MAYOR'S BUSINESS READY TASK FORCE

October 23, 2012

2:00 – 4:00 PM, Municipal Court Room

Albany City Hall, 333 Broadalbin St. SW, Albany

Members: Sharon Konopa, Jeff Christman, Oscar Hult, Arthur Meeker, Jessica Pankratz, John Pascone, Dave Reece, Ron Reimers, Rob Richards, Dala Rouse, Mark Spence, Janet Steele

Staff: Wes Hare, Heather Hansen, Tari Hayes, Anne Catlin

Agenda

- Business From the Public
- Approval of September 11 Minutes
- Temporary signs; Multi-tenant signs; Planned Development
- Next steps:
    1. Completion of all code amendments and documents discussed by the Task Force
    2. In-house review of amendment packet and documents by staff in multiple-departments
    3. Hold a Joint Work Session with the Task Force, Planning Commission, and City Council
    4. If significant changes are recommended, hold another task force meeting to discuss
    5. Complete staff report and ordinance for adopting code amendments
    6. Notice to public
    7. Conduct first public hearing with Planning Commission
- Schedule Joint Work Session
- Adjourn

Mayor's Business Ready Task Force Minutes
September 11, 2012
2:00 – 5:00 PM Municipal Court Room
Albany City Hall, 333 Broadalbin St. SW, Albany

Members: Sharon Konopa, Jeff Christman, Oscar Hult, Arthur Meeker, Jessica Pankratz, John Pascone, Dave Reece, Ron Reimers, Rob Richards, Dala Rouse, Mark Spence, Janet Steele

Staff: Wes Hare, Heather Hansen, Tari Hayes, Anne Catlin, David Martineau

1. Approval of Minutes
    1. July 31
    2. August 14

    Hult made motion to accept both sets, Reimers seconded, motion passed unanimously.

2. Business from the Public

    Rich Kellum, 4085 E Commercial Way SE – attended the open house on September 6, 2012 and suggested some wording changes that he feels would give Albany a more positive reputation for dealing with businesses and residents. Rouse asked if the Albany Development Code (ADC) should say what can be done rather than what can't. Kellum gave additional examples for clarification.

3. Discussion of Remaining Items on the Business Ready Task Force *Issue Matrix*

    A. Infill and Redevelopment – Commercial & Industrial (Martineau)

    In reviewing the ADC, Martineau discovered much of it governs residential rather than industrial. The group discussed the definition of infill. Albany's infill development standards are primarily aimed at residential developments to ensure compatibility with surrounding pre-existing development. The Code does not explicitly address infill of commercial or industrial property. Creation of a "positive infill strategy" is recommended to encourage desirable infill development.

    The group suggested that a representative from the Central Albany Revitalization Agency (CARA) attend preapplication meetings, providing additional support to start ups. (It is current practice to include a representative to all relevant preapplication meetings.)

The taskforce shared examples of commercial infill issues and agreed that incentives are good, but without imposing additional standards, understanding that some incentives may be regulated by state law.

Rouse could see relaxing the code in some areas, such as when the requirements are more for a new commercial project than what was required for a neighboring (landscape, setbacks, etc.)

Residential infill is covered well in the code, although too limited in Village Center zones. Since residential developments helps support commercial development, the City should encourage high density residential infill, both horizontally and vertically, in all Village Center zones. Reece asked if is there was a minimum lot size, there isn't.

Staff will bring back additional definition and clarity on infill standards.

B. <u>Incentives for Adaptive Reuse (Catlin)</u>

Catlin went over some of the existing incentives for adaptive reuse downtown and city wide. These include development code tools such as mixed use zoning, density waivers and transfers, reduced parking/loading requirements and system development charges (SDC) credits.

At state and federal levels, some incentives include rehabilitation tax credits, new market and low-income tax credits, as well as special assessment of historic properties and the Vertical Housing Zone program. Local and other incentives include Urban Renewal Funding and Historic Preservation easements. The Energy Trust of Oregon has commercial and industrial incentives for qualified energy-efficient improvements.

Some additional incentives to consider could be multi- family open space & recreation standards exemptions. Variances would no longer be needed and would save costs and time for applicants and the city, easier for new construction compatibility. Using a site plan checklist for uses allowed in the downtown zones that currently require a site plan review will reduce review time and cost.

Some financial incentives for consideration include tax abatement or tax rebates based on improvement value. This could be offered city wide, however participation may limit the amount of CARA funding a project might be eligible to receive if it is in the CARA district. Hare would prefer the City not get into abatements for commercial projects. Hare did mention enterprise zoning as an additional incentive.

Rouse suggested that these incentives be for a limited period of time and that a booklet be put together with a list of the incentives. Pascone confirmed that there may be small business loans available.

Hansen noted that there are specific areas of town that aren't developing. The City could determine what their specific issues are and possible package smaller proposals for them.

Konopa would like to see examples of the suggested incentives as noted on page 2 of the incentive spreadsheet, in particular, specific proposals for multi-family requirements for downtown.

The group discussed the derelict ARCO station located on Pacific Boulevard near K-mart. City Council has requested the City attorney pursue resolutions for cleaning up the property. Reece worked with a client a few years back to write 3 or 4 proposals to ARCO for the property. The holdup seemed to be logistics and ownership issues, as well as possible code violations.

C. <u>Increasing Allowances for Signs (Catlin)</u>

The taskforce identified some areas that sign code needs clarification. Staff would like to schedule a complete review of the sign standards, hopefully within the next year as time and budgets allow. For now, there are some standards that need to be amended or clarified in order to allow adequate signage for businesses.

1. The allowance for the total number of signs in commercial and industrial zones should be per business, currently it's per property, which is limiting and inconsistent with other standards.
2. The City is proposing cleaner wall sign standards for businesses within integrated centers. This will be helpful to businesses that do not have street or parking lot frontage which is how the current formula is reached.
3. Staff is proposing a formula to allow for interior businesses to have wall signs in commercial and industrial areas, which are often left without enough "remaining signage area," for a readable sign.
4. Although the city recently improved temporary sign standards and streamlined the permitting process and fees, staff is proposing an increase to 90 for the number of days per calendar year a temporary sign can be displayed.

Meeker noted that A-frame signs are regulated differently downtown, causing a separation between downtown and the rest of the community. Most businesses are not paying attention to the time frame, since enforcement is sporadic. He feels a better tool might be for a brochure listing the City requirements that he could hand out to his customers. Banners are easily affordable, especially in this economy and limiting them to 60 or 90 days stifles business. Rather, maybe the City should have more clear standards and allow them for 12 months with the requirement that the sign(s) need to be permanent within a year. Konopa liked the 12 month suggestion.

Rouse suggested a review of the A-frame rules. Hansen noted that A-frames are a bit different than other signs, in that they advertise the business (daily specials), and seem to be more permanent.

Meeker agreed to sit down with staff and come up with some draft standards, simple things to improve upon before a larger review of the code.

Hansen suggested that this committee participate when it's time to review the sign code in its entirety. They agreed.

D. <u>Tree Cutting on Undeveloped Industrial Properties (Hansen)</u>

City staff, along with the City Tree Commission, is revamping the entire code. For now Hansen is suggesting a small change that would allow the Director, in consultation with the City Arborist, to grant an exception to any of the tree cutting standards for undeveloped industrial properties. The existing standards are subjective, but they provide little flexibility to account for the unique needs of industrial development. This is especially true if tree removal is requested independent of plan review.

Hare shared the OR Freeze Dry as an example. Spence asked why they would need to cut the trees down if they didn't have a development plan. Pascone stated it was because they wanted to do pre-development, and the plan wasn't ready.

Rouse asked if the City should consider the type of trees in removal. This is already determined by the City arborist.

Hansen pointed out that this can also give them mitigation options (replant/replace, etc).

E. <u>Planning Fees for Concurrent Applications (Hansen)</u>

A task force member asked about capping fees on larger projects. The Building Division budget is 100% fee-based, and they are already struggling. The Planning fees don't come close to recovering the actual cost, but the Division is supported by the General Fund. Hare agreed that the cost recovery percentage is very small.

Other than a few exceptions (natural resource overlays), there are no "discounts" for multiple applications submitted concurrently. The cities of Corvallis and Lebanon have such discounts. The taskforce could propose to charge the higher application fee, and then discount the remaining application fees by 25%-50%. This makes sense, especially in cases that could be combined, one hearing, one notice, etc.

Reece asked if the City was comparable for staff levels per capita staff in Community Development (CD). The CD is comparable to other agencies its size.

Hansen will complete a 3 year analysis on what 25% and 50% discounts would amount to.

F. Landscaping Requirements (Hansen)

This will be part of a larger discussion as Public Works revises their standards for on-site storm water in the coming months. Staff recommends waiting until that time, rather than having to revise then undo the landscaping revisions. The group agreed.

