



City of Loveland

**LOVELAND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
AGENDA**

**Monday, July 11, 2016  
500 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street – Council Chambers  
Loveland, CO 80537  
6:30 PM**

*The City of Loveland is committed to providing an equal opportunity for services, programs and activities and does not discriminate on the basis of disability, race, age, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation or gender. For more information on non-discrimination or for translation assistance, please contact the City's Title VI Coordinator at [TitleSix@cityofloveland.org](mailto:TitleSix@cityofloveland.org) or 970-962-2372. The City will make reasonable accommodations for citizens in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). For more information on ADA or accommodations, please contact the City's ADA Coordinator at [ADACoordinator@cityofloveland.org](mailto:ADACoordinator@cityofloveland.org).*

*“La Ciudad de Loveland está comprometida a proporcionar igualdad de oportunidades para los servicios, programas y actividades y no discriminar en base a discapacidad, raza, edad, color, origen nacional, religión, orientación sexual o género. Para más información sobre la no discriminación o para asistencia en traducción, favor contacte al Coordinador Título VI de la Ciudad al [TitleSix@cityofloveland.org](mailto:TitleSix@cityofloveland.org) o al 970-962-2372. La Ciudad realizará las acomodaciones razonables para los ciudadanos de acuerdo con la Ley de Discapacidades para americanos (ADA). Para más información sobre ADA o acomodaciones, favor contacte al Coordinador de ADA de la Ciudad en [ADACoordinator@cityofloveland.org](mailto:ADACoordinator@cityofloveland.org).”*

**LOVELAND PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:** Jeremy Jersvig (Chair), Carol Dowding (Vice-Chair), Michelle Forrest, Pat McFall, Buddy Meyers, Rob Molloy, and Mike Ray, David Cloutier, Jamie Baker Roskie.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**III. REPORTS:**

**a. Citizen Reports**

This is time for citizens to address the Commission on matters not on the published agenda.

**b. Staff Matters**

- 1. July 25, 2016 Planning Commission Agenda Preview – no items on the agenda at this time.**
- 2. July 26, 2016 Joint Study Session with City Council – Electronic Signs. The meeting begins at 6:30 p.m.**
- 3. Flexible Zoning Overlay District Code Amendment Update: City Council 1<sup>st</sup> reading has been rescheduled to August 2<sup>nd</sup>.**
- 4. Invitation for Planning Commissioners to attend the High Plains School Grand Opening on August 2<sup>nd</sup> (sneak peek at 4:00 p.m. and opening ceremonies at 5:00 p.m.).**

5. Linda Bersch will be filling in for Jenell in August and September in the role of interim Planning Commission Secretary.
6. **City Manager Update:** Steve Adams, former Director of the Water and Power Department, has assumed City Manager duties as of July 1.
7. **Hot Topics:**  
On July 19<sup>th</sup>, the City Council will consider a West Eisenhower Reinvestment Zone, generally focusing on the area between Taft and Wilson.

c. **Committee Reports**

d. **Commission Comments**

1. **Motion to cancel the July 25, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.**

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Review and approval of the June 27, 2016 Meeting minutes**

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

**STUDY SESSION**

1. **PUD Options (Brett Limbaugh)**

**CITY OF LOVELAND**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**June 27, 2016**

---

A meeting of the City of Loveland Planning Commission was held in the City Council Chambers on June 27, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. Members present: Co-Chairman Dowding, and Commissioners Meyers, Molloy, Forrest, Ray, McFall, Roskie, Cloutier. Members absent: Chairman Jersvig. City Staff present: Bob Paulsen, Current Planning Manager; Moses Garcia, Assistant City Attorney; Jenell Cheever, Planning Commission Secretary.

*These minutes are a general summary of the meeting. A complete video recording of the meeting is available for two years on the City's web site as follows: <http://loveland.pegcentral.com>*

**CITIZEN REPORTS**

There were no citizen reports.

