

### Summary of Miscellaneous Changes Proposed for Chapter 30 and Related Sections 6/26/2017

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| A | Adding the use and clarifying that parks or recreational facilities in the BP district do not count toward the limitation on supportive commercial uses  |   |
|   | <p><b>Triggered by:</b> speculation about a recreation center at the Military Business Park and the existing developer's need for clarity that such a use would not impact the existing agreement.</p> <p><b>Change:</b> Makes Arena, Athletic field, Swimming pool non-profit, and Tennis court uses "P" in BP and notes that such uses do not count as part of the supportive or commercial uses allowed.</p>  | <p><b>Explanation:</b> Changes impact 30-4 Uses, adding stadiums, clubhouses, athletic fields, pools and tennis courts to allowed uses in the BP district and clarifying in Footnote 4 that park or recreational facilities do not count toward any specified limits to supportive/ commercial uses in a BP district.</p>   |
| B | Allowing multi-axle trailers to park on improved surfaces in front yard areas in residential districts   |   |
|   | <p><b>Triggered by :</b> Planning Commission request based on 18 mos. experience with the amendment adopted 9/14/2015 that allowed single-axle trailers and RVs to park on improved surface areas in front yards but multi-axle trailers required special approvals.</p> <p><b>Change:</b> expands the list to include multi-axle as well as single-axle trailers and RVs allowed to park on improved surfaces in residential district front and side yards; adds protection of line of sight and no parking on sidewalks or in ROW.</p> | <p><b>Explanation:</b> The Commission received five requests through March 2017 and approved all five. The Commission respectfully requests that Council reconsider requiring a special review for multi-axle trailers when unlimited numbers of single-axle trailers or RVs are permitted in front yards (provided they are on an improved parking surface and other standards are met).</p>   |
| C | Increasing the density allowed for "all other residential uses" in the NC district   |   |
|   | <p><b>Triggered by:</b> staff realizing this one standard was not adjusted with all the others during an amendment in 2014, leaving 'other residential uses' at a level that discouraged residential development in the NC district.</p> <p><b>Change:</b> density of 6 units/acre changes to 12</p>   | <p><b>Explanation:</b> "All other residential uses" include apartments and attached SF, which logically occur at a density higher than detached single family development but usually not as intense as a separate mixed use zoning. The other measures were increased with Ord. 2014-003 but this change was overlooked.</p>   |
| D | Making the expiration and allowed extension the same for the certificate of appropriateness as for a special use permit (one year to expiration or as specified in the approval, extension for up to six months)   |   |
|   | <p><b>Triggered by:</b> staff realizing that similar processes were treated differently, once the Historic Resources Commission (HRC) was directly under Planning.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b> For Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), changes 6 months to 1 year before expiration, and allows one 6-month extension.</p>  | <p>The proposed change for expirations and extensions of an approval under the Certificate of Appropriateness would match those allowed under another quasi-judicial process, the Special Use Permit (SUP). Current standards are six months with no extension. The additional time is more realistic with regard to completing financing and other steps before getting a building permit.</p> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| E | Enabling Administrative Adjustments for utilities needing more flexibility to maintain or restore critical services during or after emergencies   |   |
|   | <p><b>Triggered by:</b> South River Electric’s plans for larger above-ground fuel tanks; staff can envision similar needs by other utilities preparing for future emergencies.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b> adds utilities and purpose for including them to the “applicability” statement for Administrative Adjustments and, in the use-specific standards for “outdoor storage”, adds that utilities can seek Adm. Adj. if necessary to provide emergency services.</p>  | <p><b>Explanation:</b> Staff proposes using the Administrative Adjustment as one of the quickest ways to protect adjacent property owners and community-wide goals while addressing the unique needs of utility companies working to continue critical services during emergencies. Staff anticipates that other utilities conducting such ‘after-action’ analyses could benefit from an option to request quick adjustments.</p>   |
| F | Allowing limited commercial/institutional storage options with portable shipping containers   |   |
|   | <p><b>Triggered by:</b> churches and businesses needing additional storage on short term but possibly recurring schedules combined with the proliferation of unauthorized use of readily available portable shipping containers.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reorganization of the temporary storage standards by district type instead of size, location and duration (30-4.E.6(d)).</li> <li>• Clarification that storage during permitted construction is addressed by a separate section of the temporary use codes.</li> <li>• No change to Residential standards.</li> <li>• DT and MU are subject to the same standards as if in Residential districts.</li> <li>• Uses in nonresidential districts and legal nonconforming nonresidential and institutional uses can have temporary storage containers larger in size, up to 6 months in any 48 month period with one 30-day additional occurrence upon good reason in that 48 month period, screened from view of the public and visitors, and not in parking or loading areas or travel lanes or obstructing emergency access.</li> <li>• Clarification that “just-in-time” storage is subject to the outdoor storage standards and, where applicable, transitional standards.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Explanation:</b> Amendments for PODs in 2011 focused on residential areas; there was little pressure elsewhere at the time. Subsequently, institutions like churches and more businesses began to address short-term needs with the inexpensive portable shipping containers. The proposed amendment would provide some temporary storage options while addressing issues regarding building standards, appearance, where it is not appropriate, and, when it is appropriate, how long is okay.</p> |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |