sidewalk	Required

Stone Valley Parkway	
Location	West side of site
Major Roadway Plan	Neighborhood Collector (unimproved & Boone County maintained). 60-foot ROW (30-foot half-width) required to be dedicated. Existing 66-foot right of way.
CIP projects	None
Sidewalk	Required

PARKS & RECREATION

Neighborhood Parks	Located within Rothwell Park and Louisville Park service area
Trails Plan	None adjacent to site.
Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan	Pedway along Scott.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

All property owners within 200 feet and City-recognized neighborhood associations within 1,000 feet of the boundaries of the subject property were notified of a public information meeting, which was held on November 13, 2018.

Public information meeting recap	Number of attendees: ~40 (including applicant) Comments/concerns: Traffic, commercial land use impact, density, removal of trees, intersection safety.
Notified neighborhood association(s)	Quail Creek HOA, Stoneridge HOA, West Lawn HOA, King's Meadow NA, Quail Creek NA
Correspondence received	Attached.

Report prepared by Clint Smith

Approved by Patrick Zenner

Zoning Comparison Table

The following table is provided for a general overview of the existing and proposed conditions on the site per the relevant zoning; however, the zoning district boundaries do not match exactly, so a direct comparison cannot be made and the numbers provided may not be entirely accurate. It also may not reference every section of the UDC (e.g., parking), but includes the sections (such as landscaping) that are most relevant. Also, note that some uses are paraphrased or shortened for clarity, and some terms are defined below.

Definitions

Property Edge: Lot boundary between lots of dissimilar zoning

Street trees: generally trees planted along ROW

Street buffer: generally landscaping required to screen parking lots, pavement

Zoning Comparison Table		
	Existing Conditions	Proposed
Overall Development		
Zoning	PUD-12 - 22.58 acres O-P - 7.57 acres C-P - 15.07 acres	R-MF - 20.3 M-N - 3.31 M-C - 21.53
Specific Prohibited Uses (att. #6)	Commercial picnic grounds Commercial stables Drive-in theaters Gun clubs, skeet trap for ranges Machine shops Commercial outdoor stage & concert facilities Commercial plumbing, heating, and air-conditions business Travel trailer parks Warehousing and distribution facilities Automobile repair facilities Bars, cocktail lounges, and nightclubs (except restaurants) Billiard halls and game arcades Bus stations Commercial parking for automobiles & light trucks Hotels Lumberyards Newspaper publishing plants Sign painting shops Theaters Any noxious activity Automobile service station or "convenience store" which sells gasoline	<p>Bold = Uses are those that directly correlate with a current UDC use; Parentheses = UDC district where permitted</p> <hr/> <p>Commercial picnic grounds (M-C) Commercial stables Drive-in theaters (M-C) Gun clubs, skeet trap for ranges Machine shops (M-C, CU) Commercial outdoor stage & concert facilities (M-C) Commercial plumbing, heating, and air-conditions business (M-C, CU) Travel trailer parks Warehousing and distribution facilities (IG) Automobile repair facilities (M-N, CU) Bars, cocktail lounges, and nightclubs (except restaurants) (M-N, CU) Billiard halls and game arcades (M-N) Bus stations Commercial parking for automobiles & light trucks (M-C) Hotels (M-C) Lumberyards (M-C) Newspaper publishing plants (M-C) Sign painting shops Theaters (M-N)</p>

		Any noxious activity Automobile service station or “convenience store” which sells gasoline (M-N, CU)
Height (max)	45’	R-MF - 35’ M-N - 35’ M-C - 45’ ¹
Landscaping/ Screening	Minimum landscape area: 15% of lot Dumpster screening: <i>not</i> required Parking lot landscaping: required Street trees: required per plan	Minimum landscape area: 15% of lot Dumpster screening: required Parking lot landscaping: required Street trees: required
Lighting	Height: 35-40’ Fixtures: Cutoff where bordering residential Light levels at property line: <2 foot-candles	Height: 28’ (reduced to 24’ within 50’ of residential) Fixtures: Cutoff Light levels at property line: <0.5 foot-candles adjacent to residential; <2 fc otherwise
Lots 1 & 2		
Zoning	O-P	M-N
Valid development plan	Yes	Not required
Permitted Uses	<u>R-3 Uses</u> Day Care <u>O-1 Uses</u> Banks Medical clinics Office buildings for admin Offices for professionals Customary accessory uses (e.g. drive through)	M-N uses (see att. #5)
Landscaping	Property edge: 8-foot fence with landscaping, 80% opacity within 3 years Street buffer: required per plan (prior zoning required when at least 50’ of pavement is within 20’ of ROW)	Property edge: 8-foot tall screening device (e.g., fence, berm) within 10-foot landscaped buffer with 80% opacity at time of planting; Street buffer: required when at least 40’ of pavement is within 25’ of ROW
Lot 3		
Zoning	O-P	M-C
Valid	Yes	Not required

