City Council
Tuesday, June 12, 2018
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
7:00 PM

Note: The time frames assigned to agenda items are estimates for guidance only. Agenda items may be heard earlier or later than the listed time slot.

Special Meeting Agenda

1. CALL TO ORDER

7:00 – 8:00 PM

2. DISCUSSION/DIRECTION – UPDATE ON COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGN STANDARDS AND SIGN CODE PROJECT AND POLICY GUIDANCE
   - Staff Presentation
   - Public Comments (Please limit to three minutes each)
   - Council Questions & Comments

3. ADJOURN

Study Session Agenda

8:15 – 9:00 PM

1. DISCUSSION WITH PLANNING COMMISSION ON MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST

2. ADJOURN

Citizen Information
If you wish to speak at the City Council meeting, please fill out a sign-up card and present it to the City Clerk.

Persons with disabilities planning to attend the meeting who need sign language interpretation, assisted listening systems, Braille, taped material, or special transportation, should contact the City Manager’s Office at 303 335-4533. A forty-eight-hour notice is requested.

City of Louisville
City Council 749 Main Street Louisville CO 80027
303.335.4536 (phone) 303.335.4550 (fax) www.LouisvilleCO.gov
SUBJECT: DISCUSSION/DIRECTION: UPDATE ON COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGN STANDARDS AND SIGN CODE PROJECT AND POLICY GUIDANCE

DATE: JUNE 12, 2018

PRESENTED BY: KRISTIN DEAN, PRINCIPAL PLANNER

SUMMARY:
The City is currently updating the Commercial and Industrial Development Design Standards and Guidelines and the sign regulations. The consultant for this update is Russell + Mills. The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the project and to seek policy guidance on allowed height in different commercial and industrial areas of the City.

From this meeting, the key elements that Staff requests City Council input centers on:

1. Confirming the height policies as set forth in various plans.
2. Translating the number of stories to appropriate allowed heights in feet.
3. Setting or confirming policies to achieve the heights which are found to be appropriate in different areas, such as allowing the heights by right, by Special Review Use and/or by waiver request.

PROJECT UPDATE:
The City last updated the Commercial Development Design Standards and Guidelines (CDDSG) and the Industrial Development Design Standards and Guidelines (IDDSG) in 2000. It is recognized that many of these standards and guidelines are outdated and do not reflect the current development trends nor vision for development within the City. The updated Design Guidelines will focus on maintaining current small town character, architectural integrity and aesthetics, multi-modal connectivity, integrated landscape features, site drainage, parking lot layout and circulation, and will include sustainability measures as determined through the review process and based on sound industry standards.

The project schedule consists of 1) public input and information gathering, 2) creation of draft documents, and 3) review and adoption of final design standards. Currently, staff and the consultants are completing the public input and information gathering process and also working on the draft of the proposed changes.

A meeting with a focus group consisting of architects, engineers, landscape architects, developers, local business owners and residents convened on March 1, 2018 to obtain initial feedback, input and perspective on the existing regulations and thoughts regarding ideal changes. Russell + Mills followed up with individual phone calls and
meetings with focus group members whom were interested in sharing more thoughts and ideas. A summary of their comments is attached (Attachment 1).

A public workshop was held on April 26, 2018 which drew approximately 20 members of the public. Staff promoted the workshop through advertisements in the Colorado Hometown Weekly, the EngageLouisville website, email notifications and the City calendar and news events notifications. The workshop included a survey which covered many of the categories included in the CDDSG and the IDDSG that are being considered for amendments. A summary of the public input is attached (Attachment 2). A similar survey will be added to the EngageLouisville site in the near future in order to reach a larger audience for public participation and feedback in this endeavor. Staff will promote participation in the survey, additional workshops, and public meetings through emails, newspaper advertisements, on the City website and at local events such as Street Faire, the Farmer’s Market, and Concerts in the Park.

City staff in the Planning, Parks, and Public Works departments have also met with Russell + Mills several times to discuss issues with the current regulations and to also discuss options for changes. Russell + Mills is currently in the process of preparing a draft of the proposed changes. Once the draft is complete, meetings with the focus group, the public, and staff will be scheduled to present the draft and obtain feedback. The draft will then be presented to various boards and commissions including the Planning Commission, Public Parks and Landscape Advisory Board, Open Space Advisory Board, the Sustainability Board and to City Council.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:

Height Policy Issue
In analyzing the Comprehensive Plan, South Boulder Road Small Area Plan and the McCaslin Boulevard Small Area Plan for guidance in developing the draft regulations, Staff reviewed the building height policies for each commercial and industrial area in the City subject to the CDDSG and IDDSG. The policies set forth in the advisory documents specify the areas desired for buildings to be a maximum of one to two stories and other areas where a mix of two and three story buildings are desired. The CDDSG and the Municipal Code (Code) both specify height in feet and not stories. Thus, with the Small Area Plans and the Comprehensive Plan both envisioning buildings in stories, it is necessary to ensure there is a clear translation between feet and stories as the amendments to the Design Guidelines are processed. Thus, staff seeks Council and Planning Commission confirmation of these policies, what heights should correspond with policies related to the number of stories, and clarification where there may be conflicts in policy prior to completing the first draft of the revised design guidelines.
**Height- Regulatory Comparisons**

Currently, the CDDSG limits height to 35-feet, and 42-feet to the top of the rooftop mechanical screen. Architectural elements such as domes, spires, towers, etc. may exceed the 42-foot height limit up to 50-feet when authorized through the PUD process. In the IDDSG, height is limited to 40-feet to the top of the parapet and 50-feet for architectural projections. The municipal code specifies a maximum height of 50-feet for buildings on properties zoned Industrial.