G. Commercial Uses in Vacant Industrial Buildings (Hansen)

Staff added this issue, having had many request for commercial uses in vacant industrial buildings. Staff would like more flexibility during the economic downturn. The city is responsible to maintain an adequate supply of land for economic development through Statewide Planning Goal 9 – Economic Development, which is implemented through our development code. If industrial land is used for commercial purposes it's no longer available for industrial purposes. BUT, there are other ways of writing codes to enable more flexibility while maintaining an adequate supply of industrial land. Staff talked with Tom Hogue of Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and he is willing to assist Albany in a revamp of the code. The City would be the first in the State to provide the level of flexibility being discussed. A complete revamp of the code will take at least a year and will require technical assistance funds. In the meantime, The City could allow some commercial uses in industrial zones on a "temporary" basis – maybe up to 3 years with potential for annual renewal – through the conditional use process.

Reece pointed out that the City would need to review the inventory regularly to make sure it’s not bumping up against the Goal 9 inventory. Rouse asked if 3 years was enough and suggested 5 years; the others concurred.

The group discussed tying the use to the length of lease. Pascone shared that usually a commercial lease is shorter term. Chances are the lease would time out or the owner would buy out if something bigger came in.

Hansen said rezoning is also an option. Temporary users need to know that the approval is short term.

H. Upkeep of Abandoned Buildings (Hansen)

The City doesn’t currently have a way of addressing the upkeep of derelict buildings other than through the dangerous buildings section of the Albany Municipal Code. That section is limited to health and safety issues. There are some abandoned commercial properties throughout the city that are run down. They are often in key visible locations in the City. They degrade the overall image of the city as well as the values of adjacent real estate.

Our City Attorney proposes a "carrot and stick" approach. The "carrot" would be a loan fund created to front the money for demolition of the derelict commercial buildings, which

would be repaid at the time of sale. The "stick" would be to deem properties that have lost their nonconforming status a public nuisance *(NOTE: we are proposing to return nonconforming status to all properties, then restart the clock on January 1, 2013)*, then give the property owner a year to either bring the site into conformance or to demolish the building. In egregious cases, the City could file an injunction in circuit court, and the judge would determine what the property owner would need to do to abate the nuisance and when.

Clearer definitions are needed for “egregious” and “derelict”.

Reece would like to see mowing standards. While the code is based on actual fire danger and not esthetics, he supports a policy of sending a letter to the landowner stating that if they don’t mow it, the City will and sends them the bill. Hare said it makes a difference to community enforcement to have to have tools (carrots & sticks) in their tool kit.

Hansen questioned if maybe it could be a City Council decision, and they could declare a building a nuisance.

Pankratz pointed out that if the owner doesn’t have the money for upkeep, then they wouldn’t have to bring it up to code.

Also, it was noted that it’s not a”non-conforming use”, its “non-conforming property”, since we don’t know what future use will be.

I. <u>Expiration Dates for Approved Plans (Hansen)</u>

Most approvals expire within 3 years, and frequently is a financial issue on the part of the owner. The City is proposing an option for an extension up to 1-year, assuming there haven't been changes to relevant city, state, or federal regulations. Reece and Pascone agreed a one year extension would be good.

The group asked if there was a way to freeze other approvals, such as storm water, etc. Staff will check.

Rouse would like to see some examples of non-conforming uses throughout the city.

J. <u>Review of Recommended Home Business Standards (Catlin)</u>

Staff is currently trying to define standards; keeping the standards measurable, and working on clearer definitions of off-site impacts (offensive odors, etc). Neighbors have different opinions about what constitutes *excessive traffic*, for example.

Changes the City is considering to address concerns raised in June include:

1. Hobbies are currently included as a “home occupation” but are being removed in the revised home business standards;

2. Open houses and events, like yard and estate sales, would be exempt when they meet the city's regulations for yard sales (3 times a calendar year, up to 3 days each);
3. Size and scale - Businesses allowed outright could be up to 25% of the house floor area (excluding garage) up to 500 square feet; OR when located in a garage (attached or detached) or an accessory building, they may be up to 1,000 square feet. Businesses that need more space would be considered through a Conditional Use review.

4. Next meeting:
    1. October 2, 2012
5. Adjourn 5:00

TO: Mayor's Business Ready Task Force

FROM: Heather Hansen, Planning Manager
Anne Catlin, Lead Long Range Planner

DATE: October 18, 2012

SUBJECT: Final Items for Task Force Discussion on October 23:
Temporary signs; Multi-tenant signs; Planned Development

The three abovementioned are the final items on the Task Force's *Issue Matrix*. The issues, current regulations, and proposed revisions are summarized below. We look forward to your input.