¹ 55’ height is allowed with approval of transit standards

development plan		
Permitted Uses	<p><u>R-3 Uses</u> Day Cares</p> <p><u>O-1 Uses</u> Banks Medical clinics Office buildings for admin Offices for professionals Customary accessory uses</p>	M-C uses (see att. #5)
Landscaping	Property edge: 8-foot fence with landscaping, 80% opacity	Property edge: 10-foot landscaped buffer with 80% opacity at 5 feet at time of planting; 8-foot tall screening device (e.g., fence, berm)
Lots 4-11		
Zoning	C-P	M-C
Valid development plan	Yes	Not required
Permitted Uses	<p><u>C-1 Uses</u> Alcoholic beverage sales by the package Alcoholic beverage sales at restaurants Barber and beauty shops Public utilities Cleaning, pressing, dyeing establishments Laundries, coin operated Pet stores and grooming shops Photographic service shop Physical fitness centers, private gyms\ Printing shops Radio and TV sales and services Repair of household appliances Restaurants, cafes or cafeterias Schools operated as a business Shoe repair Stores, shops and market for retail trades Accessory uses, including drive-up facilities</p> <p><u>C-2 Uses</u> Armories Assembly halls Bakeries Bicycle repair shops Car washes Electrical repair shop Garment storage facility Government buildings Hospitals for small animals Laundries, commercial</p>	M-C uses (see att. #5)

	Printing shops Process labs Research labs Restaurants, cafes and cafeterias Shops for custom work, or manufacture of articles to be sold at retail Trade schools Wholesale sales offices and sample rooms Any retail business or use of a similar character to those listed above C-3 Uses Car Washes Rental Services	
Landscaping	Street buffer (Scott): Landscaping with berm required per plan	Street buffer (Scott): No berm; landscaping required at 80% opacity when at least 40' of pavement is within 25' of ROW
Lots 12-15		
Zoning	PUD-12	R-MF
Valid development plan	No	Not required
Uses	Overall Single-family dwellings Duplexes Multi-family dwellings Townhouses <u>Along Kings Meadow border (north)</u> Single-family dwellings Duplexes	R-MF uses (see att. #5)
Max Units/ Proposed Units	208/194	320 ² /NA
Height	45'	35', but when abutting R-1/R-2 must step down height to 24' or increase setback (29-4.7.e)
Proposed Density/ Actual	12 dwelling units per acre/10 du per ac. (per void PUD plan).	Approximately 17 du per ac./ NA
Lot size minimum	SF lot size = 10,000 sf Duplex lot size = 9,000 sf MF/townhouse lot size: lot will be 10 feet larger than building footprint Setbacks = 15 feet	5,000 sf 7,000 sf MF = 2,500 sf/du; Townhouse = 3,500 sf Setbacks: front, rear = 25', side = 10'

² Based on 2,500 sq.ft. minimum lot area per unit

<p>Landscaping (Current plan is void, so new plan would have to comply with UDC)</p>	<p>Street buffer (Scott): Landscaping with berm required per plan Property edge: Per plan, none required between single-family and two-family.</p>	<p>Street buffer (Scott): No berm; landscaping required at 80% opacity when at least 40' of pavement is within 25' of ROW Property edge (Multi-family use abutting R-1 or R-2): 6-foot landscaped buffer with 80% opacity at time of planting</p>
<p>Development Guidelines</p>	<p>See att. 6, exhibit D (Applies to all residential development)</p>	<p>See UDC 29-4.6 <i>Design Standards & Guidelines</i> (Attachment #5, pg 6) See UDC 29-4.7 <i>Neighborhood Protection Standards</i> (Attachment #5, pg. 8)</p>