An Implementation Toolbox
An incomplete list

Implementation Toolbox
Mixed-use
Pedestrian design
Neo-traditional neighborhood design
Cottage housing
Density versus Design
Design standards
Downtown revitalization
Historic preservation
Planned action EIS
TDR's
Market Analysis
Zoning: Euclidean vs. form-based
Others?

Implementation Toolbox
Mixed-use
Mixing of uses in a single building, typically residential and commercial / offices
Mixed-use

- Typically implemented through zoning
- Usually must “incentify the marketplace”
- Breaks for density, height, parking and/or others
- Planned action EIS(?)
- Design Review desirable
- Pedestrian design needed
  - Zero setbacks
  - Street interest / amenities

Mixed-use

Pro's
- Gentle increase of density
- Brings economic activity
- Social interaction
- Public safety
- Support adaptive re-use (H,P.)
- Simple zoning implementation
- Pedestrian (& transit) oriented
- Housing options (may be more affordable)
- Traditional look

Con’s
- Financing complex
- Parking
- Done best with design review
- May require incentives (waits, density, coverage, parking, setback, etc)
- Developer's not experienced

Pedestrian Design

“Community design that facilitates walking and less reliance on the automobile”
Pedestrian Design

- Applies to both commercial and residential areas
- In both, moves buildings closer to street
- Alleviate and in parking to rear
- Encourage schools to remain in neighborhoods
- Better separation of auto and pedestrian
- In commercial, most successful in mixed-use areas
- Interest at the street edge

Goals:
- Lessen dependence on auto
- More economic and social activity
- Healthier lifestyles
- Better quality of life

Possible steps:
- Smaller front yards in SF residential areas
- Alleviate in SF areas (incentivised?)
- Require usable porches in SF areas
- Zero (or near zero) setbacks in commercial areas
- Commercial design standards requiring street level
- Interest
- Require or fund street amenities
- Designate neighborhood commercial nodes or centers

Pedestrian Design

Pro's
- Quality of life
- Crucial companion to mixed-use
- Crucial companion to downtown revitalization and infill efforts
- Pleasing, traditional feel

Con's
- Requires multiple levels of regulation / cooperation
- Required developers to leave comfort zone
- Benefits somewhat hard to measure
- Not a stand-alone strategy
Neo-traditional Neighborhood Design
"designing neighborhoods like America used to build them"

Neo-traditional Neighborhood Design

- People first, car second
- Safety, eyes on street
- Social interaction
- Pedestrian oriented healthy lifestyle
- Slightly higher density (more efficient)
- Pleasing, traditional form (quality of life enhanced)

Neo-traditional Neighborhood Design

Steps:
- Allow smaller lots (trade-off for alleys and other design changes)
- Require rear loading
- Smaller front yard set-backs
- Smaller rear yard setbacks for garage only
- Possible design or development standards for porches
**Neo-traditional Neighborhood Design**

**Pro's**
- Can / should be incentivized (not a requirement)
- Lower crime
- More efficient (higher density) without feeling much more dense
- Less auto dependent
- Quality of life improved (people like it – hot seller!)

**Con's**
- Some do not want smaller lots allowed
- Smaller yards
- May need more parks
- More complex design and or development standards
- May be outside developer comfort area

---

**Cottage Housing**

*a grouping of small, single family dwelling units clustered around a common area with a coherent plan for the entire site.*

---

**Cottage Housing**

**Issues and steps:**
- More affordable housing option
- Slightly higher densities with minimum impact
- More efficient use of infrastructure
- Provide mechanism in zoning
- Minimum parcel size / area?
- Maximum house size?
- Design standards / guidelines?
- Parking incentive?
- Process, CUP or outright?
- Common spaces – covenants?
- Common space maintenance
### Implementation Toolbox

#### Cottage Housing

**Pro's**
- More efficient (higher density) without feeling much more dense
- Creates affordability
- Attractive appearance

**Con's**
- Resistance to raising densities
- Smaller yards
- May need more parks
- More complex design and or development standards
- May be outside developer comfort area
- Probably requires design review

---

#### Implementation Toolbox

#### Density versus Design

The assumption that all density is bad, often indicates a reaction to poorly done density. Very often it is actually poor design that people dislike.

---

#### Implementation Toolbox

#### Density versus Design

---

---
Implementation Toolbox

Density versus Design

Issues and steps:
- Is it density we don't like, or BAD density?
- Visual preference surveys reveal:
  - It's about bulk and scale, detail, setbacks, street widths, landscaping, etc.
  - It's not really about density
- Much loved traditional neighborhoods often more dense than new subdivisions
- Add better development standards or design guidelines?
- Incentivize density to get the quality the community wants?