In most all zoning districts, the height permitted reflects the height allowed by the CDDSG. However, in the A-O and AO-T zoning districts, the Municipal Code ("Code") limits height to 25-feet. In the B-O zoning district, the Code allows up to 40-feet in height. Thus, there are areas where the zoning code and provisions set forth in the CDDSG conflict. Additionally, both the South Boulder Road Small Area Plan and the McCaslin Blvd. Small Area Plan include “Height Plans” which specify where one, two, and three story buildings are preferred, but do not specify the actual desired height. Under each of these plans, there are additional conflicts between the height that is envisioned under the plans and the height that is permitted under the Code. These conflicts are discussed in more detail within the respective plan area discussion in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Municipal Code (ft)</th>
<th>CDDSG (ft)</th>
<th>Small Area Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-O</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO-T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>No Code Standards</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCZD-C</td>
<td>varies per GDP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40 (IDDSG)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCZD-I</td>
<td>Per the Business Center at CTC GDP</td>
<td>35-40 feet (CDDSG &amp; IDDSG)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2013 Comprehensive Plan**

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan identifies character zones to “clarify and illustrate the community’s expectations related to the City’s land use functions, form, and character…and to ensure the City’s Vision Statement and Core Community Values are properly translated and illustrated in the Comprehensive Plan.” The Comprehensive Plan defines three development patterns in the City; urban pattern, suburban pattern, and rural pattern. The development patterns dictate how parcels are subdivided, building design and arrangement on the street, and how parks and public spaces are integrated into neighborhoods.
The Comprehensive Plan further identifies five development types that occur throughout Louisville: centers, corridors, neighborhoods, special districts, and parks/open space. The development types reflect the types of uses and activities appropriate for each area and include policies related to density and the amount of public infrastructure desired in different areas of the City.
The South Boulder Road Small Area Plan ("SBR SAP") and the McCaslin Blvd. Small Area Plan ("McCaslin SAP") further specify the desired and unique development patterns for each of these character areas.

**South Boulder Road Small Area Plan**

Per the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, most of the South Boulder Rd. area is in the Urban character zone, except for the western portion of South Boulder Rd., which was left undetermined between Urban and Suburban. The area around the intersection of South Boulder Rd. and Hwy 42/96th St. is designated a Center development type to the east, west, and north, and the Neighborhood type further off the major roads. Centers are intended for a mix of uses and more activity while Corridors are for more specialized uses along major roads, and Special Districts are intended for developments like office parks.

Both the SBR SAP and the McCaslin SAP includes a "Building Height Plan" which specifies commercial areas where one to two story buildings are preferred and other commercial areas where three story buildings could be considered. The SBR SAP Building Height Plan specifies one story buildings are desired on properties adjacent to South Boulder Road and Hwy. 42, and second story buildings along South Boulder Rd. and Hwy. 42 may be allowed by special review. For the remainder of the properties in the study area that are not adjacent to those two arterial roads, two story buildings are permitted and three story buildings may be permitted by special review.
The SBR SAP also includes graphics to demonstrate the variations in height envisioned for this corridor.
Zoning designations in this area include AO, O, CC, CB, and PC.

As noted in the beginning of this memo, in the area where the AO and O properties are located, there are several conflicting policies between the Code and CDDSG requirements and the Height Plan. Under these zoning designations, the Code limits the height to 25 feet for AO, but the CDDSG would allow for 35-feet in height. Section 17.28.020 of the Code specifies that where there are conflicts between the CDDSG and the Code, the more restrictive will prevail. However, per the Height Plan, the portions of these properties adjacent to SBR are envisioned to have buildings of one to two stories. There are also portions of these properties that could permit up to three story buildings. There are no other properties zoned AO in the City. It should also be noted that the O zoning district is actually an outdated zoning district and there is a likelihood that this property could be rezoned in the near future.
Thus, Staff requests input from Council regarding the appropriate height for buildings on properties zoned AO. Should it be determined that three stories could be appropriate, then a Code Amendment would be required to increase the permitted height in these zoning districts.

Staff also requests confirmation that the height plan included in the South Boulder Road SAP accurately reflects the height restrictions desired by the community. The plan would allow for one-story buildings along South Boulder Road and Hwy.42/96th St. and a two-story building would require a SRU. The plan would further permit two-story buildings set back from the arterial roads and three-story buildings would be permitted with a SRU.

If Council determines this is the appropriate height plan for this area, then Staff further requests confirmation that all two story buildings along the arterials and all three story buildings allowed further back from the arterials should only be approved through a Special Review Use process. Section 17.14.100 of the Code sets forth the following criteria for evaluating a Special Review Use:

1. That the proposed use/development is consistent in all respects with the spirit and intent of the comprehensive plan and of this chapter, and that it would not be contrary to the general welfare and economic prosperity of the city or the immediate neighborhood;
2. That such use/development will lend economic stability, compatible with the character of any surrounding established areas;
3. That the use/development is adequate for internal efficiency of the proposal, considering the functions of residents, recreation, public access, safety and such factors including storm drainage facilities, sewage and water facilities, grades, dust control and such other factors directly related to public health and convenience;
4. That external effects of the proposal are controlled, considering compatibility of land use; movement or congestion of traffic; services, including arrangement of signs and lighting devices as to prevent the occurrence of nuisances; landscaping and other similar features to prevent the littering or accumulation of trash, together with other factors deemed to effect public health, welfare, safety and convenience;
5. That an adequate amount and proper location of pedestrian walks, malls and landscaped spaces to prevent pedestrian use of vehicular ways and parking spaces and to separate pedestrian walks, malls and public transportation loading places from general vehicular circulation facilities.

