File

AGENDA

Finance and Economic Development Committee Meeting
Tuesday, November 30, 2010
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
City Hall South Conference Room

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of minutes of the October 12, 2010 meeting.**
3. **Marina District Planning Update.**
4. **Economic Development Planning update.**
5. **Committee member comments.**
6. **Future meetings.**

Marina District Planning

Summary of Stakeholders Meeting 1 – September 1, 2010

OVERVIEW

The purpose of the first Stakeholder Group meeting was to consider key elements of successful town centers and to begin brainstorming development and redevelopment opportunities for the Marina District.

Staff presented information on the City's planning and economic development goals; strengths, issues and opportunities affecting development and redevelopment in the Marina District; and ideas on what redevelopment could look like.

The remainder of the meeting was dedicated to small group discussions, which explored ideas and envisioned land use options for three opportunity nodes centered on S 223rd/7th Avenue S, S 216th/Marine View Drive, and S 227th/Marine View Drive. Each group was asked to designate a spokesperson to report out to the at large group at the end of the brainstorming session.

SUMMARY

Stakeholders Group members broke out into three working groups. Each group was asked to vision future development within three smaller opportunity nodes within the Marina District. Groups were asked to focus on the S 223rd/7th Avenue S node first, with discussion of other areas as time allowed.

Participants brainstormed locations where taller buildings might be possible and discussed the desired character of the built form and streetscape for each node, keeping in mind the following questions:

What's needed to support a vibrant and sustainable community?

What opportunities or limitations exist that affect your option?

How does each node function relative to the other nodes?

General observations for the Study Area ranged from defining needs to suggesting solutions. Establishing gateways and incorporating artwork into the Marina District were seen as "quick wins" that were easy to implement and demonstrated that the City of Des Moines cares about its image and has a vision for its future. Traffic roundabouts were a common theme to announce "you have arrived" as well as calm traffic speeds along Marine View Drive and 7th Avenue S. The view potential was identified as an asset and it was suggested zoning standards need to allow taller buildings where views are not compromised. All three groups saw the QFC site providing an opportunity to increase building heights (60+ feet). Green space, trees and landscaping were also deemed important elements that contributed to the sustainability of the area.

Improved transit service connecting the Marina District to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Pacific Highway S was seen as essential element to bringing people into the area. The area around S 223rd/Marine View Drive was identified as a logical location for a bus transit station. Shuttle services from the Marina and bicycle rentals were also identified as ways to improve access to and through the Marina District. Connectivity for pedestrians was a recurring topic among all three groups, pointing to the need for improved sidewalks and streetscape amenities. Other ideas included installing an elevator and stairs at the west end of S 223rd Street and enhancing the central stairway off of 6th Avenue S to improve access to/from the business district and the Marina.

Common themes and ideas generated for each of the opportunity nodes are summarized below:

S223rd Street/7th Avenue S Node

Discussions around the S 223rd/7th Avenue S Node focused on identifying new uses to attract people the area and strengthening the S 223rd Street connection to the Marina and Beach Park. Specific uses identified for this area included museums, art studios, boutique shops, a winery, antique shop, nice restaurants and cultural activities. Enhancement of the streetscape along Marine View Drive, S 223rd Street and 7th Avenue S were seen as important for creating a walkable area and providing strong connections through the neighborhood. Mixed use and affordable housing options were discussed. Gateway treatments, artwork, street trees, open space and overall attractiveness of the area were seen as important elements for creating a positive image for the Marina District. Generally, a more human scale was envisioned for the built environment with building heights around 45 feet +/-.

S216th Street/Marine View Drive Node

Ideas and observations for redevelopment of the S 216th Street/Marine View Drive Node included redevelopment of the QFC site with taller buildings (60+ feet) that include mixed income housing, a good grocery store, some retail and ample open space, pedestrian network and parking within. The bridge over Des Moines Creek and the intersections at Des Moines Memorial Drive and S 216th Street were viewed as opportunities for incorporating gateway signage, artwork and traffic calming measures and to establish a positive image for the Marina District.

S 227th Street/Marine View Drive Node

The groups did not have as much time to focus on the S 227th Street Node. This area was seen as providing opportunities for redevelopment, higher building heights and strengthening the gateways and connections to the Marina.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

A summary of the ideas and comments generated by each of the working groups is provided below. The summary is based on the notes taken at each table, graphics that were developed, and the group report-outs.

