Project Overview

The Land Development Code Update (LDCU) is being developed in conjunction with the EE&CS, in order to recommend modifications and/or updates in the LDCU that will enhance the community’s ability to conserve energy. In addition, a consultant team will be performing an analysis of the existing, outdated code in order to resolve inconsistencies among code sections as well as inconsistencies between the recently updated Comprehensive Plan and current code. Alternative code language and user-friendly implementation options will be developed. As with the EE&CS, this work will include a combination of community input (through surveys, interviews, and public workshops) and expert analysis, and will be subject to public comment and review by the City Council. In this case the Planning Commission will be providing the technical review.

Code Update Timeline

What’s Tonight About?

The purpose of tonight’s meeting is to get your feedback on key elements of Ellensburg’s Land Development Code. In fall 2010, we began gathering input through a series of stakeholder interviews and a community survey. Tonight, we will share results of the survey and present preliminary code update concepts and options for your review. Please take a questionnaire, visit the display stations, watch the presentation, and participate in the rotating station discussions on the code update. Based on your input, we will draft the updated code language over the next several months.
LDCU Survey Results

Below are results of the on-line community survey for the EE&CS and LDCU. The charts on the left show the percentages of surveys that responded with the particular answer for each question. The shaded blue boxes indicate more popular answers. The bar charts on the right indicate the total number of surveys that shared similar responses to each question. The results here reflect over 500 completed surveys.

Trees and Sidewalks

New Multifamily Developments

New Single Family Areas

New Commercial Developments

Miscellaneous Concepts

Land Development Code Update
Non-Motorized Transportation
Connectivity: Getting from Here to There

Comprehensive Plan Guidance
Policy T-3: Design of new streets in the city shall use a street grid system at an interval of 1/2 mile for arterial streets. Within the 1/2 mile sections, attempts to maintain a 1/4 mile connection for auto circulation, with 200 to 800 foot pedestrian connections, depending on zone density.

Non-Motorized Transportation Plan Guidance
Maintain a pedestrian-friendly level of connectivity.
Implement the Comprehensive Plan recommendations T-3.
Use GIS capabilities to map potential street alignments within 1/2 mile sections.
Convene neighborhood meetings to review proposed alignments.
Adopt alignment as Comprehensive Plan amendments.
Refine goal T-3 to clarify “with 200 to 800 foot pedestrian connections, depending on zone density.”
Amend code to allow maximum block length of 800 feet for Rural Suburban and Residential Low density zones.
Amend code to allow maximum block length of 600 feet in Residential Medium zones.
Amend code to allow maximum block length of 400 feet in Residential High density zones, provided block length may be satisfied with internal transportation networks for large complexes.

Current Ellensburg Policy
- Preserve ROW on Road Classifications map
- “Provide for the continuation of major streets which serve property contiguous to the development.”
- Require blocks >400 ft < 1200 ft
- Cal de sacs allowed < 500 ft < 40 lots

Issues:

Distance to school
Ridgeview Neighborhood
- Red line 824 ft = 1.5 mi
- Current route to school

Distance to a playmates
Radio Hill Neighborhood
- Yellow line 3720 ft = 0.71 mi
- Route to school precluded by existing development
- By crow about 200 ft
- By street about 5000 ft (nearly a mile)

Distance Around the Neighborhood
Radio Hill Neighborhood
- Natural barriers like streams and steep slopes will prevent street connections in places like west of Brink Road.
- Existing neighborhoods also create barriers when there is no plan.
- Concurrency exists had no opportunity to connect to the Radio Hill streets.

Park Lane-Water Neighborhood
- From home on one side of the neighborhood to a church on the other side.
- Via Game Farm: 605 ft (1,15 mi)
- Via Radio Rd: 696 ft (0.96 mi)
- Creek: 1620 ft = 0.3 mi

Choice of Routes
- One Route
- Just travel on high traffic street

Yellowstone Neighborhood
- Some residents choose to trespass by climbing a fence (which results in property damage), to avoid the extra 1070 feet (0.3 mi) when walking home.

Trespass
- Route options
- Boot travel on low traffic streets
- Boot travel on high traffic streets

Land Use Development Code Update
Non-Motorized Transportation
Connectivity: Block Length

Current Ellensburg Policy:
RCW 12.08.160 B3. Blocks shall be as established in the public works developments standards. Block shall be wide enough to allow two tiers of lots, except where fronting on major streets, or prevented by topographical conditions, or size of property.
Public Works Standards, Section 3, Street Standards. Blocks shall not be less than four hundred feet nor more than one thousand two hundred feet in length.