Implementation Toolbox

Density versus Design

(Pro’s & Con’s relying on better design to allow slightly more density)

Pro’s
- More efficient (higher density) without feeling much more dense
- Creates affordability
- Attractive appearance
- More housing options
- More development options

Con’s
- Resistance to raising densities
- Smaller yards
- May need more parks
- More complex design and or development standards
- May be outside developer comfort area
- Probably requires design review or more complex development standards

Implementation Toolbox

Design Standards
Design Standards

Issues and steps:
- Broadens development options that are acceptable to the community
- Clarity and predictability are key
- Compliance options desirable
- Requires additional process
- May be crucial to solving compatibility issues surrounding several otherwise desirable implementation mechanisms:
  - Mixed-use
  - Cottage housing
  - Neo-traditional neighborhood standards

Design Standards

Pro's
- May resolve community concerns with otherwise desirable development options
- Increases community involvement
- Tried and tested

Con's
- Extensive effort to initiate
- Added process
- Can be seen as somewhat subjective (by its minimality)

Downtown Revitalization

Issues and steps:
- Supports economic vitality
- Promotes quality of life
- Simple to implement
- Effective partners available
- Consistent with efficient land use principals
- Promotes strong community/participatory ethic
Historic Preservation
Issues and steps:
- Supports strong D.T.
- Supports strong neighborhoods
- Can be incentive driven
- Promotes quality of life
- Promotes community ethic
- Simple to implement
- Supports environmental goals and values*

Planned Action EIS
City initiated environmental "pre-approval" for desirable development

Issues and steps:
- Environmental review (SEPA) can be expensive
- Law allows City's to do the SEPA review for projects consistent with Comp Plan.
- City's can use this to incentivize desirable development (according to the CP)
- Entails preparing an EIS for the type, scale and approximate impacts of the development envisioned in the C.P.
- Usually done by district or project area (not entire City / C.P.
- Shoot a bit high
Planned Action EIS

Pros
- Very effective incentive
- Directly linked to community vision and desire
- City has discretion

Cons
- Expensive
- Equity (will be questions)
- Some SEPA may still be required

Market Analysis

Because for every action there is a direct and probably unanticipated market-based reaction - darn!

Market Analysis

Issues and steps:
- Development/ economic capacity and need is limited
- City decisions must be strategic (long-range)
- Individual actions affect the community (sometimes we must be courageous)
- Important for rezone/ UGA expansion decisions (goes beyond local growth factors)
- Guesses and assumptions are fun - but not reliable
- There is good info out there for free... but
- We can't analyze everything
- Sutner's Buxton Report... a story
Market Analysis

Pro's
- Good information fosters efficient use of limited resources
- Analysis = defensibility
- Analysis = reduction of unintended consequences

Con's
- May be expensive
- Time consuming
- Might not like the answer

Zoning: Euclidean vs. Form-Based

So...what is the best regulatory framework? [answer: it depends]

Zoning: Euclidean vs. Form-Based

Goals are the same:
- Assure compatibility
- Mitigate negative impacts
- Protect property values
- Protect quality of life
- Implement community vision
- Balance individual rights with community values
Zoning: Euclidean vs. Form-Based

Basic approach differs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Euclidean</th>
<th>Form-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control by type and location</td>
<td>Control by form, performance, and impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set basic development</td>
<td>Set more extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards (setback, height,</td>
<td>performance and architectural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverage)</td>
<td>standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption: A never</td>
<td>Assumption: A might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatible with B</td>
<td>compatible with B if it's done right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-use based</td>
<td>Form based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form-based codes

A method of regulating development to achieve a specific urban form. Form-based codes create a predictable public realm primarily by controlling physical form, with a lesser focus on land use.

Form-based codes commonly include the following elements:

- **Regulating Plan**: A plan or map of the regulated area designating the locations where different building form standards apply, based on clear community intentions regarding the physical character of the area.
- **Public Space Standards**: Specifications for the elements within the public realm (e.g., sidewalks, travel lanes, on-street parking, street trees, street furniture, etc.).
- **Building Form Standards**: Regulations controlling the configuration, features, and functions of buildings that define and shape the public realm.
- **Administration**: A clearly defined application and project review process.
- **Definitions**: A glossary to ensure the precise use of technical terms.

Form-based codes also sometimes include:

- **Architectural Standards**: Regulations controlling external architectural materials and quality.
- **Landscaping Standards**: Regulations controlling landscape design and plant materials on private property as they impact public spaces (e.g., regulations about parking lot screening and shading, maintaining sight lines, insuring unobstructed pedestrian movements, etc.).
- **Signage Standards**: Regulations controlling allowable signage sizes, materials, illumination, and placement.
- **Environmental Resource Standards**: Regulations controlling issues such as storm water drainage and infiltration, development on slopes, tree protection, solar access, etc.
- **Annotations**: Text and illustrations explaining the intentions of specific code provisions.
## Form-Based Codes

### Pro’s
- Prospective (what you want)
- More public awareness of what things will look like
- Allows for more diverse development
- Essentially codifies vision and compatibility (if direct)
- Easier to understand
- Might eliminate need for design guidelines (replace)

### Con’s
- May be expensive to develop
- Design based approach might = subjectivity
- Might be time consuming to administer
- Public and staff not familiar
- Might still need separate codes for signs, landscaping, storm, CAO’s and others

---

*End part 2*