**STAFF MATTERS**

1. **Robert Paulsen**, Current Planning Manager, provided a preview of the July 11<sup>th</sup> and July 25<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission Meeting.
2. **Mr. Paulsen** noted that the Planning Commission and City Council will have a joint study session on July 26<sup>th</sup> to discuss Electronic Sign Provisions
3. **Mr. Paulsen** stated that the first reading for the Flexible Zoning Overlay provisions will be presented to City Council on July 5<sup>th</sup>.
4. **Mr. Paulsen** stated that the West Eisenhower Reinvestment Zone is on the July 19<sup>th</sup> City Council agenda.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no committee reports.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

There were no comments.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

*Commissioner Meyers made a motion to approve the June 13, 2016 minutes; upon a second from Commissioner Forrest the minutes were unanimously approved.*

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**1. Anderson 1<sup>st</sup> Subdivision Preliminary Plat Extension**

**Project Description:** This request requires quasi-judicial review by the Planning Commission to consider extension of the Preliminary Plat for Anderson 1st Subdivision for an additional one-year period. The preliminary plat and PUD Preliminary Development Plan

were approved by the City in January 2009. Extensions have been granted by the City since that time to keep the plat and plans valid. The most recent extension was granted by the Planning Commission on 8/10/15 for one year.

The property is located at the northeast corner of South Lincoln Avenue and South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street. The western portion of the property, consisting of approximately 34 acres, is zoned E-Employment and is controlled by a Concept Master Plan. The eastern portion of the property, consisting of 89.35 acres, is zoned “Ridge at Thompson Valley PUD” which allows a maximum of 152 dwelling units, and a gross density of 1.7 dwelling units per acre. Planning Commission has final authority on this matter.

*Commissioner Meyers motioned to approve the items on the consent agenda. Upon a second by Commission Molloy, the motion was unanimously approved.*

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

### **2. Plan of Development (DDA)**

**Project Description:** This item was continued from the June 13, 2016 Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to adjust the Plan of Development to reflect Commission comments provided at the June 13, 2016 meeting.

The Plan of Development (DDA Plan) for the Loveland Downtown Development Authority (DDA) was initially reviewed by the Planning Commission on June 8, 2015 and subsequently approved by the City Council on July 7, 2015. The DDA Plan has been amended to incorporate minor changes in anticipation of the 2016 ballot measure—the ballot measure is needed to secure revenue generating measures for the DDA. By statute, the Planning Commission must review any Plan amendments, making a recommendation to the City Council for adoption. The amendments are reflected in redline format in the submitted Amended DDA Plan.

The DDA Plan is defined as a plan for the development or redevelopment of the DDA District over a thirty to fifty year period. After receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, the City Council will hold a public hearing and thereafter consider a resolution approving the Amended DDA Plan. Review of this Amended Plan does not require a public hearing.

**Mike Scholl** stated that the commissioners’ requested revisions were incorporated into the Plan of Development per guidance from both the DDA and City of Loveland Attorneys.

## **COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS:**

- **Commissioner Myers** asked for clarification on the definition of food sales tax. **Blair Dickhorner**, Attorney representing the DDA, stated that the definition of food sales tax is defined in the City Code.

- **Commissioner Meyers** also asked if the plan defines items that should be taxed and items that are exempt from food sales tax. **Mr. Scholl** stated that the city is experienced with segregating out different items that should and should not be taxed.

*Commissioner Molloy motioned to recommend the City Council adoption of the Amended Plan of Development for the Downtown Development Authority. Upon a second by **Commissioner Forrest** the motion passed with five ayes and three nays (Commissioners Ray, McFall, and Meyers).*

### 3. Gatorwest Annexation and Zoning

**Project Description:** This is a public hearing regarding the proposed annexation and zoning of a 2.3-acre property located at 5100 Granite Street. The associated zoning request is for B - Developing Business. Annexation is a legislative matter, and final decision making authority rests with the City Council. The property is located along the west side of North Garfield Avenue (State Hwy. 287) to the north of 50th Street and to the south of Ranch Acres Drive. This area of Garfield includes a mix of commercial businesses and vacant property; there is a mixed pattern of annexed land in this area. The annexation and zoning request is compliant with State Statutes and with City policies and staff believes that all key issues have been resolved. Consequently, staff is recommending that the Planning Commission recommend approval of this application to the City Council.