Temporary Signs. Staff reviewed temporary sign standards in other cities and found examples of the amendments suggested at the September 11 meeting in other cities. Most cities regulate the number of signs per business; however some limit them per property.

Issue Description	Current Regulations	Proposed Revisions
• A-frame/Portable signs should be allowed year-round city wide • Currently A-frame signs are only allowed year round downtown	• A-frame signs are limited to 60 days except in downtown area	• Allow one portable/A-frame per business, year round, city wide • Require signs to be taken in when business closes for the day • When multiple tenants are on one property, require signs to be spaced 20 feet apart *(Note: This is intended to address overcrowding of signs along street frontages)*
• Time period too short for banners and other temporary signs or displays, especially for new businesses; • Separate permits are required for each sign, even for community events.	• Temporary signs are limited to 60 days in a calendar year and they do not specifically address the needs of new businesses or temporary events	• Allow a new business to have one temporary banner sign up to 1 yr or until a permanent sign is installed, whichever is less • For existing businesses, continue to allow promotional signs/displays up to 60 days per calendar year • Temporary event signs may be used to promote an event. Instead of a permit for each sign, the permit would be for all signs related to the event. Signs may be no larger than 24" by 18" and can be displayed no more than 21 days. One sign is permitted per property per street frontage. Temporary event signs are permitted in any zoning district.
• Number of temporary signs allowed is too limited	• One sign per frontage (all temporary sign types)	• Allow one A-frame/portable and one other temporary sign per business located on-site *(Note: We can't regulate content so signs could be placed for other businesses. This limits the total to the number of businesses on-site.)*

Signs Allowances in General and Multi-Tenant Developments

Issue Description	Current Regulations	Proposed Revisions
• Determining the sign allowances and standards for sign types is confusing	• Currently you have to look at the aggregate allowance by pedestrian area or commercial/ industrial area, and also look at the standards for sign types	• We will be rewriting the sign code within the next two years. In the meantime, we will develop a sign handout that makes it easier to navigate through the standards
• Aggregate Sign allowance is confusing and in some cases limiting	• Limit is 2 signs per property per frontage	• Change to per business per street frontage
• Businesses in multi-tenant buildings and buildings with no street frontage	• Sign allowance is calculated by street frontage or building frontage	• Multi-tenant buildings & businesses with no street or parking lot frontage. Add allowance for one wall or marquee sign no greater than ½ foot for each lineal foot of the building façade on which the sign is placed. In addition, one sign for all businesses located within is permitted if they do not exceed 1 square foot for each 1 lineal foot of the building façade on which the sign is placed.
• Integrated Centers	• Standards do not clearly address interior businesses	• Interior Businesses. When more than one business is located interior to a building and does not have a separate entrance or individual frontage on a street or parking lot, each interior business is permitted one wall sign so long as the total area devoted to signs on each building façade shall not exceed a maximum of 12 percent of the wall area.

Planned Developments (PDs). The general purpose of PDs is to allow flexibility in some standards in exchange for a "higher quality development." Staff reviewed our PD standards against those in other cities and we are recommending several changes that will streamline the review process, and will adjust the amount of common area required, and clarify what areas count toward open space. Attached is a table of other cities' common area/open space requirements for your review. The table below includes some ideas from other cities regarding the common/open space requirements for your feedback and discussion.

Issue Description	Current Regulations	Proposed Revisions
• 3-step process is time consuming	• 11.300. 3 steps: Staff review, Planning Commission, staff	• 2 steps: Prelim PD reviewed by Planning Commission, staff review of final plan/plat
• Outdoor living area/ open space requirement a lot, especially in mixed-use/urban areas	• 11.330 (1). 40% total required; 75% must be in common or shared outdoor living area	• Set outdoor living/open space minimum by zone, consider 20% to 40% in res'l zones • 20 % in mixed use/comm'l zones, allow indoor to count
• How is open space / common area calculated, what is included?	• 75% outdoor living area includes all shared/common spaces, may include front yards and planter strips in r-o-w; • Side and rear yards can count towards the remaining 25%, although this is not specified in the Code	• Revise calculation to include only commonly enjoyed spaces or amenities (Medford, others); Would not include side/back yards • Do not include land in r-o-w unless applicant provides a specific amenity or if landscaping/planters exceed minimums; e.g. large planter strips to allow for large canopy trees and path (Lebanon)
• Indoor Recreation area requirement in addition to outdoor space excessive	11.330 (2). PDs with 50 units or more require indoor recreation area of 10 s.f. per unit	• Remove this as a requirement • Allow indoor to count in lieu of outdoor in mixed-use zones • Allow rooftop gardens accessible to residents (*Roseburg*)
• Perimeter Compatibility	• No standards	• Consider perimeter compatibility standards between uses (*Roseburg*)
• Natural Features. Current language is too subjective and often doesn't result in protection of natural features.	• 11.310(2) "Protection results in more efficient utilization of natural features of site"	• Open spaces containing significant natural features shall be retained (Consider specific language that addresses preserving oak groves, heritage trees per AMC) (*Roseburg*) • Consider requiring a mitigation plan with prelim PD that addresses how any negative impacts to natural features or adjacent uses will be mitigated (*Lebanon*)

