



**CITY COMMISSION/PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP SESSION AGENDA
JUNE 19, 2017
8:00 PM**



DPS Facility, 851 South Eton, Birmingham, MI 48009

Navigating through the agenda:

- Use the bookmarks on the left to navigate through the agenda.
- Tablet Users: Tap the screen for available options, select "Open in", select "Adobe Reader". The agenda will open in Adobe Reader. Scroll through the bookmarks to navigate through the agenda.
(The Adobe Reader application is required to download the agenda and view the bookmarks. This free application is available through the App Store on your tablet device.)

**BIRMINGHAM CITY COMMISSION /
PLANNING BOARD JOINT WORKSHOP SESSION
JUNE 19, 2017
DPS FACILITY, 851 SOUTH ETON
8:00 P.M.**

WORKSHOP SESSION

This will be considered a workshop session. No formal decisions will be made. The purpose of this workshop format is to focus on problem definition and desired outcomes. Each commissioner will have an opportunity to share their perspective and thoughts on problems and possible solutions and engage the Planning Board for input. Citizens will have an opportunity to make public comment at the end of the workshop meeting.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mark Nickita, Mayor

II. ROLL CALL

Cheryl Arft, Deputy City Clerk

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- A. Current Issues:
 - 1. Renovation of commercial properties
 - 2. Commercial projections onto public property/ architectural allowances
 - 3. Rail District boundary review
 - 4. Economic Development License boundary review
 - 5. Bistro allowances and restrictions
 - 6. Rental property considerations
 - 7. Retail definition revision
 - 8. Shared parking considerations
- B.
 - 1. Planning Board Action List Review

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

V. ADJOURN

NOTICE: Individuals requiring accommodations, such as mobility, visual, hearing, interpreter or other assistance, for effective participation in this meeting should contact the City Clerk's Office at (248) 530-1880 (voice), or (248) 644-5115 (TDD) at least one day in advance to request mobility, visual, hearing or other assistance.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento, tales como servicios de interpretación, la participación efectiva en esta reunión deben ponerse en contacto con la Oficina del Secretario Municipal al [\(248\) 530-1880](tel:(248)530-1880) por lo menos el día antes de la reunión pública. (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964).



MEMORANDUM

Planning & Building Divisions

DATE: June 14, 2017
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
Bruce R. Johnson, Building Official
SUBJECT: Current Planning Issues for Discussion

(1) Renovation of Commercial Properties

Background:

Questions have been posed recently as to the procedure for determining what level of board review is required for the renovation of a building or construction of a new building. There are three boards that review building improvements: the Planning Board, the Design Review Board and the Historic District Commission.

Article 7, Section 7.25 of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the reviewing board for site plan reviews as follows:

For properties located within historic districts designated under Chapter 62 of the Birmingham City Code, Site Plan Reviews will be conducted by the [Historic District Commission and the Planning Board](#). Site Plan Reviews by the Planning Board are required for non-historic properties and the following types of developments:

- A. Single-family cluster developments.
- B. Accessory building in all zoning district except single-family.
- C. Attached Single-Family Residential (R8).
- D. Two-Family Residential (R4).
- E. Multiple-Family Residential (R5, R6, R7).
- F. Neighborhood Business (B1).
- G. General Business (B3, B2B, B2C).
- H. Office/Residential (B3).
- I. Business/Residential (B4).
- J. Office (O1).
- K. Office/Business (O2).
- L. Parking (P) and all off-street parking facilities in any zoning district except in a district zoned single-family residential when the area thereof accommodates three or less vehicles.
- M. Mixed Use (MX).

Thus, Article 7, section 7.08 provides for site plan review for new development of all historic properties by the Historic District Commission and the Planning Board, and for site plan review for new development of non-historic properties by the Planning Board.

Article 7, section 7.08 of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the review procedure for design reviews for all building renovation and construction activities as follows:

All Design Review plans for new non-historic construction also requiring Site Plan Review will be submitted to and reviewed by the Planning Board. All plans, not requiring Site Plan Review or Historic District Review, for new construction, the alteration or painting of the exterior of any building and/or the addition of any lighting, signs, equipment or other structures which substantially alter the exterior appearance as determined by the City Planner shall be submitted to the Design Review Board for review. All plans for additions or alterations to historic structures or structures within a historic district shall be submitted to the Historic District Commission in addition to any required Site Plan Review. For uses requiring a special land use permit, Design Review of such uses shall be undertaken by the City Commission with recommendations from the Planning Board pursuant to Section 7.26. Those items not requiring Design Review by the Design Review Board are as follows:

- A. Single-family residential buildings and structures not located within a cluster development.
- B. Items such as gutters, downspouts, door and window replacement when similar materials are used, antennas, roof vents and small mechanical equipment not readily visible to the public, painting to a similar color, and items of ordinary repair and maintenance.

(Emphasis added.)

Thus, Article 7, section 7.08 states that for all new non-historic construction projects the Planning Board is responsible for conducting both the site plan review and design review. All plans for projects not requiring site plan review or HDC review such as exterior alternations, lighting, signs, equipment or other structures that substantially alter the exterior appearance of the building shall be reviewed by the DRB. Finally, Article 7, section 7.08 states that all Special Land Use Permit reviews will be conducted by the City Commission, with recommendations from the Planning Board. The Design Review Board is responsible for conducting design reviews for new construction and the alteration of existing buildings when no site plan is required.

Issue:

The Zoning Ordinance establishes the review process for new construction and renovation of existing buildings. However, the Zoning Ordinance is not clear as to the extent an existing building can be renovated before it is deemed new construction, and the ordinance is not clear as to what specific changes trigger site plan review.

Some recent examples of projects that have been reviewed by the Design Review Board exclusively include the following:

- Lavery Audi dealer – 34602 Woodward
- Meadowbrook Urgent Care – 33722 Woodward
- OWC wine shop – 912 S. Old Woodward
- Holiday Market select – 1740 W. Maple

Discussion:

Is there interest by the City Commission to amend the review procedures for new construction and / or the renovation of existing buildings? Is there interest by the City Commission to clarify the distinction between a site plan review and a design review?