While the CDDSG can be revised to specify those areas which require an SRU in order to construct a two or three story building, the update to the CDDSG could also be used as a mechanism for determining those areas that would meet the criteria for an SRU and therefore specify where the two and three story buildings are permitted by right.
Thus, Council could consider removing the SRU requirement for two to three story buildings in the plan area or could also consider directing staff to identify areas that could be considered to meet the SRU criteria and therefore those certain areas would not require the SRU.

**McCaslin Blvd. Small Area Plan**

Under the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, the southern portion of the McCaslin Blvd. area is in the Urban character zone, while the northern portion was left undetermined between Urban and Suburban. The Urban character zone calls for smaller blocks, more connected streets, and a more pedestrian friendly environment, while the Suburban character zone calls for more auto-oriented development on larger blocks with larger streets. The intersection of McCaslin Blvd. and Dillon Rd. was designated a Center development type, with the Corridor development type to the north.

The McCaslin SAP further breaks down the areas into Corridor, Center, and Edge categories. Center development corresponds to the urban pattern and consists of small parcels with limited landscaping. Buildings are oriented toward streets and sidewalks with small, consistent setbacks. Pedestrian and bike connectivity is provided by street and sidewalk networks. Corridor development corresponds to the suburban pattern and consists of medium-sized parcels with more formal landscaping. Buildings are oriented toward streets and parking lots with varying setbacks. Pedestrian and bike connectivity is provided by large sidewalks, on street bike lanes, and hard surface trails. Edge development corresponds to the rural pattern and consists of large parcels with natural landscaping. Buildings are clustered with significant setbacks from
streets. Pedestrian and bike connectivity is provided by soft-surface trails. The McCaslin SAP building height plan specifies that buildings should be a maximum of two stories on properties adjacent to McCaslin Blvd. and also in areas adjacent to residential zoned properties. A mix of two to three story buildings are permitted on all other properties within the plan area. Two and three story buildings do not require a special review use in the McCaslin area.
The McCaslin SAP further illustrates the building heights intended for each specific area along this corridor. For example, the Urban Center designated areas should exhibit 1-2 stories along McCaslin whereas up to 3 stories are permitted within the development.
For Corridor Development in the McCaslin area, a similar concept is also envisioned, with 2-story buildings fronting McCaslin Blvd. and up to 3 stories within the development area.

Staff requests that Council confirm that the height limitations set forth under the McCaslin SAP are considered to be appropriate for the area.

The majority of the McCaslin SAP area is zoned CC or PCZD and both zoning districts align with the 35-foot height limit established in the current CDDSG. The Centennial Valley General Development Plan (GDP) does not include height standards, and therefore the maximum heights are based on the height limits established under the CC and CB zoning districts.
The Century Park Office Center is zoned Business Office (BO) which permits structures to be 40-feet in height. The existing buildings along McCaslin located on properties zoned BO are all one and two stories. The buildings in this zoning district which are not directly adjacent to McCaslin are also a mix a one and two story buildings. With the BO zoning allowing buildings to be constructed up to 40-feet, Staff requests Council's direction in regards to the appropriate height of structures in this area. Specifically, does Council find it appropriate to permit buildings up to 40-feet in height in the BO zoning district on properties adjacent to McCaslin, or should those buildings be limited to one and two stories maximum as outlined in the McCaslin Blvd. Height Plan?

**Height vs. Story**
The Municipal Code does not define "story". Thus, under the current CDDSG, where three story buildings are permitted by the Small Area Plans, the building height is limited by the specified height in the CDDSG and the underlying zoning district. Thus, in most areas, a three story building would need to be designed to be no taller than the 35-foot height maximum. However, with current trends in architecture, building three stories within a 35-foot height maximum could pose some architectural challenges or limitations. It is not to say that it cannot be accomplished, but most likely, the building would be designed with a flat roof and lower floor plates, than the market currently desires, especially at the ground floor where retail is desired.
Current industry practices generally include a 12 to 14 foot ground floor retail space with 9 – 10 foot upper level office space. Factoring in all of structural needs for mechanical, plumbing, etc., achieving three stories within 35 feet can be challenging. Thus, with the update to the CDDSG, where three story buildings are permitted or desired in accordance with the SAPs, Staff requests guidance from Council as to whether the CDDSG should allow for taller building heights consistent with other three story buildings and market trends as a by right use, providing a more streamlined review process. Alternatively, additional height could be achieved through a special review use process or by waiver.

There are currently several buildings in the McCaslin area which are three stories, but not all are within the McCaslin SAP plan area. Two within the McCaslin are located at 361 and 363 Centennial Parkway. The buildings were approved under the same PUD on January 6, 1998 and are similar in style. The buildings are 46-feet at the top of the parapet and include several approximately 2-foot architectural elements above the parapet line. The screen walls measure 52’8” above grade. Each floor is approximately 15-feet in height.
Other three story buildings in the McCaslin Area include the LaQuinta Inn (42.2.- feet), the Courtyard Marriott (47-feet) and the Hampton Inn (approx. 45-feet). In the South Boulder Road area, the Christopher Plaza building is three stories and approximately 42-45 feet in height.

Staff is requesting input from Council regarding the appropriate height for three-story buildings. For reference, the Mixed Use Development and Design Standards and Guidelines (MUDDSG), which are applicable to development on properties zoned MU-CC and MU-R permits two and three story buildings. The MUDDSG specifies that two story buildings are limited to 35-feet in height while three story buildings are limited to 45 feet in height inclusive of any parapet or rooftop mechanical equipment.

Attachment 3 provides eight models of varying building heights and stories. The graphics illustrate varying floor heights and levels of building articulation and include photographs of existing buildings which demonstrate similar characteristics. All of the models include a 3.5-foot parapet. The images include:

1. Two story buildings approximately 28-feet in height with minimal building articulation, and setback 30-feet from the ROW. The first floor is 15-feet in height and the second floor is 10-feet in height.
2. Three story buildings, approximately 35-feet in height with minimal building articulation, setback 15-feet from the ROW. Each floor is 11-feet in height.
3. Three story buildings approximately 40-feet in height with moderate building articulation, and setback 15-feet from the ROW. The first floor is 15-feet in height and the second and third floors are 11-feet in height.
4. Three story buildings, approximately 40-feet in height, with second and third story step backs, and 15-feet from the ROW. The first level is 15-feet in height and the second and third floors are 11-feet in height.
5. Three story buildings, approximately 45-feet in height, and setback 15-feet from the ROW. The third level is stepped back from the first and second levels. The first level is 15-feet in height and the second and third floors are 13.25-feet in height.
6. Three story buildings, approximately 45-feet in height, setback 40-feet from the ROW. The third story is stepped back from the first and second stories. The first level is 15-feet in height and the second and third floors are 13.25-feet in height.
7. A mix of two and three story buildings and setback 15-feet from the ROW. The second story is 28-feet in height and the third story is 40-feet in height.
8. A mix of two and three story buildings, predominately three stories and setback 15-feet from the ROW. The second story is 28-feet in height and the third story is 40-feet in height.

To be consistent with current trends in architecture and to facilitate the ability to achieve better overall design, City Council could consider allowing three story buildings to be a
maximum of 45- feet in height, inclusive of the parapet and rooftop mechanical equipment. City Council could also consider requiring that any buildings over a certain height, for example 35-feet, be required to include additional articulation, including step backs at the third story.

Questions for Council
1. Is Council supportive of the heights envisioned by the SBR SAP and McCaslin SAP Height Plans?
2. Should a SRU be required for two and three story buildings where specified under the SBR SAP or should more consistency in process be provided between commercial areas?
3. Should the maximum height permitted for three-stories be increased from 35 feet to 45 feet, including parapets or to some other specific height standard?
4. Where increased height is permitted, should additional architectural standards such as setbacks on the third level or additional architectural features be required?
5. For properties zoned AO and within the SBR SAP, should a Code Amendment also be processed which would allow for taller buildings in accordance with the vision set forth in the Building Height Plan?
6. For the properties zoned BO in the McCaslin Blvd. SAP, should 40-foot tall buildings continue to be permitted where the height plan limits buildings to a maximum of 2-stories?

Additional Options for Council Consideration:
1. Continue to limit the height to 35-feet and require waivers for anything above 35-feet through the PUD process.
   a. Continue to also require a SRU for 2 and 3-story buildings in the SBR SAP.
2. Add provisions in the CDDSG which allow for taller buildings (40-45’) where the SAP allows for 3 stories. The height would include parapets.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Focus Group feedback
2. Survey Results from the April 26, 2018 Public Workshop
3. Models demonstrating varying heights and architectural features
4. Presentation
Meeting Minutes: Focus Group Meeting 1

Louisville Design Standards and Guidelines
Meeting date: March 1, 2108 6-8pm
Location: City of Louisville Building

Attendees
Andy Johnson  DAJ Design
Erik Hartronft  Hartronft & Associates
Kyle Callahan  Callahan & Associates
Carol Adams  Studio Terra
Greg McMenamin  McMenamin Design Associates
Leslie Ewy  Sanitas Group
Jim Vasbinder  Etkin Johnson
Jeff Sheets  Koelbel
Walt Koelbel  Koelbel
Josh Heiney  Comunale Properties
Jim Loftus  Loftus Developments, LLC
Scott Rechenberg  The Colorado Group
Audrey DeBarros  Commuting Solutions
Debra Williams  Planning Commissioner
Elizabeth Kaufman  Resident
Chris Hagelin R  Resident
Steven Williams  Resident
Linda Boyd  Resident
Paul Mills  Russell + Mills Studios
Craig Russell  Russell + Mills Studios
Shelley La Mastra  Russell + Mills Studios
Robert Zuccaro  City of Louisville
Kristin Dean  City of Louisville
Lisa Ritchie  City of Louisville
Lauren Trice  City of Louisville

Site Planning
McCaslin
- McCaslin area over-parked, parking should be looked at/studied
- Over-parking is a big problem, sea of parking, detracts from the character of the overall corridor
- Over-parking doesn’t promote a walkable environment
- If users have other options for transportation then parking can be reduced
- You can do other things with the space if you aren’t providing parking
- Colony Square is adequately/under parked, poorly designed for access
- McCaslin will redevelop slowly over time, it will take time to implement change
- Totally possible to fill in the gaps in the McCaslin corridor

Setbacks
- Setbacks should be adjusted - they are too far
- Size of building should dictate setbacks
- Larger grocery store could have 80’ setback with smaller parking lot in front and remaining parking on sides to eliminate sea of parking
Gathering areas
- Places like the Sams Club site would be a phenomenal place for a gathering place. Could bring the residential and commercial together/create interface
- Alfalfas public gathering is successful
- Louisville lacks successful outdoor areas
- Look to Jeffco standards - common amenity counts double toward open space requirement

Lighting
- Wasn’t addressed in the presentation, but is intended to be addressed

Parking Lots
- Side or rear parking does not work for some retailers, front door parking is needed in some cases
- Mixed use businesses/restaurants have parking problem
- If multi-modal requirements are increased then parking requirements can be decreased
- Parking based on tenant restrictions
- Use case studies
- Land banking for future parking
- Analyze Home Depot parking count per 1space/sf
- Too many spaces, too many cars required in this standard
- What works? Boulder too tight
- Parking requirements per zone/use need to be analyzed
- Set lower standard and encourage parking studies to permit lower counts
- Open space requirements protect from excess parking
- Open for maximize parking

Loading Areas
- Putting loading spaces in the rear and parking can potentially cause conflicts
- Lots of site planning problems in CTC, very isolated
- Need sidewalks, complete streets
- Partnering with BVSD related to streets and connections
- Think through placing walks and sidewalks where people actually want to walk.
- Consider TDM to reduce parking, including EcoPass

Other
- Infill adding buildings in empty parking areas to increase density

Access/Circulation/Connectivity

Streets
- How to create new internal street networks
- Public ROW is desirable, but it could be met through the use of greenways for walking when a new street isn’t feasible
- Residents/Schools are worried about kids crossing Via Apia
- Provide pedestrian activated safe crossings
- Residents feel like they are “walking where they aren’t supposed to walk” to get to destinations
- Sidewalks are segmented or missing
- Highway 42 is a big area of concern
- Divide larger parcels and use public ROW
- Need to improve safety of roads in Louisville
- No safe way for bikes to cross major roads
- Safe crossings do not exist
- Breaking up super blocks, hard to do piecemeal

US 36 Corridor
- The City has missed the mark on maximizing that huge investment along the 36
corridor
• Need to integrate the uses in order to create walkability. Commercial development only will not get it done
• Residential around the BRT is crucial for getting this done

Underpasses
• Continue to look at the use of underpasses as a safe way to cross these majors corridors. Use multiple funding sources and use for floodplain area

Other
• Can properties better connect to neighborhoods?

Multi-Modal
Bus/RTD/BRT
• So far, we haven’t taken advantage of the BRT improvements
• Increased use at McCaslin, but they are all arriving via car, no connectivity, located in a sea of parking
• City of Louisville needs to invest more into making RTD a more viable option, needs to be a local investment, can’t rely only on RTD to make it a viable system
• The BRT should be a focal point both for land use and for transportation

Parking
• Create parking lot connections
• Look into TDM/Eco pass program to reduce parking needs

Pedestrian/Bike
• A shorter term gain along McCaslin is to repurpose some of the front setback space, front detention areas into multi-modal infrastructure, bike lanes, bus space, etc
• CTC - hard to get there if not in a car
• Pedestrian access difficult in industrial areas

Architecture
• Building standards should be measurable/reasonable
• Building forward character
• Yes to metal, material needs to define
• Shipping containers?
• Do not limit materials but allow for design and creativity
• Look at material durability
• Issue with back of building facing street, 360 degree treatment
• Force front facing buildings

Landscape
Open Space
• Would like to see that open space does not include concrete. Whatever percentage is required should be green (or xeriscaped)
• Open space distribution per aggregate, not individual
• Percent open space - point system

Landscape & Materials
• We should not plant grass, be sensitive to the environment we live in. Grass can be appropriate for play/activity areas, but not for medians or other unused areas
• Consider appropriate plant species, ensure they don’t overgrow their space and impact visibility of businesses
• Seed vs. sod requirements
• Water conservation efforts
• Water tap credits for native plants/low water/xeric
• Flex category for industrial
• Maximum irrigated area
• Too many plants in front
• Regimented street trees should offer options to cluster trees
• Hard to see buildings & signs due to tree species and setbacks
• Performance standards with flexibility
• Landscape should not always be formal
• Requirements for tree diversity (i.e. ash borer)
• Low water/Xeric plants - no prescriptive lists
• Reduce turf - maximum for bluegrass
• Native seed areas - performance measures, soil amendments
• Interior landscape percentage better than exact spacing
• Landscape in industrial area is a conundrum - find appropriate/large scale

Detention
• Should not be in front of the building
• Should not be a place that can gather trash
• How to prevent these from becoming public health hazards, such as standing water attracting mosquitoes
• Detention can become an opportunity, could be redesigned into usable space
• Could re-purpose some of the large parking areas into detention and gain additional area for development
• Could consider a guideline that allows a detention pond to be a water feature
• Pond locations are not correct

Residential Buffers
• The top image on the residential/commercial setback should not be an option – must have a buffer with landscaping
• Some interest in a fixed buffer distance
• Just as critical for disparate uses to be closer together
• Use setback areas for walking paths to connect to open spaces

Signage
• Think of signage as wayfinding
• Not adequate signage along McCaslin, balance aesthetics and business needs
• Related to urban design (setbacks), the business can’t be seen
• No sandwich boards along McCaslin
• Who are we orienting to? Car or pedestrian?
• Wayfinding and legibility important for retail to be smaller and work. Example 29th street in Boulder

Additional Topics
Emerging Technologies
• Curbside management
• How do you leverage the good side of Uber/Lyft/others
• Flexibility/Trade-offs

Retrofit - no PUDs as long as it meets the standards - other incentives?
Public Meeting #1 - Survey Results

Date: April 26, 2018

Survey Participants:
Richard Morgan
Chuck Thomas AICP
Phyl Thomas
Aaron Clark
John Leary
Colleen Vandendrossche
Warren Bloys
David Hsu
Elizabeth Kaufman
Betty Solek
Watt Koelbel

City Staff:
Rob Zuccaro
Kristin Daan
Lisa Ritchie

Russell + Mills Studios
Craig Russell
Paul Mills
Shelley La Mastra

Which of the following best describes your interest in this project?

- Resident
- Business Owner
- Property Owner
- Design professional
- Developer

How long have you lived in or frequently visited Louisville?

- 20+ years
- 15+ years
- 10+ years
- 5+ years
- 5 or less years

How many times per week do you visit commercial (including retail) or industrial areas in Louisville?

- Daily
- 3-5 times/week
- Once/week
- Once/month
- Almost never
Public Meeting #1 - Survey Results

SITE PLANNING

**Which of the above commercial building setbacks do you find most appropriate for Louisville?**

- building closer to street
- building setback with parking between street and building
- both are acceptable
- none of the above

**Comments:**
- Along arterials only
- Disagree for multi-story buildings

**The City should consider reduced setbacks for Industrial properties.**

**The City should consider requiring building frontage at corners or along a portion of a lot in Commercial properties.**

**Comments:**
- Agree to improve pedestrian access to buildings
- Along arterials only
- Disagree for multi-story buildings
- Photos a little confusing
The City should consider evaluating required restaurant parking for two categories - standard and fast food.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- No opinion
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Other

Comments:
- Maybe - McCaslin
- Marketplace underparked
- Should be up to business and how they see their needs
- What would happen with extra space?

The City should consider evaluating required office, retail, and industrial parking requirements.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- No opinion
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Other

Comments:
- Not enough without
- Should be up to business and how they see their needs
- Strongly agree evaluating retail parking
- Retail is overparked - reduce parking requirements

The City should consider incentives for converting overparked areas to landscape areas.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- No opinion
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Other

Comments:
- Should be up to business and how they see their needs
- Incentives should be to convert the land to revenue generating purpose, like anew building, not changing it into landscape
- What would incentives/reason for owner to do this? more maintenance
- Depends, make it more user friendly?

Shared parking agreements and land banking should be considered to allow for multiple buildings using one parking area.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- No opinion
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Other

Comments:
- Only if day/night uses vary
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**SITE PLANNING**

**Which of the above gathering areas do you find most appropriate for Louisville?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>larger scale/more public</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaller scale/less public</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intimate/more private</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- • Evaluate handicap parking also
- • Quality bike parking

**Designated parking spaces for carshare, electric vehicles and carpooling could be considered.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- • Depend on overall layout of development
- • Depend on building use
- • #2 because seems similar to outdoor seating
- • More shade structures and wind breaks
- • Closer to buildings, example picnic pavilion at Kohl’s is too far from building to be

**How important is it to integrate bike/pedestrian facilities along private drives?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all important</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately important</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat important</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very important</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- • Dedicated bike and separate dedicated pedestrian
- • Yes! Bike and ped should be integrated for safety and convenience for bikers and walkers

**The City should consider better connections throughout larger developments with measurable standards.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- • Depends if people need to use them
- • As long as it’s done together with other factors
- • Home Depot is an example of how not to provide connections through larger development. Reduce setbacks of buildings to streets and bike/ped access makes buildings more accessible
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**Which image best represents the appropriate amount of irrigated lawn for Louisville’s commercial/industrial areas?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native seeded areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf in R.O.W. only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller areas of turf on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased areas of turf on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger areas of turf on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which of the above commercial/industrial landscape do you find most appropriate for Louisville?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High water use/non-native plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium water use/non-native &amp; native plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium water use/non-native plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium water use/native plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low water use/native plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- No opinion - depends on building/use
- As long as it’s not an excuse for neglected areas, “weeds” vs. native grass
- Save water! Minimal lawn. Please no “weedy” looking plants
- #1-industrial, #2 commercial
- Merge measurable vs aesthetic standards
- Process (sketch plans/reduce uncertainty) vs Standards
- Native is good. Low grasses can look like unkempt lawn
- Save water! Minimal lawn. Please no “weedy” looking plants
- #1-industrial, #2 commercial

Comments:
- Merge measurable vs aesthetic standards
- Process (sketch plans/reduce uncertainty) vs Standards
- Native is good. Low grasses can look like unkempt lawn
- No opinion - depends on building/use
- As long as it’s not an excuse for neglected areas, “weeds” vs. native grass
- Save water! Minimal lawn. Please no “weedy” looking plants
- #1-industrial, #2 commercial
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**LANDSCAPE**

Which of the above detention ponds do you find most appropriate for Louisville?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>native species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native species with wildflowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native species/manicured edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscaped as a feature with some native species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- No opinion
- Very site specific
- No concrete pans in detention ponds
- Use shared detention facilities so that don’t end up with small ugly ponds that could function as a usable/attractive feature

The City should consider allowing street trees to be clustered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Trees should not block visibility of street signs, building signs or road
- More space for tree roots, poor trees struggle to survive
- Give more space for tree roots. Cluster landscape areas for trees to be able to survive
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**LANDSCAPE**

The above landscapes generally represent appropriate solutions for Louisville.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- no opinion
- agree
- strongly agree

Comments:
- No!
- The question is confusing
- Agree - reduce amount (quantity) of landscape, change to higher quality
- Require less turf but high quality nice looking xeriscape is perfect
- Strongly agree with designs, but do not agree with reducing landscape percentage amounts
- Can we trade landscape areas around buildings with green roofs and green walls and shade structures?