Land Use Code Update
Non-Motorized Transportation
Local Residential Streetscape

Comprehensive Plan Guidance:
Policy T-2-B-3 Minimize street widths
Policy T-4-A Enhance the appearance of and from public rights of way. 1 Update and use the City's public tree inventory and assure an annual net gain of suitable trees in the public right of way. 2 Review street standards to permit more flexibility to enhance design of the public realm, provide greater separation of pedestrians from vehicles, and accommodate on-street parking in commercial districts.
Policy T-10-C-3 Introduce calming measures to slow traffic on non-arterial streets.

Non-Motorized Plan Guidance:
Recommendation 2.4.2c Build a more attractive pedestrian environment on local streets. 1. Convene a stake-holder group to include transportation planners, community planners, builders, fire/emergency response officials, walking advocates, neighborhood advocates and citizens, to review street width requirements. (The recommendations below are a result of that committee's work.)

Current Policy: Existing 38 ft Residential Street Required
Pavement width: 38 ft
Parking: Both sides
Planting strip: Optional 6 to 10 ft
Curb: Rolled
Sidewalk: 5 ft
Queuing: No
Estimated cost: $573 per linear ft
Example: Ellington Street
Stonebridge Lane

Proposed 30 ft Residential Street Option
Pavement width: 30 ft
Parking: Both sides
Planting strip: one side 10 ft
Curb: Full
Sidewalk: 5 ft adjacent to planting strip
6 ft adjacent to street
Queuing: Yes
Estimated cost: $361 per linear ft
Example: Second Avenue

Proposed 24 ft Residential Street Option
Pavement width: 24 ft
Parking: One side
Planting strip: one side 10 ft
Curb: Full
Sidewalk: 5 ft adjacent to planting strip
6 ft adjacent to street
Queuing: Yes
Estimated cost: $337 per linear ft
Example: Ninth Avenue

Proposed 20 ft Residential Street Option
Pavement width: 20 ft
Parking: No on-street parking. Pavement call travel, at the rate of one space per dwelling unit, must be provided within the development in addition to the standard on-street parking requirements.
Planting strip: Both sides 10 ft
Curb: Full
Sidewalk: Both sides 5 ft
Queuing: No
Estimated cost: $324 per linear ft
Example: None in Ellensburg

Intent:
Provide safe and attractive local streets to access adjacent property. Discourage through traffic and speed. Convenience to the motorist is secondary to the safety and enjoyment of the residents.

Skinny Streets:
Weekly streets with long sight distances encourage high travel speed. In collisions, faster speeds cause more damage. Narrow streets “calm” and discourage “cut through” traffic. They are more safe, cost less to build and maintain, and produce less polluted run off and radioactive heat than wider streets.

Queuing:
Narrow streets do not allow room for cars to pass unimpeded if there are parked cars present. Queuing, or pausing in pths between parking to allow incoming cars to pass, is necessary. This works on local streets because traffic volume is so low, it is rare to meet an on-coming car.

Planting Strips:
Weekly strips provide a safety barrier between pedestrians and vehicles. They can be used to detain storm water runoff and as a place to store snow. Trees provide an attractive “face” to the street, shade, and “edge friction” that encourages lower traffic speed. Full curbs are required to discourage people from parking in the planting strip or on the sidewalk.

Land Development Code Update
Non-Motorized Transportation
Planting Strips

Comprehensive Plan Guidance:

Policy T-4: Continuous improvement of the overall appearance and physical condition of the community. Enhance the appearance of and from public rights of way. 1. Update and use the City’s public tree inventory and ensure an annual net gain of suitable trees in the public right of way.

Policy T-10: Implement a non-motorized transportation system that increases the number of residents who choose to walk or bicycle in lieu of driving. Increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety along arterial streets. 1. Revise street standards to increase separation of pedestrians from travel ways. 3. Introduce calming measures to slow traffic on non-arterial streets.

Non-Motorized Plan Guidance:

Recommendation 2.4.2a: Build a more attractive pedestrian environment on arterial streets
3. Require planting strips and street trees on arterials at the time of development. Options include:
   A. Require homeowner association or property owner maintenance agreements
   B. Require gates in back fences to allow property owner access to maintain landscaping

2.4.2b: Build a more attractive pedestrian environment on collector streets.
1. Require a planting strip on new collector streets.

2.4.2c: Build a more attractive pedestrian environment on local streets.