Table 1:

S223rd/7th Avenue S Node

- Affordable housing options, mixed use
- Green space and play areas for pets, children, young families (pet potty stations)
- Staggered building heights up to 45 feet
- Lower speed limits on Marine View Drive and 7th Avenue S (25 mph) or slow traffic down in other ways with street shape (i.e., curb bulbs)
- Activities and uses at Marina and Beach Park – variety and built-in infrastructure
- Bike station rentals (i.e., similar to zip cars)
- Art shops, winery, antique shop, nice or eclectic restaurants, cultural activities
- What draws us here?
- Museums, art studios, boutique shops
- Flexibility in design standards and setbacks to accommodate more green space (for all nodes)

S216th/Marine View Drive Node

- Whole Foods complex with outdoor seating and parking in center of complex
- 60-foot height allowance
- Green space – concrete is dirty
- Site design should include courtyards, kidney and organic shapes
- Looks Inviting – where car wash was, and auto repair spot good candidates
- Roundabout with public art that also provides access into the development at the QFC site
- Three choices of housing – smaller to larger multifamily
- Green space options, creative choices
- Outdoor seating
- No "Theme" that is required, flexibility

S 227th Street/Marine View Drive Node

- Wayfinding signs to bring people down to Marina and guide them to parking, etc.
- View corridors
- Trees in median (keep medians weeded)
- Variety and flexibility in architecture
- Roundabouts for intersections (i.e., S 227th/Marine View Drive)
- Artistic shops, plants, public space on interior
- Pedestrian friendly
- Strobe warning lights for crosswalks

- Establish "Adopt a Street" and "Adopt a Green Space" programs to help with beautification and maintenance
- Provide lots of open space and green space

Table 2:

General Comments

- Establishing basic 20-year plan (downtown vision) is important
- What is the 20-year cost of paving/maintenance along Marine View Drive S? It may be beneficial to declassify/remove the state highway status (i.e., balance the City cost vs. the ability to create a vibrant Main Street with angle parking along Marine View Drive)
- Roundabouts on Marine View Drive to improve circulation and calm traffic
- Wayfinding/signage to help people navigate to and through the Marina District
- Gateways – decorative light standards to create sense of place (example: bridge at S 216th/MVDS)
- Water feature at gateway/s
- More shops, retail, more parks and recreation activities, good grocery store (i.e., PCC – Puget Consumer Co-op)
- Shuttle between Marina and Downtown
- Transit loop from Marina District to Pacific Highway S
- More defined walking path around downtown
- Fewer bars
- Banners (seasonal)
- Street trees, flower planters and/or hanging baskets (drip irrigation) throughout; incorporate infrastructure such as access to water when water system upgrade occurs
- Developers will not want to pay for all infrastructure improvements
- Marine View Drive - traditional main street with angle parking
- Invest in alleys
- Maximize height where feasible/not overbearing
- Mixed use development
- Gathering place on waterfront in Marina area

S223rd/7th Avenue S Node

- Need businesses to walk to in center of S 223rd
- Smaller scale, quaint, walkable, historic
- Focus on getting down to Marina via S 223rd
- Stairs at end of S 223rd above marina hill climb (i.e., stairs with elevator similar to Pike Place Market and/or Harbor Steps)
- More restaurants at Marina/Beach Park
- Declassify Marine View Drive from State Highway status
- Focus on Marie View Drive as "Main Street" to support existing businesses

- Development along S 223rd should only extend partially onto 7th Avenue S (mid-block from S 223rd) then grow out over time
- Keep buildings on Marine View Drive lower scale (35-40 feet)
- 7th Avenue S - maximize heights without compromising views
- Add street trees and flower baskets along MVD, S 223rd and 7th Avenue S
- Marina serves as main gathering place
- Add bus terminal at S 223rd/Marine View Drive
- Stairs/elevator at hill climb to/from Marina

S216th/Marine View Drive Node

- Increase height (60+ feet)at QFC site to encourage redevelopment and increase the number of people living in Marina District
- Possibly increase heights to 45 feet directly to the south
- Roundabout at S 216th Street/Marine View Drive to provide gateway and slow traffic
- Create a gateway at bridge from Des Moines Memorial Drive/MVDS – incorporate gateway signage, decorative fencing, artwork and pedestrian scale lights – shows Des Moines cares about its image and enticement that there's more to come
- Fountain/water feature at Big Catch Plaza
- Future use at Des Moines Elementary potential asset for sports activities

