

**PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY NOVEMBER 25, 2014
7:00 PM
HOOD ROOM, MATTHEWS TOWN HALL**

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of October 28, 2014 Meetings
- III. MOTION 2014-7 – Small Area Plan for the Sportsplex and Family Entertainment District
- IV. MOTION 2014-8 – Miscellaneous Text Amendments to UDO
- V. SCHEDULE ALTERNATE DECEMBER MEETING DATE
- VI. ADJOURNMENT

MEMO

TO: Planning Board Members
FROM: Kathi Ingrish
DATE: November 17, 2014
RE: November 25, 2014 Planning Board Meeting

Do you hear the turkeys playing hide and seek in the forest? They want you to focus your attention on the pending motions this month, and not on them! Even though the agenda itself is relatively short, the two motions have plenty of background reading for you.

Motion 2014-7 is the second small area plan to be considered for addition into the Land Use Plan since it was completely updated two years ago. The expectation is that we will continually prepare more detailed policy and vision plans for specific areas of our community, which will become appendices to the Land Use Plan. Making revisions to the Land Use Plan, including initially adopting or amending appendices, requires a joint public hearing, Planning Board review and recommendation, and final decision by Town Board. This particular small area plan is a precursor requirement for any property within the proposed ENT Entertainment district zoning boundaries – a “general concept plan” must first be adopted by Council, then requests for rezoning into the ENT category can begin. Now that the second phase of the Sportsplex is about to get going, there is increased development interest in the private land side of the territory. There was little discussion at the public hearing a couple weeks ago, and no one got up to speak on it. Therefore, no changes have been made to the text of the draft document since the public hearing.

Motion 2014-8 is a compilation of relatively minor text and formatting amendments to the UDO. Like the Motion above, there were no speakers at the public hearing. A couple questions were raised by Council, including the reason for added text for occasional flexibility on parking within a sight triangle, and some confusion regarding how the term “innovative” is intended to be used throughout the UDO. After further checking all the places the word “innovative” is used, I have prepared further text revisions to make the meaning and the terminology consistent throughout the document. I have also provided some examples of site plans where a portion of an on-site parking space intrudes into a sight triangle and does not cause any public safety concerns. While doing these follow-up efforts, staff also discovered a few other items that we would like to pose as additional corrections within this Motion:

- * Correct the numbering/citation from 155.503.8.G.11. to 155.503.8.H.
- * Create a cross reference statement at both 155.405.4 and 155.701.C. to clarify that the criteria at each location applies to all types of new development. The criteria in both are for improvements to public infrastructure (streets, driveway curb cuts, etc.)
- * Add text that was adopted into the previous Zoning Ordinance in 2010 but was inadvertently missing from the UDO allowing a reduced I-1 front setback for a unified development.
- * Delete maximum land area restriction for I-1 development sites using the reduced setback provisions.

The last two listed above can be anticipated to be used along the Monroe Road corridor to assist in implementing the vision given in the recently adopted Monroe Road Corridor Small Area Plan. Charlie has seen these additional suggested amendments and has said they can be considered by your Board at this time.

Thank you all for checking your calendars for possible alternate meeting dates. As you see, we anticipate a quorum for the regular 4th Tuesday date in November, however, we will need to reschedule our December meeting. The best alternate date appears to be Tuesday January 6, 2015. This gives applicants time to make changes to their proposals and discuss them with Planning staff prior to the January 12 public hearing/return for decision date, and allows Planning Board members a good opportunity to see near-final revised plans before making a recommendation. We have 2 zoning applications scheduled for December public hearing and 1 for January, all of which have some details that may require careful notation on their site plans.

As always, please let one of us know if you find you will not be in attendance next Tuesday evening. Also, feel free to call or e-mail any of us with questions at any time.

PIBd ag 11-25-14 memo

**MINUTES
PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2014
7:00 PM
HOOD ROOM, MATTHEWS TOWN HALL**

PRESENT: Chair Tom Lawing; Members Rob Markiewitz, Gary Turner, Steve Lee, Eric Johnson and Eric Welsh; and Alternate member Barbara Dement; Town Attorneys Charles Buckley and Craig Buie; Youth Voice Benjamin Dodson and Sarah Ward; Planning Director Kathi Ingrish, Planner II Jim King, and Zoning Technician/Deputy Town Clerk Mary Jo Gollnitz.