Comparison of Planned Unit Development Common Area/Open Space Requirements

City	Common/Open Space %	Common/Open Space Defined	What is Included in Common/Open Space
Medford	20% of land area for Residential PDs	Common area, excluding parking areas or private streets	• Natural features/sensitive lands • Common recreational space • Landscaped area • Commonly enjoyed amenities
Tigard	20% of gross site area for Residential PDs	Shared open space facilities includes: • Up to 75% Minimal use facilities/sensitive lands • Up to 100% Passive use facilities/passive recreation • Up to 100% Active Facilities/active recreational use	• Sensitive lands, i.e. steep slopes, wetlands, streams, or 100-year floodplain • Passive and Active recreation areas i.e. landscaping, irrigation, pathway and other structural improvements
Lebanon	Lot coverage may be no greater than underlying zone/use: 40% – 80% max lot coverage	Land area to be used for scenic or open space recreational purposes; does <u>not</u> include: streets, driveways, parking areas, required setbacks or public easements	Land counted toward open space includes: • Minimum dimensions of 20' x 20', and min. 400 s.f. • Preserved natural areas and complimentary landscaping • Streets, driveways, parking areas, required setbacks and easements <u>IF</u> they have a special recreational purpose • Land designed for recreational and leisure use of those occupying the PD • Accessible and usable year-round.
Florence	20% of <u>Net</u> developed area, which excludes roads	At least 25% of the required 20% open space requirement must be designated and improved for recreation use and enjoyment	The following counts toward the 20% open space, but may <u>not</u> be counted toward the recreation area requirement: • Hillsides over 25% slope; • Land in the floodway, floodplain, or required riparian or wetland buffer, unless trails, benches, picnic tables and similar above are incorporated; • Roadside ditches; • Monument entry areas and central landscaped boulevards; • Stormwater retention or detention ponds that are designed to hold stormwater runoff from less than one hundred (100) year events; • Parking areas and road rights-of-way that are located within the parkland, open space, or common area, except for parking that is required specifically for use of the parkland; • Yards, court areas, setbacks, or other open areas required by the zoning and building ordinances and regulations shall not be included in the computation.

Comparison of Planned Unit Development Common Area/Open Space Requirements

City	Common/Open Space %	Common/Open Space Defined	What is Included in Common/Open Space
Roseburg	Minimum no less than impervious area required in underlying zone max lot coverage: 55% to 80%	Open space is land not covered by buildings or structures, except minor recreational structures; does not include streets, driveways, parking lots or loading areas.	Open space includes: • 50% of Landscaped Roof areas devoted to recreational or leisure-time activities, freely accessible to residents; • Locations, shapes, sizes and other characteristics of open spaces must be consistent with their proposed uses and the purposes of the PUD. • Equitable distributed throughout PUD, unless otherwise approved. • Protected natural features (Environmental Design standards)

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report #545: Planned Unit Developments (2007)	25% of (gross *or* net) project area set aside for Open and Common Open space	The Open and Common Open Space areas excludes street right-of-way and 50% is be set aside for open space	• Common open space is an area or areas within the boundaries of the PUD designed, set aside, and maintained for use by all residents of the PUD;
			  o The location of common open space is to be contiguous to the extent possible and located for the maximum benefit of the residents, preserving, and where possible, enhancing natural features. Buildings, structures, and improvements permitted in the common open space must be appropriate to the uses authorized for the common open space.
			• Open space includes:
			  o Sensitive Lands: 100-year floodplain; stream buffer areas; slopes above 25% percent in a contiguous area of at least 25,000 feet; wetlands; habitat for federally listed endangered or threatened species; archeological sites, cemeteries and burial grounds; scenic viewsheds; significant farmland of a minimum size and existing healthy native forests.
			  o Other open space areas include: important historic sites; areas that connect the tract to neighboring open space, trails or greenways; soils with severe limitations for development due to drainage problems; landscaped site elements, such as arterial street buffers, district boundary buffers, civic greens, and landscaped medians.
			• Uses include: pedestrian, bike and multipurpose trails; passive recreation areas, including pocket parks; active recreation areas; agriculture, and silviculture or pasture use.