S 227th Street/Marine View Drive Node

- Potential for higher building heights
- Strengthen connections to the Marina

Table 3:

S223rd/7th Avenue S Node

- Green and trees on Marine View Drive makes it more pedestrian friendly
- Marine View Drive: 19,000-20,000 vehicles per day (vpd) and 7th Avenue S: 3,000-4000 vpd
- Lack of benches
- Feel unprotected next to the traffic on Marine View Drive
- Lack of sidewalks along S 223rd
- No destination – No incentive
- Only one waterfront restaurant
- Lack of easy connection to the Marina from node – lack of clearly defined sidewalk
- Lack of sidewalk on S 240th Street creates a barrier for Highline Community College students to walk to Downtown
- City should take risk and buy land to consolidate for redevelopment project – to relocate library Downtown? Or even City Hall? – this will generate more business for cafes and lunch spots

S216th/Marine View Drive Node

- Create a clearly visible pedestrian access off of 7th Avenue S down to Beach Park Trail with signage to it that is visible from Marine View Drive
- Metropolitan Market instead of QFC, PCC
- Like to see mixed-use
- More inviting art/water feature at Big Catch Plaza – we already have a glass artist in Des Moines

S 227th Street/Marine View Drive Node

- Cover/screen boat yard at entrance to Marina District and use its surface for a "Welcome to the Marina District" sign or put up historical images of Des Moines
- Don't like seeing Jack-in –the-Box, Taco-Time, 7-Eleven or other fast food as "first impression"
- Provide continuous sidewalk (paved with trees and landscaping) from Pacific Highway/Kent-Des Moines Road to S 227th/Marine View Drive

Marina District Planning

Summary of Stakeholders Meeting #2 – October 6, 2010

OVERVIEW

The purpose of the Stakeholder Group Meeting #2 was to gain a better understanding of the various facets of development and redevelopment and to review and comment on land use Scenario 1.0 which reflected the input and ideas from the Stakeholder Group Meeting #1.

Staff presented additional information on the factors that affect the success of development projects such as required utility infrastructure, precedents for higher building heights and land values, along with an overview of some of the tools and incentives to support redevelopment. Insights on job creation and resident spending were also presented to demonstrate the potential economic benefits from new development and redevelopment in the Marina District.

Scenario 1.0 was introduced to the group. Staff described the general land use, scale of development and pedestrian environment for each node. Initial modeling for the S 233rd Street corridor from Marina View Drive to Cliff Avenue was also shared with the group.

The remainder of the meeting was dedicated to small group discussions to refine Scenario 1.0. Each group was asked to think about some of the broader policy questions for implementing the Stakeholder Group's ideas:

- Should the City initiate/jump start change with public investments?
  - Purchase property for public-private partnership?
  - Relocate City Hall or the library to Marina District?
- Declassifying Marine View Drive from a State Highway designation was proposed - Given the time and cost associated with this action (i.e., City takes over the ownership of the bridge and operation and maintenance costs for Marine View Drive and Kent-Des Moines Road):
  - Should this receive priority over other improvements identified for the Marina District?
  - If so, who pays for the new operations and maintenance costs? City-wide tax levy? Marina District levy?
- Roundabouts have been discussed many times over the past years
  - Is this an important element that the City needs to explore further? If so, what priority should it take?
  - Who pays for improvements? Establish Local Improvement District?
  - Should this receive priority over other improvements identified for the Marina District?

Each group designated a spokesperson tc report out to the at large group at the end of the brainstorming session.

SUMMARY

Stakeholders Group members broke out into three working groups. Each group was asked to evaluate Scenario 1.0 keeping in mind the following questions:

- *What is needed to support a vibrant and sustainable community?*
- *What opportunities or limitations exist?*
- *What is missing?*

Refinements to Scenario 1.0 reinforce the need to improve the character and image of the Marina District through enhanced gateways, wayfinding signage, pedestrian scale lighting, and branding. An eclectic mix of uses as well as entry level, mid level and high end housing are important elements for attracting people to use and live in the area. Many recommend focusing economic development efforts on one node or at the Marina and letting the market determine how the other areas develop. At the policy level, it was recommended that the City initiate the zoning changes and incentives now to be ready for an upswing in the market. This included raising building heights and extending the multifamily tax exemption to the Marina District to help jump-start development. Traffic roundabouts at S 216th and S 227th Streets were seen as important gateway and traffic calming features. Options for angle parking along Marine View Drive and 7th Avenue S were also discussed.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

A summary of the ideas and comments generated by each of the working groups is provided below. The summary is based on the notes taken at each table and the group report-outs.