ABSENT: Member David Pratt and Alternate member Michael Ham

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Lawing called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. He introduced and welcomed Youth Voice representatives.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Dement asked to have the minutes reworded on page 6 paragraph 8. Steve Lee made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 23, 2014 meeting as amended. Eric Welsh seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

ZONING APPLICATION 2014-620 – Reid House 134 W. John Street from O-15 to O (CD)

Planner II Jim King reviewed for the Board the proposed rezoning request O-15 to O (CD) for the Reid House located at 134 W John Street. He stated that there was no comments or concerns raised at the Public Hearing. The applicant is seeking a change from O-15 to O (CD) to bring the property into the current zoning classifications. The O zoning district dimensional requirements are not as strict as the O-15. There are limited permitted uses for the property. Expansions, demolition or alterations to the property must be approved by Matthews Historical Foundation or Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Landmarks Commission. He stated that special events may occur as currently happen on the property. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning.

Mr. Markiewitz asked what the difference is between museum and art gallery non-commercial versus museum or art gallery. Mr. King explained that they are two different museum classifications, one being commercial and one would not.

Rob Markiewitz recommended zoning application 2014-620 for approval as presented at the public hearing and/or most currently amended, is consistent with the policies for development as outlined by the Matthews Land Use Plan, and/or Town's long-range Vision Statements and other adopted policies. Gary Turner seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

ISSUES/CONCERNS/IDEAS FROM MEMBERS

Chairman Lawing wanted to express his appreciation to all the Board members for their time, effort, and comments at the last meeting. He noted that several Town Council members commented that the Planning Board had done a good job with the discussions.

Eric Johnson asked if there is a retreat planned in the near future. Ms. Ingrish explained that the Town Board holds their annual planning conference the last week of February. In the past the Planning Board has been invited. She continued noting that the Council has discussed meeting with the Planning Board annually or bi-annually. She has not heard when that may happen. This board can request the meeting. She stated that Council often has a 5:30 pm meeting regarding a particular topic that you may want to be part of.

Barbara Dement asked about the case load from the last meeting. She asked if there is any way to cap the application requests in order for the Board to do due diligence. She provided a couple of suggestions in handling a large number of applications. Chairman Lawing asked if you can restrict someone from submitting an application.

Attorney Charlie Buckley said that you cannot restrict someone from submitting an application. He further noted that the Planning Board has 30 days from the date the Council refers the application to them to respond. Failure to respond is considered an affirmative recommendation. Because of the time limitation this Board cannot choose which application to review when. Ms. Dement stated that maybe they could call a special meeting and split the applications in order to appropriately review the items. There was further discussion regarding the process in place for submitting applications. Mr. Buckley noted that he does not remember a Planning Board meeting lasting this long with so much substance.

Eric Johnson said he could see development coming into Matthews because of the UDO being in place. It was noted that development in general has picked up. Ms. Ingrish said that there were so many zoning cases years ago that Council created a third meeting a month to hear the cases. At that time there was not the 30 day requirement for reviewing rezoning applications.

Ms. Ingrish stated that at Council meeting last night it was mentioned that with the previous Council there was not a lot of discussion on issues at the Public Hearing. The Council would wait until decision time and bring up questions. She continued stating that the Planning Board and Council should ask questions at the public hearing. The more issues that are brought up at the hearing the more likely they will get resolved by the time it comes to the Planning Board when it should be the final product.

Eric Welsh stated that questions occur to him after the applicant has spoken. Can the Planning Board ask questions at that point? Ms. Ingrish said that it is a joint hearing between both boards and the Mayor should be able to recognize you. Mr. Buckley said yes as long as the public hearing is open you still have a right to ask questions.

Gary Turner asked if there is any update on the widening on John Street. Ms. Ingrish stated that there were some additional concept changes where Greylock Ridge and Campus Ridge Roads connect. In both situations NCDOT proposes super street configurations. Ms. Ingrish explained the concern with the Greylock Ridge configuration. Discussion continued regarding funding of the John Street project, other road projects and design changes.

Eric Johnson asked if the State, in the process of acquiring right-of-way, will allow the town to have development rights to the leftover land. He continued asking what would be the best approach for the Town to guide the development in these instances. Ms. Ingrish stated that she does not believe there has been anything like that in the past. The State has in the past placed an uneconomic remnant up for sale or offered it to an adjacent property owner. There was additional discussion regarding the town working with NCDOT. Mr. Buckley noted that the State is subject to the local zoning unlike the federal government.