Business Ready Task Force: Issue Matrix (10/18/12)

	Issue	Description	Response/Status
A	Home occupation (businesses and hobbies)	We want to encourage and support small home businesses. We also need to be concerned about compatibility with residential neighborhoods. Existing criteria are too subjective.	Discussed and reviewed on May 22nd and June 19th. Proposed amendments will be reviewed at an Open House on September 6th. Discussed on September 11th. **Will require Measure 56 Notice!!**
B	Site Plan Review checklist	Develop checklist to determine if SPR is warranted in all cases, such as change of use when no onsite improvements are possible. Request for "over the counter" review.	Discussed on June 19th. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
C	Small-scale manufacturing with onsite sales	Current code unduly limits these uses. Review and revise.	Discussed on June 19th. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
D E F	Existing buildings/ Challenging properties/ Nonconforming situations	Sites that are difficult to develop, and buildings that are difficult to lease or sell, due to ADC requirements. Consider short-term solutions until the economy turns around? Consider adding more flexibility for redevelopment or change of use, such as extending the 1-year expiration of nonconforming status, giving owner more time to make improvements, etc	Discussed on July 31st. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
G	Use 25% of total project cost for "commensurate with development"	This is similar to the ADA requirement – it's an alternative way of defining "commensurate" with development.	Reviewed by staff and a different approach is proposed**.** Discussed on October 2nd. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
H	Parking requirements	Reconsider parking ratios, joint use for infill vs. new construction; off-street parking requirements; gravel lots; landscaping; restriping permits	Discussed on October 2nd. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
I	Development review process	Review and discuss process from start to finish – fees, timing, steps, and issues. Pick a recent example, such as SI projects, SPR. Include pre-apps. Fear of retribution is another issue, though no one was sure if it has actually happened. Who is repsonsible for relaying to prospective buyers/lessors what is allowed per zoning?	Discussed on August 14th. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
J	Incentives for adaptive reuse	There are many possibilities that could incent filling vacancies downtown and in other areas, such as forgiven taxes, extended timeline for improvements, etc. Could have list of eligible properties.	Discussed on September 11th. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
K	Infill & Redevelopment	Consider adding flexibility for infill projects. Infill is defined as smaller lots (< 2 acres?) surrounded by existing development.	Discussed on October 2nd. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.

Business Ready Task Force: Issue Matrix (10/18/12)

	Issue	Description	Response/Status
L	Landscaping requirements	Buffering and screening, setback areas - Can they be lessened or delayed?	Delayed until 2013 when PW updates stormwater regs.
M	Tree cutting on commercial and industrial land	Should we lessen standards for commercial and industrial lands?	Discussed on September 11th. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
N	Non-industrial uses in Industrial zones	There are more and more requests for commercial uses in existing buildings in industrial zones.	Discussed on October 2nd. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
O	Upkeep of vacant buildings	There are some properties that are run down and they affect the image of the City.	Discussed on September 11th. **Measure 56 Notice required! Discuss further.**
P	Capping fees on larger projects	Instead of the fee being x% of the total project cost, consider capping it.	Discussed on September 11th. Staff proposed "discount" for concurrent applications. Discussed further on October 2nd. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
Q	Expiration dates	Expand expiration times. Most approvals expire within 3 years, such as Site Plan Review, Subdivisions.	Discussed on September 11th. Will bundle amendments for PC hearings in Winter 2013.
R	Signs – Limited situations	Temporary signs; integrated centers; mix of uses in one building with one entrance	Discussed on September 11th. **Will be dicussed on October 23rd.**
S	Planned Development	Too many steps and too much open space required.	**Will be discussed on October 23rd.**
T	Variances	Can they be allowed in more circumstances? Easy variances would not be legal, but we can find out how far we can push the envelope.	*Checked with Jim Delapoer. He strongly advises not to loosen standards for variances.*
U	SDCs are high	SDC fees can limit development. Do they have to be so high?	*Handout of SDC in other cities.*
V	Goal 5	It should be goals, not regulations	*Memo - Protection of significant natural resources through Goal 5 is a state requirement.*