TABLE 1:

General Comments

- The Marina is the key to revitalizing the community
  - Restaurant and amenities at the Marina so it is used (not a "walk through")
  - Maritime museum on Marina floor
  - Facility for community/group events
- Electric Utilities – Need a map showing 3-phase power grid to better understand the system; Are there latecomer fees?
- Signage – "Welcome to Marina District"
  - From gateways to Marina
  - From Des Moines Creek Trail to Marina
  - Should there be consistent/conforming signs on all storefronts? (no consensus)
- Branding – fun destination, maritime images (including modern images)
- Inexpensive artistic effects – altering chain link on bridge, night lighting
- Pedestrian traffic – slow down cars, night lighting
- Angle parking along Marine View Drive

- Idea - property owners can give up some frontage to accommodate angle parking similar to what's in front of the theater
- WSDOT comment - back in angle is safer

- Make land use changes now before economy pops
- Building heights – raise them now
- Hard to compete with cost of existing space unless heights are raised to spread costs over more square footage
- Don't move City Hall or library to downtown – they don't draw enough people
- Market will determine land use at each node
- Housing should be a blend of entry level, mid level and high end
- Land is still affordable in Des Moines
- MFTE – expand Multifamily Tax Exemption to Downtown for mixed use buildings

S223rd/7th Avenue S Node

- 7th is the key component to success - create vitality, pedestrian friendly (Note - in response to the question "How should each node function?")
- Leave Marine View Drive alone
- Could S 223rd Street become Main Street?
- Boutique hotel on S 223rd above Marina

TABLE 2:

General Comments

- Wayfinding signage is needed
- Need a front door entrance at each side of a store (i.e., corner lots)- example Mill Creek
- Incentives – pedestrian friendly
- Hire one person to put developers and tenants together (i.e., Walla Walla success story)
- Speed reduction – convert Marine View Drive and 7th Avenue to one way couplet
- Allow for angle parking
- Make one node work, success of the others will follow

S216th/Marine View Drive Node

- QFC Plaza – find anchor tenant such as Whole Foods and Starbucks

TABLE 3:

S223rd/7th Avenue S Node

- Keep buildings south of S 222nd lower
- Stop light signals need to be more equal for east-west queues (e.g., cars on S 223rd E/W wait longer than cars N/S on Marine View Drive)
- Bars – need standards for the type of bars located in the Marina District
- Running paths
- Trader Joes

- People Avenue to Marina
- Bring museum to S 223rd
- More art, more green...

S216th/Marine View Drive Node

- Change perception from residential to commercial – lots of retail and services
- Des Moines Memorial Drive and S 216th is the entry from north to commercial
- Mid-height buildings 35-45' (minority opinion)
- Make entryway inviting (arch/gateway) to raise anticipation and make people happy to leave Normandy Park and Burien
- Connection to Des Moines Creek Trail and Beach Park Historic District
- Pedestrian crossing – light at S 219th Street or red flags at a minimum
- Businesses should front on 7th Avenue from S 216th to S 227th Street
- Integrate lights (pedestrian scale??)
- Roundabout at each end (S 216th Street and S 227th Street)

S 227th Street/Marine View Drive Node

- Improve aesthetics – make more attractive
- Restore small boater access to water
- Design to create anticipation:
  - Beautiful water feature/plaza
  - Attractive businesses
  - Kiosk for visitors/Marina customer
  - Clean up roadway along Kent-Des Moines Road/10th Ave S to S 227th/Marine View DR
  - Attractive cinema at S 226th Street (Stegan property)
  - Lower scale size buildings
  - Make old theater into a live theater
  - Join the yacht club to launch
  - Opportunities to generate revenue
  - Integrate branded lighting that says "Des Moines"
- Boutique shops, restaurants w/ outdoor seating and things that advertise welcome folks
- Create a sense of place with street arches/entry ways
- Use more "green" technology
- Business should reflect the Marina
- Incentivize building in the Marina to grow the Marina District
- Create a "Blue Zone" (e.g., support arts, boost walking and biking, create greenbelt, prohibit drive through, shrink signage, control signage)
- A place to escape from the world (District)

Marina District Planning

Summary of Stakeholders Meeting #3 – November 3, 2010

OVERVIEW

The purpose of the Stakeholder Group Meeting #3 was to review the stakeholder contributions to date, make additional refinements to Scenario 1.0 and discuss and confirm policy recommendations for the Planning Agency and City Council consideration.