Ms. Dement asked when the Board does a rezoning change, such as QuikTrip, why is there is no scrutiny for someone to come next door and develop however they wish. Mr. Buckley explained that QuikTrip was rezoned as a legislative conditional district within the boundaries defined in the application. The carwash next door was not a part of that application. That piece of property already had zoning and if they can do a particular use under the current zoning it is considered by right. They must comply with the text in the UDO. There was further discussion regarding overlay districts, conditional districts and performance standards. Ms. Ingrish stated that one example is Erickson Senior Living Center which was zoned R/I (CD) before the recession. She noted that there were lengthy detailed conditions in the approval. The company folded that had submitted the application, but those conditions are still in place for the new developer.

ADJOURNMENT

Steve Lee made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Eric Johnson seconded the motion which passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Gollnitz
Zoning Technician/ Deputy Town Clerk

DRAFT

Possible Text Amendments to the UDO for Planning Board to Consider adding into Motion 2014-8 at their meeting of November 25, 2014

Proposed Additional Text Change #1) "Innovative Development" Standards Process vs. "Innovative"

We can clarify that when the term "Innovative Development" is used in the UDO to refer to an established process for requesting alternative standards, it really should mean "Flexible Design". The word "innovative" is used in its dictionary definition meaning in other places in the ordinance. While the intent is relatively simple – change out one term for another where appropriate, there are many places in the text that should be switched. In all, there are 42 times throughout the UDO that "innovative development" should be changed to "flexible design" to refer to the *process*, and 11 times the word "innovative" appears in the UDO with the intended dictionary definition meaning of "featuring new methods; advanced and original; inventive; ingenious; creative".

Text in green shows the proposed terminology change from "innovative development" to "flexible design".

155.401.7 Use of ~~Innovative Development Provisions~~ Flexible Design Standards

A. OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY. Certain conditional zoning districts are intended to allow flexibility in overall design through the use of ~~Innovative Development~~ Flexible Design Provisions. Because it is not always possible to anticipate variations or improvements in the development types or to accommodate changes with broad, all-encompassing regulations which could create good quality of life opportunities, these provisions allow the Board of Commissioners to consider and evaluate new and ~~innovative development~~ flexible design concepts in a specially designated and controlled setting.

1. The R-VS SRN, C-MF, MUD, TS, and ENT Conditional-Only districts provide such a setting. Therefore, the opportunity for ~~innovative development~~ flexible design standards may be included as an integral part of proposals for these districts.

2. The Cottage Cluster Housing alternative in the residential districts provide such a setting. Therefore, the opportunity for ~~innovative development~~ flexible design standards may be included as an integral part of proposals for Cottage Cluster Housing within any of the single-family zoning districts when requested through a Parallel Traditional district process.

3. Various permitted uses within the CrC district may apply ~~innovative development provisions~~ flexible design standards.

B. PURPOSE. It is the objective of these ~~Innovative Development Provisions~~ flexible design standards to encourage development proposals that exhibit such special qualities or concepts that they may deviate from standard ordinance requirements. These regulations are established in order that an ~~innovative development~~ flexible design proposal will be evaluated on its own merits. It is recognized that some proposals or concepts will be more successful than others, and the approval of a specific proposal in one situation does not mean that a similar proposal would be acceptable in other circumstances. These provisions are purely optional and are a voluntary means by which land may be developed outside of the standard ordinance requirements. These provisions are designed to evaluate only those ~~innovative~~ flexible design concepts that propose to meet a community need that would not otherwise be met. Finally, it should be emphasized that these provisions should not be confused with or take the place of the normal zoning and subdivision variance procedures established either in § 155.403 or § 155.712.

C. CERTAIN ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS MAY BE MODIFIED. The quantitative dimensions and locational zoning standards listed here which would normally apply to development may be modified through the ~~innovative development~~ flexible design process.

1.

D. CERTAIN INFRASTRUCTURE STANDARDS MAY BE MODIFIED. The infrastructure standards of Chapter 7 which would normally apply to development may be modified either through the subdivision variance process or ~~innovative development flexible design~~ process, each as identified below.

1. Street right-of-way.

. . . .