(2) Commercial Projections onto Public Property / Architectural Allowances

Background:

The City has historically permitted the projection of certain architectural elements into the right of way, including awnings, signage, canopies, marquees, balconies, planters and other similar elements. The recent renovation of the 100 S. Old Woodward building and the 335 E. Maple building have raised questions as to whether projecting elements should be permitted, and if so, whether there should be restrictions on the materials used. Article 3, section 3.04 of the Zoning Ordinance states:

- 5.) First-floor awnings may encroach upon the frontage line and public sidewalk, but must avoid the street trees; provide at least 8 feet of clearance above the sidewalk; and be set back a minimum of 2 feet from the road curb.
- 6.) Upper-floor awnings shall be permitted only on vertically proportioned windows, provided that the awning is only the width of the window, encroaches upon the frontage line no more than 3 feet, and is not used as a backlit sign.

Thus, the Zoning Ordinance clearly allows for the projection of awnings into the public right of way, as long as the required 8' of clearance is provided, and upper floor awnings do not project into the right of way more than 3'.

Section 2 of Chapter 98, Streets, Sidewalks and Other Public Places also addresses the construction of elements that project into the right of way and states:

(2) Construction and maintenance of awnings, canopies, marquees.

All awnings, canopies and marquees shall be constructed to withstand loads as specified, and in accordance with provisions of chapter 22, and shall be maintained in a clean, whole, safe and sound condition at all times, and any awning, canopy or marquee which shall become torn, frayed, loose, or out of repair as a whole, shall be dismantled and removed by the owner thereof. If such awning, canopy or marquee shall become torn, frayed, loose and out of repair in part, the same shall be repaired promptly, upon notification from the building official. Upon failure or neglect of the owner of any awning, canopy, or marquee to repair or remove the same

within five days after due notice, requiring such removal or repair, has been received from the building official, such building official shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to dismantle and remove any such awning, canopy or marquee which is maintained contrary to the provisions of this section. Any costs incurred by the city in connection therewith may be charged against the property upon which such awning, canopy or marquee is located, in accordance with provisions of chapter X of the city Charter.

Thus, section 2 of Chapter 98, Streets, Sidewalks and Other Public Places implicitly states that awnings, canopies and marquees are permitted to extend over a street, sidewalk or other public space. Section 2 also states that such structures must be constructed in accordance with Chapter 22, which adopts the regulations of the Building Code, which contains specific definitions and regulations for canopies, awnings, marquees and other similar structures.

Issue:

While Chapter 98 seems to imply that awnings, canopies and marquees are permitted to project into the right of way, Chapter 98 does not clearly state that these elements are permitted, nor does it provide definitions for awnings, canopies or marquees. Neither Chapter 98, Streets, Sidewalks and Other Public Places, or Chapter 126, Zoning, address whether balconies or other architectural features are permitted to project into the right of way, or provide regulations for such projections. However, section 2 of Chapter 98 does refer to the regulations of the Building Code, which contains specific definitions and regulations for canopies, awnings, marquees and other similar structures. The City Commission may wish to include some or all of these standards in the Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion:

Is there interest by the City Commission to clarify in the Zoning Ordinance which, if any, projections are permitted, and then have the Planning Board draft regulations to address the height, projection or permitted materials for architectural features projecting into the public right of way?

(3) Rail District Boundary Review

Background:

The City Commission recently created defined boundaries for the Rail District that include all properties located in the Mixed Use (MX) zoning district, the properties located on the east side of S. Eton where the Big Rock, The Reserve and the District Lofts are located (zoned B2B), as well as the parcel located at 2100 E. Maple where the new Whole Foods Market is currently under construction (zoned B2* Grocery store use only). The creation of these boundaries clarifies which properties are located within the Rail District, and allows for bistro establishments to be operated on any of these properties with a Special Land Use Permit. There was subsequent discussion to consider the inclusion of businesses across from Big Rock and in the North Eton Plaza where Jet's Pizza is located.

Issue:

Should the Rail District be expanded to include properties on the west side of S. Eton across from Big Rock and/or to include the North Eton Plaza on N. Eton?

Discussion:

Does the City Commission wish to alter the boundaries of the existing Rail District?

(4) Economic Development License Boundary Review**Background:**

In 2009, the City Commission approved the creation of an Economic Development Liquor License as an incentive to encourage development in certain areas of the City. The properties that are eligible for this incentive are identified on the map in Exhibit 1 of Appendix C of the Zoning Ordinance. These properties are predominately located on or near Woodward Avenue.

Issue:

Should the boundary of the Economic Development License area be expanded to consider other areas of the City?

Discussion:

Is there interest by the City Commission to revise the map in Exhibit A of the Zoning Ordinance to amend the number and/or location of properties that may qualify for an Economic Development liquor license into other areas of the City?

(5) Bistro Allowances and Restrictions**Background:**

In 2007 the City of Birmingham amended the Zoning Ordinance to create the bistro concept that allows small eclectic restaurants to obtain a liquor license if they have no more than 65 seats, including 10 at a bar, and low key entertainment only. The bistro regulations adopted also included requirements for storefront glazing, seating along the storefront windows, and a requirement for outdoor dining. In accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, each bistro applicant is required to go through an initial screening process at the City Commission, demonstrate that all bistro requirements have been met, and then obtain a Special Land Use Permit from the City Commission.

Issue:

As the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make the establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. The following issues have been raised:

- **Use of Eisenglass** – extends the time period outdoor dining areas are in operation which increases the number of seats for restaurant as a whole for a majority of the year;
- **On-street Dining/Rooftop Dining** – the use of on-street parking spaces and rooftops in addition to the sidewalk area allows the addition of larger outdoor dining areas;
- **Parking Needs** – the expansion of outdoor dining increases the number of people dining at the restaurant, which increases parking demand;

- **Building Code Requirements** – the enclosure of outdoor dining areas triggers Building Code regulations such as Energy Code compliance, fire suppression requirements, fire separation distances and exterior wall fire resistive ratings.

Discussion:

Is there interest by the City Commission to have the Planning Board review the bistro regulations on the location or number of outdoor dining seats permitted? Does the City Commission wish to clarify and/or provide additional regulations to regulate the operation of bistros?

(6) Rental Property Considerations

Background:

Questions are arising about the practice of renting or leasing dwelling units on a short term basis and whether they would be subject to the City Code regulations for rented and leased dwelling units. The City has regulated rented or leased dwelling units since 1963. These provisions are in Chapter 22, Division 4, of the City Code and require a person to obtain a license prior to renting or leasing a dwelling unit or a room in rooming house. The premise is inspected for compliance with the International Property Maintenance Code prior to the license being issued. Inspections are conducted on a biennial basis after the initial license is issued. The City Code requirements for rented or leased dwelling units are applicable to any dwelling unit offered for rent or lease regardless of the time period it is rented or leased. However, the practice of short term renting or leasing of homes most likely was not anticipated at the time the regulations were drafted.