**ARCHITECTURE**

The City should consider requiring industrial buildings to have more clearly defined entrances from the public R.O.W. with measurable standards.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- no opinion
- agree
- strongly agree

Comments:
- Depends upon size and number of tenants

The City should consider standardizing color palettes for commercial and industrial buildings.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- no opinion
- agree
- strongly agree

Comments:
- Prefer to have character not standardization
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ARCHITECTURE

Which of the above commercial buildings has the most appropriate level of architectural metal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metal accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal on portion of walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal walls/stone base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large wall plane areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most wall planes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• All ok - no opinion
• Should be accepted, personal preference but that subjective
• Depends upon use and location
• Fine if have variety of architectural materials

Which of the above industrial/flex buildings has the most appropriate level of architectural metal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metal accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal on portion of walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal walls/stone base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large wall plane areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most wall planes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• All ok
• Metal and updated looking buildings should be accepted
• Not this (#4, #5)
Comments:
• Adopt dark sky standards
• Full cut-off should be required, yes on lighting standard requirement
• Require building lighting to be motion detectors. Reduce night time parking lot lighting!

Comments:
• Porous paving and permeable paving
• LID and green roofs should be requirement in Louisville
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**SIGNAGE: COMMERCIAL**

### Current:
- Maximum sign area: 60 sf
- Maximum sign height: 12 ft

### Comments:
- Consider increase and decrease in standards
- Unknown—depends on building/location
- It's a waste of time and resources to have continuous waivers

### Commercial monument sign area preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Current: maximum sign area 60 sf
- Moderately increase sign area
- Significantly increase sign area

### Commercial monument sign height preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Current: maximum sign height 12 ft
- Moderately increase sign height
- Significantly increase sign height

- Comments: too reduced
Current:
Individual wall signs shall not exceed 40 sf per sign and 100 sf total

Comments:
• Up to owner and building size

Moderately increase wall sign area

Significantly increase wall sign area

Current:
1 freestanding monument sign per site

Comments:
• Up to owner
• One per entrance if can’t be seen from each/both entrances

Allow 2 or more monument signs at sites with more than one entrance (number of signs based on number of entrances)
Current:
Individual tenant: max. 18 in. ht.
Building occupied by a single tenant: 24 in. ht.

Comments:
• Up to owner and building size

Moderately increase character heights
Eliminate regulation of character heights. (signs would be still be subject to overall sign area requirements)

Current:
Monument signs max. 25 sf of sign area

Comments:
• Up to owner and building size

Moderately increase sign area
Significantly increase sign area
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**SIGNAGE: INDUSTRIAL**

- **Industrial sign number preference**
  - Current: 1 freestanding monument sign per site
  - Moderate: Allow 2 or more monument signs at sites with more than one entrance (number of signs based on number of entrances)

- **Industrial wall sign area preference**
  - Current: max. 15 sf per individual sign
  - max. 80 sf total wall signage per building
  - Moderately increase wall sign area
  - Significantly increase wall sign area

Comments:
- Up to owners
- Up to owner and building size
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**SIGNAGE: INDUSTRIAL**

**Industrial character height preference**

- Current: Individual tenant: max. 18 in. ht.
- Building occupied by a single tenant: 24 in. ht.
- Comments: • Up to owner and building size

**SIGNAGE: GENERAL**

**Downtown murals preference**

- Current: Non-commercial murals cannot exceed 50% of a building facade. Walls min. 500 sf uninterrupted space
- Moderately increase allowable size of mural to not exceed 75% of a building facade
- Significantly increase allowable size of mural to up to 100% of a building facade
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**SIGNAGE: GENERAL**

**Citywide murals preference**

- Yes
- No

**Citywide sandwich boards preference**

- Yes
- No

**Off premise temporary signs preference**

- Yes
- No
- Other

**Electronic Message Center (EMC) preference**

- No change
- Moderate change
- Significant change
- Other

Comments:
- Stricter standards for sandwich boards, want fewer

Moderate: Allow EMC’s
- Up to 50% of the sign area on a monument sign only
- Only in businesses with frontage on major arterial roadways (ie. McCaslin)
- Standards for light intensity and message transition method, duration, and hold time

Significant: Allow EMC’s
- Integrated into any sign
- Any commercial area, including downtown Louisville
- Standards for light intensity and message transition method, duration, and hold time

Comments:
- No!
- Allow without permit
- Without permit - time limit
- Allow without permit
- None please

Comments:
- No EMC’s
- Hell no!
- Or not at all
- Eliminate
- Eliminate them all
- Please eliminate altogether for business except for schools only allowed for info purpose
- Schools only!
- None please
- Don’t all them at all

36
Current: Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval with a waiver: Planning Commission
City Council

Moderate: Approval with a waiver: Planning Commission

Significant: Approval with a waiver: Administratively by City Staff

Comments:
• Direct to City Council
• Consider liability with decisions
• Planning commission not go to city council
• Moderate/significant as appropriate