3. Sidewalks, pedestrian pathways, and multi-use trails (all non-motorized use paths).

Where required or used, sidewalks and other pedestrian bike facilities shall conform to the minimum width and construction standards of Chapter 7, and to the standards as may be adopted separately for any type of non-motorized use pathways. They may, however, deviate from the usual placement within the road right-of-way, and may meander on both public and privately-owned land with appropriate easements. The Board of Commissioners may consider deviations regarding location and construction standards for non-motorized vehicular use pathways through the ~~Innovative Development flexible design~~ procedures of this § 155.401.7.

4. Curbs and gutters. Where required or used, curbs and gutters must conform to the Land Development Standards Manual or other adopted street cross sections, or provide sufficient documentation to illustrate alternative construction design that will provide necessary storm water control and adequate traffic and parking safety. The Board of Commissioners may consider deviations regarding location and construction standards for non-motorized vehicular use pathways through the ~~Innovative Development flexible design~~ procedures of this § 155.401.7.

E. LIMITATIONS ON PROJECT SIZE. Due to the special nature of these provisions, it may be desirable to limit the size of the area proposed for ~~innovative development flexible design standards~~. This will ensure the appropriateness of the land use relationships with adjoining property, and/or within the development site itself, while providing needed flexibility essential to the success of these provisions.

1. In any R-VS district, the cumulative project area which may incorporate ~~innovative development flexible design~~ provisions shall not exceed ten (10) acres.

2. In any MUD district, the cumulative project area which may incorporate ~~innovative development flexible design~~ provisions shall not exceed thirty (30) acres.

3. In any residential district employing the Cottage Cluster Housing option, the total project area, when incorporating ~~innovative development flexible design~~ provisions, shall not exceed ten (10) acres.

F. APPLICATION PROCESS.

1. In applying for approval of ~~an innovative development a flexible design standards~~ project, the applicant shall include a letter to the Planning Director with a statement of intent outlining the purposes and objectives of the proposed development; the particular development standards being modified; the special design features or amenities being incorporated into the plan which makes the proposed development significant and worthy of approval; identification of the individual separate locations where ~~innovative development flexible design~~ provisions are proposed to be used, and the cumulative total acreage; and any other applicable information that the applicant may feel is appropriate. The applicant must submit a site development plan drawn to scale showing the information listed below.

G. REVIEW AND APPROVAL. Any application for ~~innovative development flexible design~~ will be considered at the same time as the related conditional district application or through a separate site plan and/or elevation plan review, as appropriate. In evaluating an application for ~~innovative development flexible design~~, the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners will consider whether the development plan meets the following objectives.

Also, "Innovative Development" provisions are referenced in many of the zoning district standards. The term can be replaced with "flexible design" or "flexible design standards" at the following:

155. 503.1. Residential Varied Style District (R-VS)

H. ~~INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBLE DESIGN~~. The R-VS district establishes minimum standards for development and design. Those standards however might not always be appropriate to the particular development. Accordingly, new development concepts, innovative design, unique circumstances or public/private ventures may require the use of alternative development or design standards. In such cases, the development requirements specified here for the R-VS district in § 155.503.1 may be modified through the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ provisions of § 155.401.7 of this Title.

155.503.2 Crestdale Conservation District (CrC)

D. ~~INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBLE DESIGN~~. The CrC district establishes minimum standards for development and design. Those standards however may not always be appropriate to a particular segment or building within the development. Accordingly, new development concepts, innovative design, unique circumstances or public/private ventures may require the use of alternative development or design standards. In such cases, the development requirements specified here for the CrC district in § 155.503.2 may be modified through the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ provisions of § 155.401.7 of this Title.

155.503.3. Small Residential Neighborhood District (SRN)

H. ~~INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBLE DESIGN~~. The SRN district establishes minimum standards for development and design. Those standards however might not always be appropriate to the particular development. Accordingly, new development concepts, innovative design, unique circumstances or public/private ventures may require the use of alternative development or design standards. In such cases, the development requirements specified here for the SRN district in § 155.503.13 may be modified through the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ provisions of § 155.401.7 of this Title.

155.503.4. Concentrated Multi-Family District (C-MF)

G.2.e. Alternative percentages of listed materials or types of materials may be requested by the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ Provisions at § 155.503.5.H. at the time of initial district designation, or through the Administrative Amendment process for an individual building after it has received site plan and elevation plan approval.

H. ~~INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBLE DESIGN~~. The C-MF district establishes minimum standards for development and design. Those standards however might not always be appropriate to the particular development. Accordingly, new development concepts, innovative design, unique circumstances or public/private ventures may require the use of alternative development or design standards. In such cases, the development requirements specified here for the C-MF district in § 155.503.4 may be modified through the ~~Innovative Development flexible design~~ provisions of § 155.401.7 of this Title.