Staff shared the initial modeling of the Stakeholder Group ideas from meetings 1 and 2. The model depicted building heights at 45 feet along 7th Avenue S between S 222nd and S 225th Streets and at 65 feet on the QFC site. In addition, the envisioned streetscape was shown along S 223rd Street from Marine View Drive to Cliff Avenue.

Staff provided an overview of how current development standards and design guidelines were applied when characterizing the building design. Stakeholders were also able to see what it might be like to stand on the ground in the model and from various perspectives within and adjacent to the Marina District. This allowed the Stakeholders to better understand the topographic characteristics of the area and potential view impacts.

Discussion of Scenario 1.0 and proposed policy recommendations focused on economic opportunities, building heights, traffic circulation, and access to the Marina. In general, there is consensus on the broader land use and streetscape character as described for Scenario 1.0. Increasing building heights is deemed critical for existing properties (i.e., Stegin property, QFC and others) to redevelop; however, the Stakeholder group wants to ensure that increases are considered through a special review process in order to monitor change incrementally. It was noted that land assembly would be necessary for any significant development projects to occur.

Although there were differing opinions on where to focus economic development efforts, allowing more mixed use on the Marina floor and providing a direct connection from the Marina floor to S 223rd was identified as the key to the overall success of the Marina District vision. It was suggested that the City sell property on the Marina floor for commercial development; however, staff pointed out that the land was acquired for a public purpose and indicated that a long-term lease might be an option for consideration. Other comments included the need to provide a range of housing choices, to plan for a younger population (including Highline Community College students), and to ensure the Marina District sets itself apart from other communities. The idea of a one-way couplet was tabled given the fact that couplets have not always worked well in other communities (i.e., City of Redmond).

The following summarizes the general policy direction provided by the Stakeholder Group:

- Increase building heights now to stimulate economic investment. Allow flexibility regarding where height increases are permitted to ensure existing underdeveloped properties can take advantage of the opportunity.
- Ensure that affordable housing choices are available within the Marina District and that developers are incentivized to provide housing to different economic segments of the population.
- Use Development Agreements or the Planned Unit Development process rather than an area-wide rezone to allow increased building heights – this would enable the City to monitor the pace and form of development and its impact on other properties.
- Focus economic efforts on attracting commercial development to the Marina Floor and investment in a stair climb and elevator to S 223rd Street.
- Focus the initial pedestrian and streetscape improvements on S 233rd Street from Cliff Avenue to Marine View Drive.
- Establish a Local Improvement District and/or other alternative funding approach that targets funds for completing the pedestrian access from the Marina floor to S 223rd as well as streetscape improvements. This could be tied to height bonuses or other deviations from development standards.

In summary, the Stakeholder Group was in support of a Developer and Property Owner Forum and broader community outreach to confirm the vision and policy recommendations of the group. They also expressed an interest in reconvening in early 2011 to discuss the outcome of the Developer/Property Owner Forum and community outreach efforts and finalize their recommendations to the Planning Agency and City Council.

Planned Unit Development Code Revisions

Preliminary Discussion for Prioritization of 2011 Work Program

Overview

Staff identified approximately 80 different code revision items for consideration in the development of the 2011 Work Program at the October 12, 2010 Finance and Economic Development Committee meeting. The Committee recognized the need to prioritize work and cull items from the list in order set realistic expectations of what could be achieved during the 2011 calendar year. About 21 items were identified as something that should be "universally understood" by Council and therefore determined to be relatively easy to fix (low-hanging fruit) and require the least amount of time to process. Another 7 items were distilled from the original list of 80 items as being high priority, but believed to be not as easy to process; these items would individually require significant time to complete. One of these 7 items seemed to have particular appeal to the Committee—the reworking of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Code. The PUD seemed to be a mechanism that might be useful in providing more flexibility from underlying zoning standards in the Marina District on a case-by-case basis. The purpose of this discussion sheet is to root out policy considerations and provide more details about how this code could potentially be modified so that the Committee can seek support and direction from Council to undertake this effort.

What are PUD's?

PUD's are used to provide flexibility from the specific, and perceived rigid, height and bulk standards to the underlying zone that applies to a particular project or development. PUD's in Des Moines have not traditionally allowed much change in the uses that are permitted in the underlying zone of a property, though this is possible if a PUD ordinance were constructed that way. PUD's are a zoning overlay; this means that all underlying zoning rules apply, unless they are specifically requested and approved to be modified. The City Council reviews and approves all PUD's and applies a "blanket" of new zoning requirements that augment and modify the underlying zone requirements.

What has the City's experience been using PUD's?

PUD's have been extremely beneficial for both the developer and the city during the last 20 years. No code can be written in such a way that all issues and circumstances are contemplated. The PUD process has enabled us to navigate around unanticipated and unique circumstances and adapt quickly. Next, trends in development are never static, they are always adapting to the marketplace which is constantly changing. PUD's help the City keep up with new trends—especially housing. Finally, PUD's allow for creativity and innovation. Having diverse developments within the city from a functional and physical appearance standpoint are very import to public perception of creating a vibrant, non-cookie cutter

[illegible]

Staff [illegible] the 2011 [illegible] meeting. The [illegible] residential [illegible] Planning [illegible] as [illegible] dens [illegible] Development [illegible] flexibility [illegible] of the [illegible] code could [illegible] to undo the [illegible]

[illegible]

PUD's are [illegible] the underlying zone that applies to a [illegible] tradition [illegible] allowed much [illegible] though it is possible if a PUD [illegible] PUD's are a [illegible] means that all underlying zoning must [illegible] approved [illegible] modified. The City Council [illegible] requirements of [illegible]

What has the City's [illegible] zoning PUD's?

PUD's have been extremely beneficial [illegible] city during the last 20 years [illegible] code can be written in such a way [illegible] circumstances [illegible] The PUD [illegible] has enabled us to [illegible] development [illegible] changing. PUD's [illegible] City [illegible] creativity and [illegible] Having [illegible] the city from [illegible] approved standards [illegible] of housing [illegible]

community. PUD's have become so necessary that almost all of our residential subdivisions in the last 10 years have been packaged as a PUD.

Despite their popularity and our dependency upon them, PUD's have not been without their issues. There is a stigma that developers are trying to avoid the "real" rules if they apply for a PUD. Staff is sometimes criticized for backing PUD projects because we are enabling developers to circumvent our codes and "what really is intended" for new development under our codes. This has been the source of considerable friction at the Council level as well as between some Council members and staff. This issue can be traced back to the awkward construction and direction in the PUD code itself. Another problem with PUD's is that while we have used them a lot for single family residential purposes, we are inexperienced (except for Waterview Crossing) applying them to mixed uses and commercial situations which is where the majority of the new growth with occur in Des Moines from this point forward. The review of a commercial PUD has been made more complex than it needs to be and in the process of doing so, it lends itself to opening up the floodgates on issues that are not even related to the subject of a PUD hearing. Developers are very nervous about exposure to their project and going backwards in their pursuit of a development approval or permit. Developers feel that some issues that have been reviewed and approved administratively are all of a sudden re-opened and ridiculed at a PUD hearing. They then go on to complain of losing time and money to appease Council concerns that are not even a part of the PUD review. A final challenge of PUD's is determining if the project merits are equal to or greater that what the codes that the city is being asked to reduce or eliminate. In the final analysis, Council is asked to make a judgment call if a proposed PUD is as good as or better than traditional development. This is hard for the Council to quantify and can lead can lead to apprehension.

What questions should we be asking ourselves as we consider reviewing the PUD Code?

1. Is our current PUD Code functioning the way we would like or does it need to be easier and more encouraging for developers to use?

2. Should the purpose of a PUD be more clearly stated and expanded to include virtually all design possibilities that exist or focus mainly on clustering density?

3. Does the City want to have PUD's with different flexibility allowances depending on the use, location, or zone that is involved? For example, should PUD's have different requirements/rules that address the future needs of the Marina District as opposed to a project located in a single family residential zone?

4. Are there standards or requirements that are off-limits and should not be modified under a PUD?

5. Should a PUD be formalized with a Development Agreement?

6. Does a PUD only work if it has a minimum site size?

7. Does a PUD always have to be processed under the rules of a subdivision?

8. Should commercial projects using a PUD have built in safeguards that insulate components of developer's projects from changes or revisions when those issues are not the subject of the PUD request or is everything up for grabs?