**Noreen Smyth**, Senior Planner, provided a project description and noted that the project meets the requirements for city annexation. The property is currently vacant; however, it is mostly surrounded by developed property. **Ms. Smyth** noted that city staff is recommending the two conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Several commissioners raised initial questions, expressing concerns with increased traffic on Granite Street and asked if it was possible for the property to obtain access off of Highway 287. **Ms. Smyth** noted that the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) would need to approve access from Highway 287 and it is unlikely CDOT would issue this approval.

**Bryan Short**, project applicant and property owner, provided a brief description of his business and his request to build a new office building at this location once annexation has been accomplished.

Several commissioners asked what the estimated traffic increase and impact on the neighborhood would be. **Mr. Short** stated that the impact would be minimal, explaining that he has a couple of survey crews with approximately six people each that would operate from the site. In addition, the facility would receive small deliveries from UPS approximately every other day. **Mr. Short** noted that all retail operations are primarily internet based, thus minimizing traffic associated with product sales.

**Commissioner Roskie** asked if the automotive repair business mentioned in the Concept Review is still considering renting space onsite. **Mr. Short** noted that this business is no longer a potential renter because the use requires Special Review approval.

## CITIZEN COMMENTS:

**Commissioner Dowding opened the public hearing at 6:55 p.m.**

- **Darrell Hughes**, resident, asked what the differences are between the B Zoning District in the county and city and why the business could not exist in the county. Mr. Hughes also expressed concerns that the site is located near a large elementary school and that residents already have problems with traffic flow. Mr. Hughes also asked if there is another potential tenant that could rent space onsite.
- **Marvin Oleske**, resident, stated that he felt the business is ideal for this site and it is consistent with the other small businesses surrounding the property. However, he stated that he preferred that the business stay in the county because much of the surrounding property is in the county.
- **Gail Woofter**, resident, stated that the residents already experience traffic congestion and would like to know how many accidents have occurred in the past year at Highway 287 and Ranch Acres. Ms. Woofter expressed concerns for the safety of the children in the neighborhood and asked what it means that the right-of-way was vacated or abandoned. Ms. Woofter requested that the fire department review the plan to determine the required width of the street to accommodate emergency vehicle access.

**Commissioner Dowding closed the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.**

- **Ms. Smyth** addressed the questions asked during the public hearing. She noted that an intergovernmental agreement between the city and Larimer County specifies expectations and requirements for the annexation of property that is located within the city's Growth Management Area. **Ms. Smyth** noted several benefits of annexing the property into the city, including the ability of the city to ensure that future development is aligned with the recently adopted 287 Strategic Plan and the city's new comprehensive plan..
- **Ms. Smyth** explained that a right-of-way on 51<sup>st</sup> Street, previously intended for the extension of 51<sup>st</sup> Street, had be vacated and is now part of private land. Consequently, 51<sup>st</sup> Street will not be extended to intersection Hwy. 287 in the future.
- **Ms. Smyth** noted that Fire reviewed the plan and didn't have any issues with the current access to the site.

## COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS:

- **Commissioner Meyers** asked what the burden to the city would be to provide paving operations and street plowing for the additional street right-of-way to be annexed. **Ms. Smyth** stated that the city would provide services to the annexed streets; snow plowing for local streets, however, is a low priority. The county would continue to provide service to the south and the north of the site.

- **Commissioner Molloy** asked if it was possible to reduce the permitted uses by right in a zoning district. **Ms. Smyth** stated that these types of restrictions are typically done in a property zoned in a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and not a standard zoning district.
- **Commissioner Meyers** asked for clarification on who would provide police service to the site and **Ms. Smyth** noted the error in the Staff Report and stated that the City of Loveland would provide service.
- **Mr. Short** was asked if he had any plans to add a future tenant and **Mr. Short** stated that he is upgrading to a larger facility so he may have space to rent. However, the use would most likely be office space or another complimentary business.
- **Mr. Short** noted that based on parking capacity he is not anticipating a large number of vehicle traffic.

#### COMMISIONER COMMENTS

- **Commissioner Ray** stated that this type of business is ideal for a residential area because it won't generate a lot of traffic. Commissioner Ray asked if it was possible to put a condition on the property limiting the uses by right. **Mr. Paulsen** and Assistant City Attorney, **Moses Garcia**, noted that it may be possible but is not a recommended approach.
- **Commissioner Meyers** stated that he did not support conditional zoning or limiting uses that would be allowed by zoning.
- **Commissioner Molloy** agreed that a business of this type typically has very limited traffic but was concerned with adding another renter depending on the use.
- **Commissioner Cloutier** agreed that this is a good use for the area and that it would be beneficial if the city had control over the property versus the county.
- **Commissioner McFall** expressed concerns with the traffic impact on the area; however, he feels the business is a good fit for the area.
- **Commissioner Roskie** stated support for the project and did not recommend placing constraints on the uses through an annexation agreement. Commissioner Roskie stated that she respects the traffic concerns expressed by the neighbors; however, the traffic generated by the school is actually up to the school to manage and not the city.
- **Commissioner Forrest** stated that this is a perfect size of business for the site and is an opportunity to start implementing the Highway 287 requirements. Additionally, the size of the project will limit the use by any other tenant.
- **Commissioner Dowding** thanked the citizens who provided comments. Commissioner Dowding asked if the plan meets the Comprehensive Plan and Highway 287 Strategic Plan requirements and **Ms. Smyth** verified that it did. Commissioner Dowding stated that the size of the business was a good fit for the area and did not feel the use would create heavy traffic.

**Commissioner Dowding** asked if the applicant accepts the conditions listed in the staff report; **Mr. Short** confirmed that he accepted the listed conditions.

*Commissioner Ray moved to make the findings listed in Section VIII of the Planning Commission staff report dated June 27, 2016 and, based on those findings, recommend that City Council approve the Gatorwest Addition, subject to the conditions listed in Section IX, as amended on the record, and zone the addition to B Developing Business. Upon a second by Commissioner Meyers, the motion was unanimously approved.*

**ADJOURNMENT**

*Commissioner Meyers, made a motion to adjourn. Upon a second by Commissioner Ray, the motion was unanimously adopted.*

**Commissioner Dowding adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.**

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Carol Dowding, Planning Commission Vice-Chair

---

Jenell Cheever, Planning Commission Secretary



## MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 11, 2016

FROM: Brett Limbaugh, Director, Development Services Department  
TO: Loveland Planning Commission  
SUBJECT: Proposed Planned Unit Development Ordinance

Staff has been working with the Title 18 Committee since early 2015 to revise zoning ordinance regulations. Recently the Title 18 Committee forwarded a new Flexible Zoning Overlay ordinance to the Planning Commission designed to expedite the redevelopment of property within the city infill areas and along major street corridors. Staff and the Title 18 Committee have recently discussed a revised Planned Unit Development- PUD ordinance that could be used primarily for larger multi-phased projects. Staff will present this new approach to the PUD process at the Planning Commission Study Session on July 11<sup>th</sup> to receive input from Planning Commissioners. A preliminary draft of the ordinance is attached to this memorandum. While the Commission cannot take formal action under the study session format, staff is seeking any guidance the Commission may have regarding the proposed process. Following the study session, staff expects to bring the provisions through a public comment period and the public hearing process over the next several months.

The proposed ordinance is designed to streamline the development review process and decrease the time required by the developer, staff, Planning Commission, and City Council to process a Planned Unit Development. The present ordinance requires either a 3 or 4 step approval process including:

1. **Sketch plan** for a conceptual review by Staff prior to submittal of a General Development Plan or Preliminary Development Plan.
2. **General Development Plan - GDP** (required for multi-phased projects) for review by Staff and Planning Commission with an approval by City Council.
3. **Preliminary Development Plan - PDP** (for single phase project or a phase of an approved GDP) to be reviewed by Staff and approved by the Planning Commission. Appeals would be forwarded to City Council.
4. **Final Development Plan - FDP** (required for land within an approved PDP) to be approved by Staff with appeals to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

This existing process is lengthy when taken in the four step order and redundant if the applications are processed concurrently. Staff is proposing a two-step PUD process consisting of the following applications:

1. **PUD Concept Plan** - A single sheet diagram to be reviewed by Staff prior to the preparation of a PUD Zoning Document.
2. **PUD Zoning Document** - A multiple sheet document to be reviewed by Staff, Planning Commission and approved by City Council in the same manner as a rezoning.

**Benefits:**

This proposed process would take half the time of the existing process and provide assurances of what development would occur on the property over multiple years and phases. Staff would follow the provisions approved within the approved PUD Zone Document when subdividing property just as it would for a standard zone district chapter.

In most cases developers with large land holdings subdivide and develop only portions of a master planned community and seek to reduce their costs until they are ready to apply for building permits. As a result developers are seeking a method to ensure that the basic zoning entitlements are in place so that they can market their property and adjust the subdivision, product type and architecture to respond to changing economic conditions. The new process would effectively zone the property and allow the expenses of the subdivision plat, traffic study, drainage study, building design, engineering and street construction drawings to be delayed until such time as the market would allow construction.

Staff and Planning Commission should prefer this method as a way to master plan and link major transportation, drainage systems, recreation and public facilities over a longer planning horizon. This type of planning process is preferred for greenfield development along the periphery of the city and will encourage annexation of those lands within the Loveland growth areas.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Draft Planned Unit Development Ordinance

## **Draft Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning District.**

- A. *Purpose.* The purpose of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning District is to provide a process for the creation of a zoning district that allows for a mix of land uses and development standards that would not otherwise be permitted within the conventional zoning districts of this chapter. Once approved by City Council a PUD secures the land use and development standards for the property as a separate and unique zoning district. A PUD may be approved for a range of project sizes including but not limited to large scale projects with multiple lots and a mix of land uses or for a small-scale single lot project which requires flexibility because of unique circumstances or to promote unique design.
- B. *Intent.* The intent of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) regulations is to permit greater flexibility of use and, consequently, more creative and imaginative design for development than generally is possible under conventional zoning regulations. It is further intended:
  1. To promote more economical and efficient use of land;
  2. To provide flexible zoning entitlements for projects that may be subdivided and developed in multiple phases;
  3. To establish a method for providing future connections between existing and proposed developments in order to achieve an integrated community with common open space, transportation, transit, and public services networks; and
  4. To allow for innovative development projects.
- C. *Definitions.*
  1. **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM.** The development review team (DRT) is composed of city staff and representatives of outside agencies that have an interest in or would be affected by a proposed PUD application. The Director of Development Services shall maintain a list of current members and may revise the list. The Director or designee within the department will select members from the DRT list and forward PUD applications to the selected members for review and comment.
  2. **PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD).** A zoning district designation for a tract of land controlled by one or more landowners, which is developed under a plan for either residential, commercial/retail, industrial, public, agricultural, open space, or recreation uses or a combination thereof.
  3. **PUD CONCEPT PLAN.** A preliminary development plan submittal to be reviewed by the development review team prior to the preparation and submittal of a PUD zoning document. The PUD concept plan is designed to aid the city and applicant in preparing a complete PUD zoning document application.
  4. **PUD ZONING DOCUMENT.** A zoning entitlement document to be reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council. The PUD zoning document is not an overlay district and once approved is the official zoning district designation for the property. An approved PUD zoning document is recorded at the County Register of Deeds and is used to guide the future subdivision and development of the property.

**D. *PUD concept plan application requirements and approval process.***

1. *PUD concept plan submittal requirements.* A completed application form shall be submitted with the PUD concept plan. The PUD concept plan shall be submitted on a single sheet at a suitable scale and contain the following information:
  - a. Perimeter property lines with measurements;
  - b. Existing and platted streets within or adjacent to the proposed development with right-of-way dimensions and street names;
  - c. Proposed collector or arterial streets within or adjacent to the proposed development with right-of-way dimensions and street names;
  - d. Land use and zoning district designations for adjacent properties;
  - e. The development areas or parcels within the property shall be labeled with the proposed land use(s), total acres and square feet, development density by dwelling units per acre and/or floor area ratio, and maximum area to be used for outdoor storage and large vehicle parking;
  - f. Location and type of existing and proposed vehicle access points along the perimeter of the property;
  - g. Location of existing irrigation ditches, flood plains, drainage courses, parks, trails, storm water facilities, culverts, easements and underground utilities, existing buildings to remain, wooded areas, wetlands and other significant natural features;
  - h. Locations of proposed storm detention and/or retention facilities;
  - i. Topography at no greater than 5-foot contour intervals; and
  - j. A title box with the name of planned unit development; name, address, and phone numbers of the landowner(s); applicant, if different from landowner(s), and any entity charged with the preparation of the PUD concept plan; and date of submission with provisions for dating revisions.
2. *PUD concept plan review process.*
  - a. The applicant shall submit the PUD concept plan to the Department of Development Services for referral to DRT.
  - b. The DRT shall review the PUD concept plan. Comments from development review team are collected by the Department of Development Services and returned to the applicant. The applicant may choose to revise the PUD concept plan and submit for an additional review. There is no formal approval by the city of a PUD concept plan. All comments from the DRT are designed to assist the applicant in the development of the PUD zoning document application.

**E. *PUD zoning document application requirements and approval process.***

1. *PUD zoning document application requirements.* The PUD zoning document application shall include the following:
  - a. A completed application form and fee;
  - b. Proof of ownership;
  - c. A letter of consent to file the PUD zoning document application signed by the land owner(s) if that owner is not the applicant;
  - d. An accurate legal description for the property;

- e. Preliminary drainage study and preliminary drainage plan (if required by the City Engineer);
- f. Master transportation plan (if required by the City Engineer);
- g. A Phase I environmental study (if required by the Director of Development Services);
- h. The PUD zoning document shall be submitted in an electronic format at a suitable scale and sheet size to be determined by the Department of Development Services. The final approved PUD zone document shall be submitted on mylar with original signatures for recording at the Larimer County Clerk and Recorder. Each sheet shall be numbered and contain a title box with the name of planned unit development; name, address, and phone numbers of the landowner(s); applicant, if different from landowner(s); and any entity charged with the preparation of the PUD document; and date of submission with provisions for dating revisions. The PUD zoning document will consist of multiple sheets and shall be formatted as follows:
  - 1) *Section 1 cover sheet.*
    - a) Vicinity map at a suitable scale showing all roadways within ½ mile of the property;
    - b) Legal description;
    - c) Signature blocks in accordance with city standards; and
    - d) Table of contents for all sheets within the PUD zoning document.
  - 2) *Section 2 land plan sheet(s).*
    - a) North arrow and scale (written and graphic) on all sheets at a suitable scale. If it is not possible to contain the entire development on the first sheet at this scale then the first sheet in this section shall contain a composite drawing showing the entire development with match lines and designated sheet numbers;
    - b) Perimeter property lines with measurements;
    - c) Existing and platted streets within or adjacent to the proposed development with right-of-way dimensions and street names;
    - d) Proposed collector or arterial streets within or adjacent to the proposed development with right-of-way dimensions and street names;
    - e) Land use and zoning district designations for adjacent properties;
    - f) The development areas or parcels within the property shall be labeled with the proposed land use(s), total acres and square feet, development density by dwelling units per acre and/or floor area ratio, and maximum area to be used for outdoor storage and large vehicle parking;
    - g) Location and type of existing and proposed vehicle access points along the perimeter of the property;
    - h) Location of existing irrigation ditches, flood plains, drainage courses, parks, trails, storm water facilities, culverts, easements and underground utilities, existing buildings to remain, wooded areas, wetlands and other significant natural features;
    - i) Locations of proposed storm detention and/or retention facilities; and
    - j) Topography at no greater than 5-foot contour intervals.
  - 3) *Section 3 building bulk standards and site development standards.*
    - a) A building bulk standards table including the proposed development parcels and building type(s) permitted within the parcel (i.e. single-family detached,

townhouse, commercial, industrial) along the vertical axis (rows) and the proposed standards (i.e. lot size, lot frontage, building setback, building height, floor area, dwelling unit area, lot coverage, parking and loading) along the horizontal axis (columns). Additional tables may be added for landscaping requirements and signage or a statement shall be added that the city development standards as adopted and amended shall apply.

- b) A section may be added granting the Director of Development Services the authority to approve variances to the bulk standards and site development standards provided there is a specific maximum percentage or amount that can be approved administratively. All other administrative approvals shall be subject to those permitted by § 17.50.060F.

- 4) *Section 4 land use schedule.*
  - a) A land use table including the proposed development area(s) along the horizontal axis (columns) and a list of specific land uses along the vertical axis (rows). The table shall indicate whether a specific land use is a use-by-right, conditional use, accessory use, temporary use, or excluded use within each proposed development area.
- 5) *Section 5 public and private improvements.*
  - a) A narrative description and/or graphic plan detailing landscape standards for public and private parks, open spaces, and drainage facilities within the property as applicable.
  - b) Street cross section design for all streets within and along the perimeter of the property.
- 6) *Section 6 design standards.*
  - a) A narrative description and/or graphic drawings defining the character of the buildings and site development improvements to be constructed in each development parcel including the color, type, and percentage of materials used in construction of the proposed buildings, building massing, roof line slope and type, and other specific architectural features that may be provided or a statement shall be added that the city development standards as adopted or amended shall apply.
  - b) A narrative of architectural elements or building materials that the applicant may want to prohibit within the PUD zoning document may be added.

2. *PUD zoning document approval process.* The PUD zoning document approval process shall follow the city rezoning procedure.

F. *PUD zoning document amendments.*

1. An amendment to the PUD zoning document shall follow the city rezoning procedure. Minor amendments to the PUD zoning document that do not require the applicant to follow the city rezoning procedure can be approved administratively by the Director of Development Services including:
  - a. An increase or decrease in building lot coverage, housing density or floor area ratio less than 20%;

- b. An increase or decrease in lot frontage, lot depth, and lot area less than 20%;
- c. An increase or decrease in building setback or building height less than 20%;
- d. An increase or decrease in the size of a PUD zoning document parcel less than 20%;
- e. An increase or decrease in overall density, intensity or area of use less than 20%;
- f. An increase or decrease in the size of designated open spaces or recreation areas less than 20%;
- g. An increase or decrease in the number of parking, loading, or unloading spaces less than 20%;
- h. An increase or decrease in the amount of landscaping less than 20%;
- i. An increase or decrease in width of a proposed street section, right-of-way, or easement less than 20%;
- j. A change in the street pattern which would not adversely impact adjacent property;
- k. Changes in the location, number or classification of curb cuts or street intersections;
- l. Changes in items such as location of landscaping, fencing, fire access lanes, parking, loading, trash and service areas, signage and sidewalk location which the Director determines to be insignificant in nature;
- m. Any proposed change in an approved phasing plan; and
- n. Any other proposed change deemed by the Director to be a minor change to the approved planned unit development.

**G. *Minor PUD zoning document amendment application requirements and approval process.***

- 1. *Application requirements.* A minor PUD zoning document amendment application can be filed for all or a portion of the land area within an approved PUD zoning document. Minor exceptions, modifications, or variances for individual lots shall follow the Administrative Exceptions or Variances procedures as applicable. The application for a minor PUD zoning document amendment shall be submitted to the Department of Development Services and include the following:
  - a. An application form signed by the property owner or authorized representative;
  - b. A written narrative explaining and justifying the request;
  - c. A revised PUD zoning document sheet(s) with the revisions clearly documented including signature blocks for recording as determined by the Development Services Department.
- 2. *Minor PUD zoning document approval process.* The Development Services Department shall review the application for completeness. Incomplete or improper applications will be returned to the applicant. Within fifteen (15) working days of receipt of a completed application, the Director shall approve the application; approve the application with conditions; or deny the application.
- 3. *Documentation of a minor PUD zoning document amendment.* The Director Development Services shall note any terms of the approved amendment directly on the minor PUD zoning document amendment sheet(s) and affix his signature and the date of approval. As applicable, such amended plans shall be recorded.