155.503.5. Mixed-Use District (MUD)

G.2.e. Alternative percentages of listed materials or types of materials may be requested by the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ Provisions at § 155.503.5.H. at the time of initial district designation, or through the Administrative Amendment process for an individual building after it has received site plan and elevation plan approval.

H. ~~INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBLE DESIGN~~. The MUD District establishes minimum standards for development and design. Those standards however might not always be appropriate to the particular development. Accordingly, new development concepts, innovative design, unique circumstances or public/private ventures may require the use of alternative development or design standards. In such cases, the development requirements specified here for the MUD district in § 155.503.5 may be modified through the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ provisions of § 155.401.7 of this Title.

155.503.6. Transit-Supportive District (TS)

G.2.e. Alternative percentages of listed materials or types of materials may be requested by the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ Provisions at § 155.503.5.H. at the time of initial district designation, or through the Administrative Amendment process for an individual building after it has received site plan and elevation plan approval.

H. ~~INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBLE DESIGN~~. The TS district establishes minimum standards for development and design. Those standards however may not always be appropriate to a particular segment or building within the development. Accordingly, new development concepts, innovative design, unique circumstances or public/private ventures may require the use of alternative development or design standards. In such cases, the development requirements specified here for the TS district (in § 155.503.6) may be modified through the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ provisions of § 155.401.7 of this Title.

155.503.8. Entertainment District (ENT)

G. BUILDING AND STRUCTURE DESIGN PRINCIPLES.

1. GENERAL BUILDING DESIGN PRINCIPLES. These principles favor an aesthetic that allows a contemporary influence within a more traditional framework. They call for a determination of an overall visual or architectural theme and selection of exterior materials that are appropriate for the region. Structures may exhibit unique details and should not utilize a standard or corporate facade that is repeated, or intended to be repeated, in multiple communities. While structures within the ENT district may be initially built to house a specific use, the buildings shall be designed to accommodate future alternative uses. These building design principles concentrate on the views from the public realm, including public streets, public sidewalks or walkways, parks, plazas, civic greens, squares, and unrestricted parking areas (those not reserved solely for residents/employees). The general building design principles listed at § 155.603 shall be utilized when designing any site within the ENT district. While only materials, techniques, and product types are prescribed here, equivalent or better practices and products are encouraged when appropriate. When requested, they must be submitted to the Town Planning office either for Administrative Amendment as explained at 155.401.5 or ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ as explained at § 155.401.7., whichever applies.

2.e. Alternative percentages of listed materials or types of materials may be requested by the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ Provisions at § 155.503.5.H. at the time of initial district designation, or through the Administrative Amendment process for an individual building after it has received site plan and elevation plan approval.

~~G.14. H. INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBLE DESIGN~~. The ENT district establishes minimum standards for development and design. Those standards however may not always be appropriate to a particular segment or building within the development. Accordingly, new development concepts, innovative design, unique circumstances or public/private ventures may require the use of alternative development or design standards. In such cases, the development requirements specified here for the ENT district (in § 155.503.8) may be modified through the ~~Innovative Development Flexible Design~~ provisions of § 155.401.7 of this Title.

155.603. Buildings – General Urban Design Principles

155.603.1 General

These principles favor an aesthetic that is traditional in a broad sense, and which create an architectural aesthetic of load-bearing walls and regionally appropriate materials. The principles also specify certain details, such as window proportions, roof or parapet configurations, shop fronts, and overhang features. The intent behind these urban design principles is to foster a unique image while utilizing regionally appropriate elements. While materials, techniques, and product types are identified in this Title as

allowed, use of equivalent or better practices and products are encouraged. They shall be submitted to the Town Planning office either for Administrative Amendment as explained at § 155.401.5 or **Innovative Development Flexible Design** as explained at § 155.401.7., whichever applies. Many of the principles apply only in conditions where the building elements are clearly visible from the public use realm, including streets, shared parking areas, and civic spaces. These urban design principles therefore concentrate on the views from the public realm and minimize interference in the private realm. For example, an architectural element that is visible only through an opening in the street wall is not clearly visible from the public realm. The following general principles are encouraged throughout the Town in all zoning districts and must be followed when Conditional-Only zoning designation is requested for the SRN, C-MF, MUD, TS, and ENT districts.

