



ZONING ORDINANCE STEERING COMMITTEE

AGENDA

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

APRIL 10, 2019

- I. ATTENDANCE AND ROLL CALL 8:00**
- II. INTRODUCE THE COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR, BRIAN BILLINGSLEY AND GUEST INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 03/27/19 8:10**
- IV. REVIEW TODAY'S AGENDA – ADDITIONS?**
- V. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS 8:15**
- VI. UPDATE FROM SRF 8:20**
 - A. APPROACH DOCUMENT**
 - 1. Nonconforming Uses and Administrative Procedures sections.
 - 2. Example of process diagrams.
Draft handouts attached
- VII. ARTIFICIAL TURF (A.T.) 8:30**
 - A. RECOMMENDED ACTION**

The City Council has requested an amendment to the current ordinance to allow artificial turf with considerations. The Committee shall present a draft amendment to the Planning Commission for their review and recommendation to the City Council.
 - B. DESCRIPTION**
 - 1. Background

The Committee has discussed artificial turf at the two previous meetings. Staff has considered the comments of the Committee and has prepared a revised draft incorporating some new ideas for consideration.
 - 2. Proposed Project

The Committee needs to decide what standards, if any, should be applied to the installation of artificial turf in the City and its jurisdiction. The following components need to be finalized:

 - a) Will A.T. be allowed at all?
 - b) Will A.T. be restricted to certain zoning districts?
 - c) Can A.T. replace part or all of the required landscape areas? If so, how much, which parts?
 - d) Should A.T. be categorized as pervious or impervious?
 - e) Is visibility a prime consideration? Viewsheds along major corridors.

- f) Should A.T. be allowed in the public street right-of-way and easements? If so, should the use of A.T. trigger a mandatory encroachment agreement with City Council?
- g) Should the installation of A.T. require a special permit?
- h) What authority (who) should approve an application for A.T.?
- i) What conditions or specifications should be required to insure minimum acceptable standards?
- j) Can an applicant request deviations from these standards on a case-by-case basis?
- k) What enforcement actions will be available for non-compliance?

C. IMPACT:

1. Strategic Impact:

- a) Are we doing this amendment for one business owner and trying to make it work for any future requests?
- b) Is A.T. of any advantage to City Government, to the public, to business owners, to residents (homeowners)?
- c) Does A.T. meet the intent of the landscape ordinance? The stormwater regulations?

2. Service/Delivery Impact:

Will the use of A.T. affect the ability of City Government to provide effective and efficient customer service to citizens?

3. Fiscal Impact:

Will the use of A.T. have a financial impact on City Government?

D. ALTERNATIVES:

- 1. Do not regulate A.T. Citizens can install it anywhere, anytime, any quantity, any quality.
- 2. Draft an amendment to allow A.T. with few restrictions throughout the community.
- 3. Draft an amendment to allow A.T. only under very specific conditions.
- 4. Draft an amendment to allow A.T. only on a case by case basis, considering the Vallely property to be the first candidate.
- 5. Recommend a prohibition of all A.T. to City Council.

E. TIME CONSTRAINTS

If an amendment is to move forward in the process, a draft must be completed and forwarded to the Planning Commission as soon as practical. It appears that the April 29 meeting will likely be too soon to meet all hearing and notice requirements. The next PC meeting will be May 28. Vallely will likely install A.T. regardless of the City's timeline for action one way or the other.

F. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

A draft of the last version of the amendment and the most recent amendment is attached.

**VIII. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO WALL SIGNS IN C3, 9:40
CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT ZONING DISTRICTS**

A. RECOMMENDED ACTION

A developer has presented sign concepts for a downtown multi-tenant commercial building that cannot be approved under current regulations of the zoning ordinance. C3, Central Business District sign regulations are very restrictive. The developer's concept seems reasonable, but the sign ordinance must be amended and the amendment forwarded to PC for their review and recommendation to the City Council.

B. DESCRIPTION

1. Background

The Committee discussed this signage issue at the last meeting and agreed upon a solution and an associated amendment to the sign code. Staff has considered the comments of the Committee and has prepared a revised draft incorporating the changes discussed at the last meeting.

2. Proposed Project

The Committee decided to revise the ordinance for wall signs in C3 for buildings that are setback away from the streets. The current language appears to have been crafted for retail shops in a "Main Street" scenario where individual businesses are close to the street and separated by common walls for the length of the block. The current sign ordinance restricts such businesses to very specific locational parameters. The proposed amendment recognizes buildings set back fifty feet or further from the street:

- a) Can locate the wall sign in areas that are not allowed in the current ordinance.
- b) The proposed wall sign can be larger than the current ordinance allows.
- c) The total sign area can be proportionally divided between multiple tenants.

C. IMPACT:

1. Strategic Impact:

The proposed amendment allows downtown business owners that own buildings set back from the street to have larger more visible signs while maintaining the existing regulations for business owners in close proximity to the street.

2. Service/Delivery Impact:

With this proposed amendment the City will maintain the ability to review and approve sign applications that meet downtown signage standards and deny applications that do not comply.

3. Fiscal Impact:

This proposed revision to the sign ordinance will not have produce undesirable fiscal impacts.

D. ALTERNATIVES:

1. Review the draft amendment prepared by staff, approve and recommend approval to the PC.

2. Review the draft amendment prepared by staff and modify it before approving and sending it forward to PC.
3. Make a determination not to address a partial revision to the sign ordinance at this time, instead waiting until the committee can review the entire signage chapter as scheduled in the future.

E. TIME CONSTRAINTS

An amendment could be included on the agenda for the April 29 PC meeting assuming all advertising and posting requirements can be met. Otherwise, the next meeting date of the PC is May 28.

F. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

A draft of the last version of the amendment is attached.

IX. ADJOURN. 10:00

City staff has a DRT meeting scheduled for 10:15 a.m. and must leave promptly at 10:00.