Issue:

Staff has recently become aware of a few homes in the City that are being offered for rent on short term basis. A couple of them are being advertised on websites such as Airbnb. Complaints have been received concerning the number of occupants coming and going from these homes. Occupants at these homes will frequently change on a regular basis that is not typical in residential neighborhoods.

There is a bill working its way through the Legislature that if approved will prevent local units of government from regulating the short term rental or leasing of dwelling units. Senate Bill No. 329 introduced on April 25, 2017, would amend the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act by specifying short term renting is a residential use of property and is a permitted use in all residential zones. Further, it cannot be subject to a special use or conditional use permit or a procedure different from those required for other dwellings in the same zone district. Please see attached Senate Bill No. 329.

The City Code regulations for rented or leased dwelling was last updated in 2011 in response to an increased number in rentals as a result of the economic downturn. While the provisions work well for the typical rented or leased dwelling unit, the practice of renting homes on a short term basis could create unique concerns and complaints.

Discussion:

Should a review of the City Code regulations for rented and leased dwelling units, along with the practice of short term rentals, be conducted to determine if regulations to mitigate potential concerns should be established?

(7) Retail Definition Revision

The definition of retail within the Redline Retail District has been discussed at previous joint meetings between the City Commission and the Planning Board, and the Planning Board has been studying this issue comprehensively over the past several months.

On May 8, 2017, the City Commission directed the Planning Board to consider measures to provide temporary relief to halt the addition of non-retail uses into storefronts in Downtown Birmingham located within the Redline Retail District, while the Planning Board continues to study this issue. Specifically, the City Commission directed the Planning Board to review and present the recommendation to amend Article 3, section 3.04(C)(6), Specific Standards, to amend the Downtown Birmingham Overlay Standards to exclude community and personal service uses as permitted in the Redline Retail District, to provide definitions for community and personal service uses, and to forward a recommendation to the City Commission on or before July 24, 2017.

On June 14, 2017, the Planning Board set a public hearing for July 12, 2017 as directed by the City Commission.

Issue:

The 2016 Plan recommended establishing the Redline Retail District, which allowed personal service uses. Personal service uses are not defined in the Zoning Ordinance, nor in the 2016 Plan. The lack of a definition for personal services has allowed office uses to occupy first floor spaces in the Redline Retail District.

Discussion:

Is there interest by the City Commission to have the Planning Board conduct a study session to review the intent of the Redline Retail District as proposed in the 2016 Plan and evaluate whether the current application of personal services is consistent with the intent?

(8) Parking Considerations

(a) Shared Parking

Background:

On January 8, 2017, the City Commission reviewed and approved the Ad Hoc Rail District Report. The City Commission further directed that the Ad Hoc Rail District Report be forwarded to both the Multi-Modal Transportation Board for review, and also forwarded to the Planning Board for review and discussion regarding Recommendation 4: Encourage Shared Parking.

Recommendation 4: Encourage Shared Parking

Specifically, the City Commission directed the Planning Board to review the Ad Hoc Rail District Report and to consider moving forward with Recommendation 4, which states:

Encourage shared parking in the district by providing the zoning incentives for properties and/or businesses that record a shared parking agreement. Incentives could include parking reductions, setback reductions, height bonuses, landscape credits, or similar offers.

Amend the shared parking provisions to simplify the calculations to determine the required parking based on industry standards and eliminate the need to hire a consultant to prepare shared parking studies.

Accordingly, the Planning Board was directed by the City Commission to consider amendments to the shared parking calculations and approval process and/or recommend zoning incentives to further encourage shared parking.

Based on this direction, the Planning Division has conducted research on shared parking provisions that are utilized in other cities. No communities were found that mandated shared parking arrangements, but many encouraged shared parking by adopting shared parking calculation standards and by offering zoning incentives to encourage sharing parking. Please see the attached staff report for draft ordinance language proposed by the Planning Board.

Issue:

Article 4, Section 4.45(G)(4) of the Birmingham Zoning Ordinance includes the current shared parking policy. This provision includes up to a 50% reduction in parking spaces in a shared parking agreement if all requirements are met. However, our current standards require hiring a parking consultant, the findings are subject to the discretion of the Planning Board, and the final agreement must be recorded on title of the property. All of these requirements increase the time and cost of a project, which may not encourage applicants to utilize shared parking. In addition, Article 4, section 4.50 (A) – (D) of the Birmingham Zoning Ordinance also include some simpler calculations for allowing shared parking on the same lot. However, these provisions only apply in the B3 and MX zoning districts. Finally, no zoning incentives are currently offered to encourage shared parking. In the past, very few applicants have taken advantage of the shared parking provisions, and none in the Rail District have done so despite the recommendation of planning staff and the Planning Board.

Discussion:

Does the City Commission have additional input on the proposed draft ordinance language?

(b) Parking Standards for Private Developments

Background:

Currently, parking is required to be provided for all commercial uses on properties that are not located within a Parking Assessment District ("PAD"). Many commercial uses fall under the office or retail classification, which requires one parking space / 300 sq.ft. of building space. Other common commercial uses include medical office space, which requires one parking space / 150 sq.ft. of floor area, restaurants, which require one parking space / 75 sq.ft., and barber shops, beauty salons and tanning salons which require two off-street parking spaces per service chair, booth or bed, or 1 off-street parking space per 300 sq.ft. of floor area, whichever is greater.

Issue:

Concerns have been expressed regarding the current parking requirements for developments in the City. The need to increase the parking requirements has been raised to alleviate parking concerns. However, increasing the parking requirements for commercial uses may resolve parking issues in some areas of the City, but will not alleviate parking problems in the downtown area as most of the CBD is within the Parking Assessment District. All properties located within the PAD are not required to provide any off-street parking on site, regardless of use as they have paid into the public parking system. At the same time, a desire to reduce or eliminate parking standards has also been raised in order to reduce the cost of development, thus reducing the amount charged for the sale or lease of building space.

Discussion:

Is there interest by the City Commission to encourage an expedited review by the Planning Board of the parking requirements for private developments in the City?

SENATE BILL No. 329

April 25, 2017, Introduced by Senator HUNE and referred to the Committee on Local Government.

A bill to amend 2006 PA 110, entitled "Michigan zoning enabling act," (MCL 125.3101 to 125.3702) by adding section 206b.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

1 SEC. 206B. (1) FOR THE PURPOSES OF ZONING, ALL OF THE
2 FOLLOWING APPLY TO THE RENTAL OF A DWELLING, INCLUDING, BUT NOT
3 LIMITED TO, SHORT-TERM RENTAL:

4 (A) IT IS A RESIDENTIAL USE OF PROPERTY AND A PERMITTED USE IN
5 ALL RESIDENTIAL ZONES.

6 (B) IT IS NOT SUBJECT TO A SPECIAL USE OR CONDITIONAL USE
7 PERMIT OR PROCEDURE DIFFERENT FROM THOSE REQUIRED FOR OTHER
8 DWELLINGS IN THE SAME ZONE.

9 (C) IT IS NOT A COMMERCIAL USE OF PROPERTY.

10 (2) THIS SECTION DOES NOT PROHIBIT REGULATION APPLIED ON A
11 CONSISTENT BASIS TO RENTAL AND OWNER-OCCUPIED RESIDENCES FOR NOISE,

1 ADVERTISING, TRAFFIC, OR OTHER CONDITIONS.

2 (3) AS USED IN THIS SECTION, "SHORT-TERM RENTAL" MEANS THE
3 RENTAL OF ANY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE OR 1-TO-4-FAMILY HOUSE OR
4 DWELLING UNIT, OR ANY UNIT OR GROUP OF UNITS IN A CONDOMINIUM, FOR
5 TERMS OF LESS THAN 28 DAYS AT A TIME.

6 Enacting section 1. This amendatory act takes effect 90 days
7 after the date it is enacted into law.



MEMORANDUM

Planning Division

DATE: March 22, 2017
TO: Planning Board
FROM: Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Shared Parking Regulations

On January 8, 2017, the City Commission reviewed and approved the Ad Hoc Rail District Report. The City Commission further directed that the Ad Hoc Rail District Report be forwarded to both the Multi-Modal Transportation Board for review, and also forwarded to the Planning Board for review and discussion regarding Recommendation 4: Encourage Shared Parking. Please find attached an excerpt from the report regarding Recommendation 4 for your review and discussion.

Recommendation 4: Encourage Shared Parking

Specifically, the City Commission has directed the Planning Board to review the Ad Hoc Rail District Report and to consider moving forward with Recommendation 4, which states:

Encourage shared parking in the district by providing the zoning incentives for properties and/or businesses that record a shared parking agreement. Incentives could include parking reductions, setback reductions, height bonuses, landscape credits, or similar offers.

Amend the shared parking provisions to simplify the calculations to determine the required parking based on industry standards and eliminate the need to hire a consultant to prepare shared parking studies.

Accordingly, the Planning Board has been directed by the City Commission to consider amendments to the shared parking calculations and approval process and/or recommend zoning incentives to further encourage shared parking.

Based on the direction of the City Commission, the Planning Division has conducted research on shared parking provisions that are utilized in other cities. No communities were found that mandated shared parking arrangements, but many encouraged shared parking by adopting shared parking calculation standards and by offering zoning incentives to encourage sharing parking. Policies involved with shared parking generally include calculation tables adopted by the city. These tables incorporate parking calculations for categories of building uses. Parking demands are calculated for different times of the day throughout the week. Peak parking demand times of the adjacent places are then compared to help determine the minimum number of parking spaces necessary. Research regarding policy recommendations on shared parking is attached for your review.

Many cities also utilize zoning incentives to promote shared parking arrangements. Examples include increasing the floor-area ratio requirements, reducing parking lot screening and/or reducing landscape requirements to provide greater access, connectivity, and ease of use between the properties sharing parking spaces. Sample ordinance language from other communities has also been attached to this report for your review. The use of calculation tables and zoning incentives ensure consistency in enforcement and reward business owners who enter into a shared parking agreement.

Article 4, Section 4.45(G)(4) of the Birmingham Zoning Ordinance includes the current shared parking policy. This provision includes up to a 50% reduction in parking spaces in a shared parking agreement if all requirements are met. However, our current standards require hiring a parking consultant, the findings are subject to the discretion of the Planning Board, and the final agreement must be recorded on title of the property. All of these requirements increase the time and cost of a project, which may not encourage applicants to utilize shared parking. In addition, Article 4, section 4.50 (A) – (D) of the Birmingham Zoning Ordinance also include some simpler calculations for allowing shared parking on the same lot. However, these provisions only apply in the B3 and MX zoning districts. Finally, no zoning incentives are currently offered to encourage shared parking. In the past, very few applicants have taken advantage of the shared parking provisions, and none in the Rail District have done so despite the recommendation of planning staff and the Planning Board. Most recently, the owners of 2125 and 2159 E. Lincoln have entered into a shared parking agreement, but this was not formalized or approved by the Planning Board as all parking requirements were met without the need for the shared parking agreement.

On February 8, 2017, the Planning Board discussed the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Rail District Committee as a whole and much of the discussion centered on traffic and circulation within the Rail District. While there was little discussion of shared parking, board members appeared to be in favor of ordinance amendments to encourage shared parking.

Please find attached draft ordinance language for your consideration to clarify the shared parking demand calculations and to simplify the approval process for shared parking by eliminating the need for a parking consultant. In addition, draft ordinance language has also been provided to add zoning incentives to encourage property owners to pursue shared parking.

Suggested Action:

To continue discussion of a revised shared parking process and the addition of incentives to encourage the use of shared parking at a future study session;

OR

To set a public hearing date of **May 10, 2017** to consider amendments the following amendments:

- (a) Article 4, Section 4.45 (G) Parking Standards, to amend the shared parking standards and streamline the approval process; and
- (b) Article 4, Section 4.50 Parking Standards, to provide the same shared parking standards for all zone districts.

Excerpt from Ad Hoc Rail District Report: Recommendation 4

Recommendations

Recommendation 4: Encourage Shared Parking

Issue: Many properties are dominated by excessively large parking lots that are not being efficiently used. Vast parking lots in the district are vacated after peak business hours and remain empty throughout the evening because of restricted access, while other lots overflow around restaurants in the evenings.



Empty parking lots can be found throughout the study area.

Shared parking is a land use strategy that efficiently uses parking capacity by allowing adjacent and/or compatible land uses to share spaces, instead of providing separate spaces for separate uses. Often, a shared parking agreement is put in place between two or more property owners and the jurisdiction to ensure parking spaces on a site are made available for other uses at different times throughout the day.

Recommendation: Encourage shared parking in the district by providing the zoning incentives for properties and/or businesses that record a shared parking agreement. Incentives could include parking reductions, setback reductions, height bonuses, landscape credits, or similar offers.

Amend the shared parking provisions to simplify the calculations to determine required parking based on industry standards and eliminate the need to hire a consultant to prepare shared parking studies. See table to the right for an example of a shared parking calculation from Victoria Transport Policy Institute.

Sample Shared Parking Occupancy Rates Table

This table defines the percent of the basic minimum needed during each time period for shared parking. (M-F = Monday to Friday)

Uses	M-F			Sat. & Sun.		
	8am-5pm	6pm-12am	12am-6am	8am-5pm	6pm-12am	12am-6am
Residential	60%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%
Office/ Warehouse /Industrial	100%	20%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Commercial	90%	80%	5%	100%	70%	5%
Hotel	70%	100%	100%	70%	100%	100%
Restaurant	70%	100%	10%	70%	100%	20%
Movie Theater	40%	80%	10%	80%	100%	10%
Entertainment	40%	100%	10%	80%	100%	50%
Conference/Convention	100%	100%	5%	100%	100%	5%
Institutional (non-church)	100%	20%	5%	10%	10%	5%
Institutional (church)	10%	5%	5%	100%	50%	5%

Courtesy of Victoria Transport Policy Institute

Policy Recommendations Research

- [Smart Growth Alternatives to Minimum Parking Requirements](http://www.urbanstreet.info/2nd_sym_proceedings/Volume%202/Forinash_session_7.pdf)
www.urbanstreet.info/2nd_sym_proceedings/Volume%202/Forinash_session_7.pdf

“In setting parking requirements, planners typically use generic standards that apply to general land use categories (e.g., residential, office, retail). Such standards have been developed and published by professional organizations, including the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), based on experience in many locations. Much of the data on which these standards are based comes from low-density, single-use developments with limited transportation choices. Therefore, the generic parking rates cannot take into account the mix of context-sensitive, community specific variables—density, demographics, availability of transportation choices, or the surrounding land-use mix— all of which influence demand for parking and *should* be reflected in parking requirements. Instead, requirements are based on maximum demand for parking, when parking is provided at no charge to users, and walking, biking, and transit are not available choices. This formula yields a surplus of parking area that is costly for developers to provide, and it subsidizes personal automobile use and encourages auto use even in areas where convenient transportation choices exist. Because of the way in which they are typically established, parking requirements are remarkably consistent across different cities, despite varying levels of economic vitality, population size, and development density.”

- [Sharing Parking Facilities Among Multiple Users](http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm89.htm), Victoria Policy Transport Institute. December, 2015.
<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm89.htm>

“Parking can be shared among different buildings and facilities in an area to take advantage of different peak periods (see Table 1). For example, an office complex can efficiently share parking facilities with a restaurant or theaters, since offices require maximum parking during weekdays, while restaurants and theaters require maximum parking during evenings and weekends. As a result, the total amount of parking can be reduced 40-60% compared with standard off-street parking requirements for each destination (Smith, 1983). ITE (1995) provides specific recommendations for shared parking implementation.”

Table 1 (Victoria) Parking Occupancy Rates

Uses	M-F	M-F	M-F	Sat. & Sun.	Sat. & Sun.	Sat. & Sun.
	8am-5pm	6pm-12am	12am-6am	8am-5pm	6pm-12am	12am-6am
Residential	60%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%
Office/ Warehouse /Industrial	100%	20%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Commercial	90%	80%	5%	100%	70%	5%
Hotel	70%	100%	100%	70%	100%	100%
Restaurant	70%	100%	10%	70%	100%	20%
Movie Theater	40%	80%	10%	80%	100%	10%
Entertainment	40%	100%	10%	80%	100%	50%
Conference/Convention	100%	100%	5%	100%	100%	5%
Institutional (non-church)	100%	20%	5%	10%	10%	5%
Institutional (church)	10%	5%	5%	100%	50%	5%

This table defines the percent of the basic minimum needed during each time period for shared parking. (M-F = Monday to Friday)

* Sharing Parking Facilities Among Multiple Users, Victoria Policy Transport Institute, <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm89.htm>

B. Parking Occupancy Rate Table

When the parking reduction has been shown to be feasible by using the demand calculations as determined by Table 1, Parking Occupancy Rates, the applicant shall submit a parking demand summary sheet showing the process for calculating the reduction as outlined in this section. (Note: The default rates from the Table 1, Parking Occupancy Rates are set to include a small "safety margin" of parking beyond that minimally needed to serve an average peak demand. Therefore a local study of parking demand may yield a greater reduction in parking required.)

(1.) The minimum number of parking spaces that are to be provided and maintained for each use shall be determined based on standard methods for determining minimum parking supply at a particular site.

(2.) The gross minimum number of parking spaces shall be multiplied by the "occupancy rate" as determined by a study of local conditions (or as found in Table 1), for each use for the weekday night, daytime and evening periods, and weekend night, daytime and evening periods respectively.

(3.) The gross minimum numbers of parking spaces for each of the purposes referred to for each time period shall be added to produce the aggregate gross minimum numbers of parking spaces for each time period.

(4.) The greatest of the aggregative gross minimum numbers of parking spaces for each period shall be determined.

- Capital Region Council of Governments Best Practices Manual.
[8. Shared Parking Fact Sheet](#)
<https://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/.../info/SharedParkingFactSheet.pdf>
 - “Target auto-oriented mixed use commercial uses. Shared parking works best in situations where there are somewhat dissimilar land uses, with different peak hours of use — i.e., a hotel and an office, or a home supply store and a movie theater.”
 - “Rather than having a series of smaller-sized parking lots divided by arbitrary lot lines with landscaped buffers, lots can be consolidated and circulation systematized, with more creative and effective landscaping, pedestrian circulation, and lighting.”
 - “Zoning incentives for shared parking can encourage a reduction in the size of the parking lots. Incentives that could be provided for shared parking include an increase in floor area ratio (FAR) and increased flexibility in certain bulk regulations, such as building coverage or height.”

- Waltham, MA: Shared Parking Ordinance
The General Ordinances of the City of Waltham, Massachusetts, v.9, updated 8-2006, Part III. Zoning Code, ARTICLE V. Parking Requirements
<http://ecode360.com/26938088>

(c) Notwithstanding any other parking requirements set forth in this chapter for individual land uses, when any land or building is used for two or more distinguishable purposes (i.e., joint or mixed use development), the minimum total number of parking spaces required to serve the combination of all uses shall be determined in the following manner:

Multiply the minimum parking requirement for each individual use (as set forth in the applicable section of this chapter for each use) by the appropriate percentage (as set forth below in the Parking Credit Schedule Chart) for each of the five designated time periods and then add the resulting sums from each vertical column. The column total having the highest total value is the minimum shared parking space requirement for that combination of land uses.

	Weekday	Weekday	Weekday	Weekend	Weekend
	Night Midnight to 7:00 a.m. (percent)	Day 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (percent)	Evening 5:00 p.m. to Midnight (percent)	Day 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (percent)	Evening 6:00 p.m. to Midnight (percent)
Residential	100	60	90	80	90
Office/Industrial	5	100	10	10	5
Commercial/Retail	5	80	90	100	70
Hotel	70	70	100	70	100
Restaurant	10	50	100	50	100
Restaurant associated with hotel	10	50	60	50	60
Entertainment/recreation (theaters, bowling allies, cocktail lounges and similar)	10	40	100	80	100
Day-care facilities	5	100	10	20	5
All other	100	100	100	100	100

*City of Waltham, MA Shared Parking Calculations Table

Draft Ordinance Language

ORDINANCE NO. _____

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 4.45(G), PARKING STANDARDS, TO AMEND THE SHARED PARKING STANDARDS AND STREAMLINE THE APPROVAL PROCESS.

G. Methods of Providing Parking Facilities: The required off-street parking facilities for buildings used for other than residential purposes may be provided by any one of the following methods:

1. By providing the required off-street parking on the same lot as the building being served, or where practical, and with the permission of the City Commission, the area in the public right-of-way abutting the property in question may be included as a portion of the required parking area if such area is improved in accordance with plans which have been approved by the engineering department.

2. By providing the required off-street parking within 100 feet of the building being served, distances being measured along the most direct line of public pedestrian access.

3. By the collective provisions of the required off-street parking for 2 or more buildings or uses, provided that the total of such off-street parking areas shall not be less than the sum of the requirements of the various buildings or uses computed separately, and the location of such area meets the requirements of subsection (2) of this section, except as provided in Section 4.45(G)(4) below.

4. ~~By the shared provisions of the required off-street parking for 2 or more buildings or uses, which has been approved by the Planning Board.~~ Shared parking between uses **may be permitted** based on the fact that certain neighboring uses may operate at different times over a 24-hour period with their greatest demand for parking occurring during different times. By allowing uses to share a parking facility, the amount of impervious land in the city may be reduced. **Notwithstanding any other parking requirements set forth in this chapter for individual land uses, when any property or building(s) is/are used for two or more distinguishable purposes (mixed use development), the minimum total number of parking spaces required to serve the combination of all uses shall be determined in the following manner:**

(a) Multiply the minimum parking requirement for each individual use proposed in the development as set forth Article 4, Table A, Parking Standards by the percentage of use noted in Chart 1 for each of the five designated time periods;

(b) Add the resulting sums from each vertical column for the five designated time periods. The column total having the highest total

value is the minimum shared parking requirement for the proposed combination of land uses.

Chart 1:

Uses	M-F	M-F	M-F	Sat. & Sun.	Sat. & Sun.	Sat. & Sun.
	8am-5pm	6pm-12am	12am-6am	8am-5pm	6pm-12am	12am-6am
Residential	60%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%
Office/ /Industrial	100%	20%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Commercial / Retail	90%	80%	5%	100%	70%	5%
Hotel	70%	100%	100%	70%	100%	100%
Restaurant	70%	100%	10%	70%	100%	20%
Movie Theater	40%	80%	10%	80%	100%	10%
Entertainment	40%	100%	10%	80%	100%	50%
Conference/Convention	100%	100%	5%	100%	100%	5%
Institutional (non-church)	100%	20%	5%	10%	10%	5%
Institutional (church)	10%	5%	5%	100%	50%	5%

All shared parking requests must be submitted to the Planning Board during Final Site Plan approval, and must include a parking demand summary chart demonstrating the process for calculating the parking reduction as outlined in this section. If a shared parking arrangement is subsequently terminated, or if the uses involved change, the property owner must notify the City in writing within 30 days, and the shared parking arrangement will be null and void as of the date of termination or change of uses. Each use shall thereafter be required to comply with the individual parking requirements of this Article, unless a revised shared parking arrangement is submitted and approved by the Planning Division using the process for calculating the parking reduction as outlined above with the new mix of uses.

a. ~~The total number of combined spaces required for each use may be reduced by up to 50% upon the Planning Board making the determination that the peak parking demands of the uses being served occur at different times and the parking area meets the anticipated demands of all the uses. The Planning Board will make this determination based upon the following information, to be provided by the petitioner:~~

- ~~i. The peak hours of operation for each use.~~
- ~~ii. The average parking demand and the peak parking demand for each use, based on reliable data. Such data will include actual parking counts for these uses, or at similar uses or actual parking counts are not available, reliable traffic/parking demand models may be used.~~

- ~~iii. The impact of shared parking arrangement on adjacent uses.~~
- ~~iv. Written legal evidence in the form of deeds, leases or contracts that establish the shared parking facility.~~

~~b. Once a shared parking arrangement is approved by the Planning Board, such arrangement must be recorded on the land titles for all affected properties. If a shared parking arrangement is subsequently terminated, or if the uses change, Planning Board approval shall be automatically revoked and each use shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section.~~

~~c. The petitioner(s) shall be responsible for any costs incurred by the city in contracting with consultants to review the proposed site plan as deemed necessary by the Community Development Director.~~

ORDAINED this _____ day of _____, 2017 to become effective 7 days after publication.

Mark Nickita, Mayor

Cherilynn Brown, City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. _____

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 4.50, PARKING STANDARDS, TO PROVIDE THE SAME SHARED PARKING STANDARDS FOR ALL ZONE DISTRICTS.

~~This Parking Standards section applies to the following districts:~~

~~**B-3 — MX**~~

~~The following parking standards apply:~~

- ~~A. Parking for Residential Uses: Parking for residential uses shall be provided on the same lot with such building or on adjacent parcels of land having direct access to the principal building, as may be approved by the appropriate reviewing body pursuant to the Site Plan Review and Design Review Sections in Article 7.~~
- ~~B. Office and Residential Parking: Where there is combined within a single building an office use and a commercial restaurant, up to 30% of the parking supplied to meet the requirement of the office use may also be used to meet the requirement for the commercial restaurant.~~
- ~~C. Office and Residential Parking: Where there is combined within a single building, an office use and a residential use, up to 40% of the parking supplied to meet the requirement for the office use may also be used to meet the requirement for residential use, provided that the number of spaces required for residential parking shall never be less than 1 parking space per dwelling unit.~~
- ~~D. Office, Residential and Restaurant Parking: Where there is combined within a single building, an office use, a residential use and a commercial restaurant, up to 40% of the parking supplied to meet the requirement for office use may also be used to meet the requirement for residential use and up to 30% of the remaining parking requirement for office use may be used to meet the requirement for the commercial restaurant.~~

O1 O2 P B1 B2 B2B B2C B3 B4 MX

Credits for Shared Parking: If two or more properties are subject to a shared parking arrangement under the provisions of this Article, all affected properties will qualify for a zoning credit under this section if they provide evidence of an executed shared parking agreement with a minimum term of 5 years, and said agreement is recorded on the land titles for all affected properties. If such evidence is provided to the Planning Division, all property involved in the shared parking agreement shall be entitled to one of the following credits:

- (a) A 50% reduction in parking lot landscaping requirements;**
- (b) A 50% reduction in site landscaping requirements;**

- (c) A 25% increase in FAR; or
- (d) A 25% reduction in minimum lot area per unit.

Each property owner must state their selected credit request in writing to the Planning Division at the time of Final Site Plan approval, and the credit request must be noted on the parking demand summary chart submitted.

ORDAINED this _____ day of _____, 2017 to become effective 7 days after publication.

Mark Nickita, Mayor

Cherilynn Brown, City Clerk

Planning Board Minutes February 8, 2017

2. Review of Ad Hoc Rail District Report

Ms. Ecker reported that on January 11, 2016, the City Commission established the Ad Hoc Rail District Review Committee to study existing and future conditions and to develop a recommended plan to address parking, planning and multi-modal issues in the Rail District and along S. Eton Road (“the Rail Plan”).

Over the past year, the Ad Hoc Rail District Review Committee has worked to identify issues in the Rail District and along S. Eton, and to develop a plan with recommendations to address parking, planning and multi-modal issues in the Rail District, as directed by the City Commission. The Ad Hoc Rail District Review Committee requested funds to hire a consultant to review some of the intersection design concepts discussed by the Committee, and to conduct an analysis of parking in the study area.

Based on the Committee’s direction, the findings outlined in the consultant’s report, and the input of the public, the Ad Hoc Rail District Report requested by the City Commission was prepared. On January 8, 2017, the City Commission reviewed and approved the Report. The City Commission further directed that the Ad Hoc Rail District Report be forwarded to both the Multi-Modal Transportation Board for review, and also forwarded to the Planning Board for review and discussion regarding Recommendation 4: Encourage Shared Parking.

The report states that there is not a shortage of parking in the Rail District. There are 2,480 parking spaces in the District as a whole. Hazel, Bowers and Haynes are residential permit parking only and were not included in the study. The Planning Board has been asked by the City Commission to identify whether to streamline the shared parking calculations and approval process and/or recommend zoning incentives to further encourage shared parking.

Mr. Williams commented that the traffic between Lincoln and Maple Rd. is too fast and there needs to be a stop sign. To him the preferable spot would be on Hazel. There are a lot of young children in the neighborhood and it is dangerous for them.

Ms. Ecker discussed a Shared Parking Occupancy Rates Table provided by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute. The table lists all the types of uses that might be on a site and then it calculates what percentage of the parking is needed for that use at any given time. Therefore, the most parking that would ever be used because of the different peak use times is known, and that is what an applicant would have to provide on their site. Use of the table ensures that parking facilities are not overbuilt. However, the board is not yet seeing a true mixed-use building in the Rail District like in Downtown. Chairman Clein added that right now there is no incentive to share parking with a neighbor. Ms. Whipple-Boyce thought there may be simple things that this board can do to encourage shared parking.

Mr. Williams noted that a bigger problem than parking is traffic. The intersection at S. Eton and Maple Rd. will just get more congested when Whole Foods and the complex next to the Reserve open.

Mr. Boyle stated if there is a particular commercial parking problem in the southern part of the District, then this board needs to address it and come up with some ideas. Ms. Ecker said there will be suburban style development and less mixed-use, but there will not be a parking problem.

Discussion contemplated the possibility of allowing parking on both sides of Lincoln.

Chairman Clein summarized that it seems the board wants to look at parking regulations from the potential to incentivize design by allowing an easier shared-use calculation on a mixed-use site; and also discuss whether they are amenable to incentives between site owners and what mechanisms would make that easier.

Mr. Williams reiterated that he thinks parking is not the problem in this area. Traffic and congestion is the problem and safety is the biggest problem. Mr. Boyle thought this is an opportunity to complete the grid. The Eton Rd. Corridor Plan that was prepared by McKenna Associates recommended that there should be a N/S link between Lincoln and Cole on the east side of the site adjacent to the Swim Club and the new orthodontist.

Chairman Clein thought the Rail District Committee was not asked to deconstruct the Eton Rd. Corridor Plan or the Multi-Modal Plan, but to incorporate them and figure out how to jumpstart and implement them. His disappointment with the document is that the final recommendations did not incorporate all of the recommendations of the existing plans. However, he felt staff did an excellent job in preparing the report. Mr. Koseck added that walking under the viaduct can be very scary and that needs to be addressed somehow.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce, former chairperson of the Ad Hoc Rail District Review Committee, noted the Committee was comprised of a group of people with various backgrounds who all brought something different to the table. There were some great ideas that came out of it, such as ways to get across S. Eton. Additionally, a plaza at the busiest section of S. Eton was a great idea, along with a better crossing at Maple Rd.

Planning Board Minutes March 29, 2017

4. Shared Parking Standards

Ms. Ecker advised that on January 8, 2017, the City Commission reviewed and approved the Ad Hoc Rail District Report. Further, the City Commission forwarded it to the Planning Board for review and discussion regarding Recommendation 4: Encourage Shared Parking. Accordingly, the Planning Board has been directed by the City Commission to consider amendments to the shared parking calculations and approval process and/or recommend zoning incentives to further encourage shared parking.

Based on the direction of the City Commission, the Planning Division has conducted research on shared parking provisions that are utilized in other cities. No communities could be found that mandated shared parking. Many encouraged it by adopting shared parking calculation standards and by offering zoning incentives to encourage sharing parking. Policies involved with shared parking generally include calculation tables adopted by the city. These tables incorporate parking calculations for categories of building uses. Parking demands are calculated for different times of the day throughout the week. Peak parking demand times of the adjacent places are then compared to help determine the minimum number of parking spaces necessary. The calculation tables simplify the process, and people don't have to hire a consultant. If they can use the chart and show that they meet all of the requirements, perhaps even administrative approval could be offered for a shared parking arrangement. The process should probably be made uniform across all of the Zoning Districts.

Article 4, Section 4.45(G)(4) of the Birmingham Zoning Ordinance includes the current shared parking policy. This provision includes up to a 50% reduction in parking spaces in a shared parking agreement if all requirements are met. However, our current standards require hiring a parking consultant, the findings are subject to the discretion of the Planning Board, and the final agreement must be recorded on title of the property. All of these requirements increase the time and cost of a project, which may not encourage applicants to utilize shared parking. Finally, no zoning incentives are currently offered to encourage shared parking. In the past, very few applicants have taken advantage of the shared parking provisions, and none in the Rail District have done so.

The way the draft ordinance is written the shared parking agreement is not required to be recorded on the title. It is required to be recorded with the City. However if they want to get a credit, then the shared parking agreement must be recorded on the title.

Mr. Williams commented if shared parking is going to work, the incentive has to work for the existing entity providing the shared parking. Chairman Clein was not in favor of reducing required landscaping in order to create more parking. Mr. Share noted if an existing entity is one that the owner is contemplating selling in the future, then the credits have value for a new owner.

Mr. Boyle suggested rather than going to the public first, the Planning Board could introduce the shared parking regulations at the a joint meeting of the Planning Board/City Commission, get their buy-in, take it to a public hearing, and then send it up to the Commission.

Mr. Share asked staff to do a little more research on the types of credits that could be used and how they might apply on a sample site, such as Armstrong White/Lincoln Yard. Ms. Ecker thought they also could run it on a true mixed-use building. Mr. Share suggested a tax credit for entering into a shared parking arrangement. That would incentivize an existing business to enter into shared parking. Board members wanted to see an expansion of the required parking distance from the building.

	TOPIC	STUDY SESSION	PUBLIC HEARING	STATUS	NOTES
1	Review dormer and habitable attic regulations in SF zones	0		Complete	As directed by the City Commission on 7-11-2016
2	Consider outdoor storage and display standards	4/10/13 4/24/13 6/12/13 8/14/13 8/28/13 1/22/14	7/13/16 PB	Complete	Develop standards for outdoor storage and displays
3	Glazing Standards	8/28/2013, 3/11/2015, 4/22/2015, 10/14/2015	9/11/13, 9/25/13, 1/27/14, 11/11/2015 PB, 11/23/15 CC	Complete	CC approved changes to the Triangle Overlay and Article 04 of the Z. O. on 11.23.15 to be consistent with the DB Overlay by measuring Glazing between 1 and 8 feet above grade. Further changes to be considered at future study sessions.
4	Height in MX district	6/22/2016	7/27/2016		Allow 10' height for rooftop mechanical equipment
5	Zoning Transition Overlay (TZ2)	2/27/13, 4/10/13 4/24/13, 5/8/13 5/22/13, 6/12/13 7/24/13, 8/28/13 9/11/13, 11/13/13 1/8/14, 3/12/14 10/8/14, 2/25/15 4/08/15, 5/15/15	10/9/13 2/26/14 4/9/14 4/23/14 6/24/15 PB 08/24/15 CC	Complete	CC approved rezoning of parcels to the TZ1 and TZ3 zoning classification on 8.24.15. TZ2 sent back to the Planning Board for further study of permitted uses.
6	Parking Requirements			In Progress	As directed by the City Commission on 7-11-2016
7	Definition of Retail			In Progress	As directed by the City Commission on 7-11-2016

8	Address allowable changes for commercial non-conforming buildings				As directed by the City Commission on 7-11-2016
9	Consider looking at principal uses allowed and add flexibility("and other similar uses")				
10	Potential residential zoning changes: MF & MX garage doors, garage house standards, dormers	1/22/2014, 11/14/14, 1/28/15, 2/11/15	3/11/2015	In Progress	Ordinance Amendment recommended for approval to City Commission at PH
11	S. Woodward Avenue Gateway Plan (Woodward Corridor Lincoln to 14 Mile Road)	2/27/08 9/24/08 10/20/08 (PB/CC) 2/10/09 (LRP) 10/17/2011 (Joint with CC) 1/22/2012 (LRP) 4/24/13 5/8/13		In Progress	LSL/Hamilton Anderson contracted to lead master plan process - Subcommittee formed to guide master plan process in 2013 - Charette held in May of 2013 - Draft plan received from LSL early in 2014 - Project postponed in summer of 2014 due to staff shortage and pending projects

12	Sustainable Urbanism – Green building standards, impervious surface, solar and wind ordinances, deconstruction, geothermal, native plants, low impact development etc.	2/09/2005 7/11/2007 8/08/2007 9/12/2007 1/9/2008 9/10/08 1/14/09 1/28/09 2/10/09 (LRP) 5/13/09 8/12/09 11/11/09 1/23/10 (LRP) 5/12/2010 6/9/10	2/25/09 (PB - Solar) 1/13/10 (PB-Wind) 2/10/10 (PB-Wind) 6/14/2010 (CC-Wind)	Solar ordinance completed; Wind ordinance completed	Incentive option in Triangle District Guest speakers in LEED Certification, Pervious Concrete, LED Lighting, Wind Power, Deconstruction Sustainability website & Awards Native plant brochure
13	Regional Planning Projects	6/12/13 10/9/13 11/13/13 2/1/14 (LRP)		Ongoing	Woodward Complete Streets and Woodward Alternatives Analysis
14	Wayfinding			On Hold	Implement way finding plan
15	Southern Downtown Overlay Gateway	5/13/2015, 6/10/2015, 7/08/2015, 9/09/2015, 9/30/2015		In Progress	Consideration of a new D5 overlay zone requested by the owners of the 555 Building
16	Medical Marijuana	2/25/2015		On Hold	