GENERAL COMMENTS
• Less rules/regulations
• I favor standards/guidelines that favor sustainability and connectivity. Also need to avoid over-allocating for parking as transportation modes change
2 Story - approx. 28' height w/ 30' setback, and building articulation
3 Story - approx. 35’ height w/ 15’ setback, and building articulation
3 Story - approx. 40’ height w/ 15’ setback, and building articulation
3 Story - approx. 40’ height w/ 15’ setback, 2nd story step back and articulation
3 Story - approx. 45' height w/ 15' setback, 3rd story step back and articulation
3 Story - approx. 45' height w/ 40' setback, 3rd story step back and articulation
2-3 Story Mix heights w/ approx. 15’ setback, w/ building articulation
3-2 Story Mix heights w/approx. 15’ setback, w/ building articulation
CDDSG/IDDSG Update
1. Public input and Info Gathering
   • Focus Group Meeting #1 - 3/01/18
   • Public Workshop #1 - 04/26/2018
2. Creation and Presentation of Draft
3. Review and Adoption of Final Document

Public Outreach
• City Website
• Engage Louisville
MAIN FOCUS OF SESSION:
1. Confirm the height policies as set forth in various plans.
2. Translate the number of stories to appropriate allowed heights in feet.
3. Set or confirm policies to achieve the heights which are found to be appropriate in different areas, such as allowing the heights by right, by Special Review Use and/or by waiver request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Municipal Code (ft)</th>
<th>CDDSG (ft)</th>
<th>Small Area Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO-T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No Code Standards</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2-3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCZD-C</td>
<td>varies per GDP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40 (IDDSG)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCZD-I</td>
<td>Per the Business</td>
<td>35-40 feet (CDDSG &amp; IDDSG)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center at CTC GDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Height v. Story
• Small Area Plans refer to "stories"
• CDDSG/IDDSG/Code specify height in feet
• CDDSG = Max 35'
• 3 stories at 35' can be architecturally challenging

3 Development Patterns
• Urban, Suburban, & Rural

5 Development Types
• Centers, Corridors, neighborhoods, special districts, & Parks/Open Space

Centers: Mix of Uses & More Activity
Corridors: Specialized Uses along major roads
Special Districts: ex. Office Parks
SRU Criteria

1. That the proposed use/development is consistent in all respects with the spirit and intent of the comprehensive plan and of this chapter, and that it would not be contrary to the general welfare and economic prosperity of the city or the immediate neighborhood;

2. That such use/development will lend economic stability, compatible with the character of any surrounding established areas;

3. That the use/development is adequate for internal efficiency of the proposal, considering the functions of residents, recreation, public access, safety and such factors including storm drainage facilities, sewage and water facilities, grades, dust control and such other factors directly related to public health and convenience;

4. That external effects of the proposal are controlled, considering compatibility of land use; movement or congestion of traffic; services, including arrangement of signs and lighting devices as to prevent the occurrence of nuisances; landscaping and other similar features to prevent the littering or accumulation of trash, together with other factors deemed to effect public health, welfare, safety and convenience;

5. That an adequate amount and proper location of pedestrian walks, malls and landscaped spaces to prevent pedestrian use of vehicular ways and parking spaces and to separate pedestrian walks, malls and public transportation loading places from general vehicular circulation facilities.
Up to 3 stories within the development

1-2 stories along McCaslin

INSERT DISCUSSION RE: OTHER 3 STORY BUILDINGS
1-2 Stories along McCaslin

Up to 3 Stories internal

BO - Max height of 40'.
2 Story - approx. 28’ height w/ 30’ setback, and building articulation

3 Story - approx. 35’ height w/ 15’ setback, and building articulation
3 Story - approx. 40' height w/ 15' setback, and building articulation
3 Story - approx. 45' height w/ 15' setback, 3rd story step back and articulation

3 Story - approx. 45' height w/ 40' setback, 3rd story step back and articulation
2-3 Story Mix heights w/ approx. 15’ setback, w/ building articulation

3-2 Story Mix heights w/ approx. 15’ setback, w/ building articulation
Questions for Council

1. Is Council supportive of the heights envisioned by the SBR SAP and McCaslin SAP Height Plans?

2. Should a SRU be required for two and three story buildings where specified under the SBR SAP or should more consistency in process be provided between commercial areas?

3. For properties zoned AO and within the SBR SAP, should a Code Amendment also be processed which would allow for taller buildings in accordance with the vision set forth in the Building Height Plan?

4. For the properties zoned BO in the McCaslin Blvd. SAP, should 40-foot tall buildings continue to be permitted where the height plan limits buildings to a maximum of 2-stories?

5. Should the maximum height permitted for three-stories be increased from 35 feet to 45 feet, including parapets or to some other specific height standard?

6. Where increased height is permitted, should additional architectural standards such as setbacks on the third level or additional architectural features be required?
SUBJECT: DISCUSSION WITH PLANNING COMMISSION ON MATTERS OF MUTUAL DISCUSSION

DATE: JUNE 12, 2018

PRESENTED BY: KRISTIN DEAN, PLANNING & BUILDING SAFETY

SUMMARY:
This joint discussion between City Council and the Planning Commission provides a forum for open dialogue to discuss mutual interests and provide input regarding the development review process and broader City topics. While this discussion may lead to covering a variety of topics, Staff suggests the following questions which may help facilitate the conversation.

1. What type of feedback is City Council most interested in hearing from the Planning Commission regarding the development review process?
2. What should be the highest priorities from a development or design perspective for the Planning Commission in their review?
3. What perspectives of the City Council is the Planning Commission interested in hearing to help guide decision making?