9. Should PUD's that offer increased development capacity be metered out in a pre-determined manner for specific geographic areas (especially the Marina District) or should PUD's be offered to anyone who wants to apply for them regardless of what has happened with neighboring properties?

10. Should there be allowances for modifications to an already approved PUD especially when details of future phases of development are not fully known?

11. Should expiration of a PUD approval be eliminated in the code and time constraints be customized into a Development Agreement instead?

12. How should density be calculated under a PUD (gross or net site area)? Is this even an issue for the Marina District where there is no density cap?

13. How does the City want to approach the give-and-take relationship of a PUD? Should it be evaluated more holistically or based on how it offsets each individual item requested to be modified?

Chapter 18.52
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Sections

18.52.010 Purpose of planned unit development.

Wherein the zoning map establishes only zone boundaries and the text of this title establishes the permitted use of land in the various zones and the conditions applicable to such use, and wherein all of the provisions, conditions, and requirements set forth in this title are in general, designed to apply to individual lots and minimum area parcels, a planned unit development, as the term is employed in this title has the following purposes:

(1) To produce a development which would be as good or better than that resulting from the traditional lot by lot development, by applying to large areas, whether consisting of consolidated lots or unsubdivided property, the same principles and purposes inherent in the required provisions applying to individual lots or minimum area parcels;

(2) To correlate comprehensively the provisions of this title and other ordinances and codes of the city, to permit developments which will provide a desirable and stable environment in harmony with that of the surrounding area;

(3) To permit flexibility that will encourage a more creative approach in the development of land, and will result in a more efficient, aesthetic, and desirable use of open area, while at the same time, maintaining substantially the same population density and area coverage permitted in the zone in which the project is located;

(4) To permit flexibility in design, placement of buildings, use of open spaces, circulation facilities, off-street parking areas, and to best utilize the potentials of sites characterized by special features of geography, topography, size, or shape. [Ord. 1197 § 14, 1997; Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.010), 1964.]

18.52.020 Initiation of planned unit development projects.

Planned unit development projects may be initiated by:

(1) The owner of all the property involved, if under one ownership; or

(2) An application filed jointly by all owners having title to all of the property in the area proposed for the planned development project, if there is more than one owner; or

(3) A governmental agency. [Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.020), 1964.]

18.52.030 Procedure for approval of planned unit development projects.

(1) Applications for planned unit developments shall be processed in accordance with review procedures for subdivisions as specified in chapter 17.16 DMMC (Subdivisions).

(2) The planned unit development resulting from the application of the provisions of this section shall be made a part of the zoning map, identified thereon by appropriate reference to the detailed planned unit development map and explanatory text (if any) either by number or by symbol and constitute a limitation on the use and design of the site. [Ord. 1174 § 62, 1996; Ord. 222 § 2, 1967: Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.030), 1964.]

18.52.040 Expiration.

Upon the abandonment of a particular project authorized under this chapter or upon the expiration of three years from the final approval of a planned unit development which has not by then been completed (or commenced with an extension of time for completion granted), the authorization shall expire and the land and the structures thereon may be used only for a lawful purpose permissible within the zone in which the planned unit development is located. [Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.040), 1964.]

18.52.050 Form of and contents of applications and types of information required.

(1) The community development department shall prescribe the form on which applications are made for planned unit development projects. It may prepare and provide blanks for such purpose and prescribe the type of information to be provided in the application by the applicant.

No application shall be determined to be complete unless it complies with the requirements.

(2) Application for planned unit development approval shall contain the information specified in DMMC 17.40.010 (Application materials – Short subdivisions, preliminary subdivisions, binding site plans, plat alterations, and plat vacations) and DMMC 17.40.020 (Application materials – Public notice).

(3) An accompanying explanatory text shall provide a written statement of the general purposes of the project and an explanation of all features pertaining to uses and other pertinent matters not readily identifiable in map form. The adoption of the text specifying the particular nonresidential uses permitted to locate on the site, if any, shall constitute a limitation to those specific uses. [Ord. 1197 § 15, 1997; Ord. 770 § 65, 1988: Ord. 222 § 3, 1967; Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.050), 1964.]

18.52.060 Permitted location of planned unit development projects.

(1) Residential planned unit development projects may locate only in single-family residential, RA, and multifamily residential zones when processed and authorized as provided in this chapter.

(2) Planned unit developments for other than residential uses may locate only in zones first permitting the heaviest use locating on the premises.