155.701. Streets

A. RIGHT-OF-WAY.

1. A proposed street right-of-way must be of sufficient width to accommodate the required cross section. However, the right-of-way shall not be less than the standards listed below unless allowed through **Innovative Flexible Design** Provisions at § 155.401.7 or through a subdivision variance outlined at § 155.712.

Proposed Additional Text Change #2) Correct a Paragraph Citation

155.503.8. Entertainment District (ENT)

~~G-11.~~ H.

(as shown in ENT section text above)

Proposed Additional Text Change #3) Add statements shown in red below at 155.405.4 and 155.701.C. to cross reference the standards are to be followed both for subdivisions and for new development/redevelopment projects.

155.405.4 General Subdivision Design Criteria

The following statements provide general requirements and policies to be used in the design, review, and approval of any subdivision under the jurisdiction of these regulations. **As stated at 155.701.C, these provisions also apply to any proposed rezoning, expansion of an existing development (40% or more increase in building square footage or outdoor use area), any new development, or any redevelopment of land where they logically can apply (i.e., not 155.405.4.Q. since subdivision names would not apply to a development site not involving a formal subdivision final plat).**

A. CONSISTENCY WITH ADOPTED PUBLIC PLANS AND POLICIES.

155.701. Streets.

C. DESIGN CRITERIA.

The following criteria shall be followed for all improvements within or adjacent to public streets in conjunction with any proposed rezoning, preliminary subdivision, expansion of an existing development (40% or more increase in building square footage or outdoor use area), any new development, or any redevelopment project. The provisions listed at 155.405.4. shall also be utilized for these types of projects, unless they clearly do not apply.

1. STREET CONNECTIVITY

Proposed Additional Text Change #4) Text regarding a reduced front setback in the I-1 zoning district was adopted into the prior Zoning Ordinance (Z App #560, approved 11-8-10) but was by omission not included in the UDO. It can be added without change at 155.502.15.C, and a footnote can be added to the Table of Dimensional Standards at 155.604.2, as follows:

155.502.15 Light Industrial District (I-1)

A. The Light Industrial District is established to create and protect industrial areas for the provision of light manufacturing and the distribution of products at wholesale. The standards established for this district are designed to promote sound, permanent light industrial development and also to protect nearby residential areas from the undesirable aspects of industrial development. Whenever possible, areas of this zoning category are separated from residential areas by natural or structural boundaries, such as drainage channels, sharp breaks in topography, strips of vegetation, traffic arteries, and similar features. The map symbol and short name for the Light Industrial District shall be "I-1 District." [formerly part of regulation known as § 153.062]

B. Lot development and design standards, as outlined in § 155.605, and dimensional standards of § 155.604.2, apply to the I-1 District. Uses allowed within the I-1 district are given in the Table of Allowed Uses at § 155.505.2. Supplementary standards which may be applicable to certain uses within the I-1 district are listed at § 155.506.

C. The minimum setback for uses in the I-1 district may be reduced by 50% when the following requirements are met:

1. No parking is proposed or allowed between the primary use building and the street.
2. The site is part of a larger unified development less than 5 acres.
3. The buildings fronting the street are designed with four-sided architecture to address the street. Four-sided architecture is defined as having the following characteristics:
 - a. No expanses of blank walls greater than 25' in length allowed. A blank wall is a façade that does not add to the character of the streetscape and does not contain windows or doors or sufficient ornamentations, decoration, or articulation (such as alternating materials, brick patterns, or similar architectural features).
 - b. Provide an operable doorway entrance from the street side along with a pedestrian walkway to that door.
 - c. All mechanical and HVAC equipment must be screened from view from the street, whether located on the roof or ground. Such equipment may not be located between the building and the street.

155.604.2 Table of Dimensional Standards for Nonresidential Traditional Districts

Add "/20⁽¹⁵⁾" in the box for I-1 minimum front setback following where it says 40', then in explanation of footnotes below add "⁽¹⁵⁾ Front setbacks may be reduced when meeting the provisions established at 155.502.15."

Proposed Additional Text Change #5) Delete land area limitation for I-1 development sites using the reduced setback provisions

155.502.15.C.2.

Delete the phrase "less than 5 acres" in text that was inadvertently missed in the ZO to UDO conversion process (proposed 155.502.15.C) so it will read:

"The site is part of a larger unified development ~~less than 5 acres.~~"