(3) The major internal street serving the planned unit development project in an RA or more intensive zone shall be functionally connected to a local/access street or higher-capacity roadway as defined by the Greater Des Moines Comprehensive Plan. [Ord. 1237 § 4, 1999; Ord. 1197 § 16, 1997; Ord. 222 § 4, 1967; Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.060), 1964.]

18.52.070 Required minimum site area.

A planned unit development project shall contain an area of not less than five times the minimum lot area per dwelling unit of the underlying zone. [Ord. 1197 § 17, 1997; Ord. 222 § 5, 1967: Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.070), 1964.]

18.52.080 Uses permitted.

In a planned unit development only the following uses are permitted:

(1) In a residential planned unit development:

(a) Residential units, either detached or in multiple dwellings;

(b) Accessory incidental retail and other nonresidential uses may be specifically and selectively authorized as to exact type and size to be integrated into the project by design, accessory retail uses to serve only as a convenience to the inhabitants of the project;

(c) Recreational facilities including but not limited to, tennis courts, swimming pools, and playgrounds;

(d) Schools, libraries, and community halls;

(2) In planned unit developments for other than residential uses, uses shall be limited to those permitted by the zone in which the use is located. [Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.080), 1964.]

18.52.090 Use control in planned unit developments.

Repealed by Ord. 1197. [Ord. 222 § 6, 1967; Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.090), 1964.]

18.52.100 Permissive variations in requirements.

In considering a proposed planned unit development project the approval thereof may involve modifications in the regulations, requirements, and standards of the zone in which the project is located so as to appropriately apply such regulations, requirements, and standards to the larger site. In modifying such regulations, requirements, and standards as they may apply to a planned unit development project, the following limitations shall apply:

(1) Placement of Buildings. The required yards, on-site landscaping, and open spaces and the height of the buildings involved shall dictate the location of buildings and structures within the planned unit development;

(2) Yards. Unless alternative yard areas are authorized with approval of a planned unit development, the requirements for front yards for the underlying zone shall apply to all perimeter lines of the site. In no circumstance shall yards as measured from perimeter lot lines of the planned unit development be less than 10 feet from the front and five feet from the side and rear lot lines;

(3) Open Spaces. The distance between buildings containing dwelling units shall be not less than that required for the underlying zone. Any accessory building shall observe a distance from a building containing a dwelling unit as set forth in the underlying zone;

(4) Height of Buildings. In a planned unit development no building or structure shall exceed the height which is allowed by this title in the underlying zone for the particular type building or structure;

(5) Number of Dwelling Units. The number of dwelling units permitted in any residential zone shall be determined by dividing the net development area by the minimum lot area per dwelling unit required by the underlying zone. Net development area shall be determined by subtracting the area set aside for churches, schools, or commercial use from the total development area;

(6) Permitted Site Coverage. The permitted percentage of coverage by buildings and structures for the net development area as determined in subsection (5) of this section shall not exceed the percentage of coverage permitted in the underlying zone;

(7) Permitted Floor Area. The maximum permitted floor area for all buildings shall not exceed the floor area permitted in the zone first permitting the use authorized;

(8) Off-Street Parking. The total required off-street parking facilities shall be not less than the sum of the required parking facilities for the various uses computed separately. All provisions of chapter 18.44 DMMC (Loading Areas and Off-Street Parking) shall be adhered to. [Ord. 1237 § 4, 1999; Ord. 1197 § 18, 1997; Ord. 222 §§ 7, 8, 1967; Ord. 175 §§ 1(24.56.100), 30, 31, 1964.]

18.52.105 Recreation area required.

(1) Within a planned unit development in a single-family residential or RA zone, park land shall be provided as specified by DMMC 17.36.150 (Parks).

(2) Within a planned unit development in a multifamily residential zone, on-site recreation area shall be provided as specified in chapter 18.45 DMMC (Multifamily Recreation Areas). [Ord. 1237 § 4, 1999; Ord. 1197 § 19, 1997; Ord. 901 § 6, 1991.]

18.52.110 Minor adjustments in planned unit development.

In issuing building permits in connection with the construction of a planned unit development, the building department may make minor adjustments involving the location or dimensions of buildings; provided, such adjustments shall not increase the total amount of floor space authorized in the planned unit development, or the number of dwelling units, nor decrease the amount of parking or loading facilities, nor permit buildings to locate closer to any boundary line, nor change any points of ingress and egress to the site. [Ord. 175 § 1(24.56.110), 1964.]