2.4.2d: Provide attractive nonmotorized transportation links to commercial areas

Policy Recommendations

(survey question 4)
1. Build new Arterial streets with a minimum 10 foot wide planting strip on both sides of the street.
2. Build new Collector streets with a minimum 6 foot wide planting strip on at least one side of the street.
3. Build new Local streets with a minimum 10 foot wide planting strip on one or both sides of the street, depending on street width.

Pedestrian Walkways

Comprehensive Plan Guidance:

Policy T-3-J: Design of new streets in the city shall use a street grid system at an interval of 1/2 mile for arterial streets. Within the 1/2 mile sections, attempt to maintain a 3/4 mile connection for auto circulation, with 200 to 800 foot pedestrian connections, depending on zone density.

Non-Motorized Plan Guidance:

Recommendation 2.4.3: Maintain a pedestrian friendly level of connectivity. A.S. Link proposed new developments to walkways, trails, and bicycle systems in the surrounding area, and provide clear pedestrian routes to building entrances.

2.2.3: Encourage connector paths where the street grid cannot be achieved

Policy Recommendations

(survey question 2)
1. Allow pedestrian walkways in lieu of a local street to achieve pedestrian circulation in long blocks.
2. Proposed design is 20 feet wide and paved for the entire width and length with a permanent surface if fenced on both sides, or 10 feet wide paved surface if fenced on one side. Bollards may be placed at the ends of the walkway to prevent auto traffic.
3. Require paths accessing multi-use trails (like the John Wayne Trail) from new subdivisions at 660 foot intervals, unless the trail is a State or County facility having different requirements.

Land Development Code Update

Willow Glen
Connecting a neighborhood to Mountain View Park

John Wayne Trail
Illinois Avenue connection to cross-state trail

Kirsten Ave
Designed so that long blocks are bisected by storm water detention basins that also provide pedestrian access

Sagebrush Trail
A pedestrian connection where the slope is too steep for a street allows Craig's Hill residents easy access for to the fairgrounds, City Pool, Memorial Park, and downtown
Development Frontages (How it looks from the street)
University Way - Campus Area

**Concept:** Establish framework to create a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood center adjacent to the campus

**Current Conditions**

**Future Conditions?**

Land Development Code Update
Height Limits in Downtown?

Comprehensive Plan Guidance
- Policy LU-1.1-A-1: Maintain and enhance the Downtown Historic District's intimate scale and character.
- Policy LU-1.1-B.2: Study the use of form-based zoning for application in the I-C zones.

Current Code
No height limit Downtown. However, new buildings are subject to design review which emphasizes that new buildings must be compatible with the historic character.

Possible Concept
Provide specific height limits for Downtown (I-C zone), including a 3-story limit for the Historic District and a 5 or 6-story limit for the rest of the I-C zone.

Building Height Examples
- Typical historic building (left) and newer 3-story office building south of downtown (right).
- Newer 4-story building on campus (left) and illustration of a 4-6-story mixed-use project (right) in a similar downtown setting (proposed elsewhere).
- Newer 5-story mixed-use building in downtown Bellingham (left) and a 5-6-story mixed-use building in Seattle (right).

Land Development Code Update
Current Zoning

Land Development Code Update
Residential Office (R-O) & Residential - Medium (R-M) Zones

Comprehensive Plan Guidance

Policy 1.2.6: Create a density bonus system for infill development.
Policy 1.2.7: Encourage housing type variety.
Policy 1.2.8: Create affordable housing opportunities.
Policy 1.2.9: Revise zoning to encourage mixed-use.

Context & Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Current context</th>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Max height &amp; density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-O Zone</td>
<td>Predominantly older single-family homes, small scale, multifamily, and office conversions.</td>
<td>Single-family &amp; multifamily [R-units/bedrooms], office uses, some personal service uses.</td>
<td>35' max height &amp; 25 units/acre max density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-M Zone</td>
<td>Apartments, fourplexes &amp; apartment complexes</td>
<td>Single-family &amp; multifamily [R-units/bedrooms]</td>
<td>35' max height &amp; 25 units/acre max density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Infill Development Types

R-O Zone homes
R-M Zone apartments
R-M Zone 4-plexes

Context

Rowhouses
Fourplexes
Apartment buildings
Corner mixed-use with commercial and apartments above

Preliminary Concepts

6. Residential/Office zone (R-O):
   a. Allow greater flexibility on housing types & permitted density, provided they meet height, parking, setbacks, and design standards that limit perceived building size.
   b. Allow small-scale neighborhood commercial uses on street corner if they have residential or office uses above and meet design standards.

7. Multifamily zone (R-M):
   Allow greater flexibility on housing types & permitted density, provided they meet height, parking, setbacks, and design standards that limit perceived building size.
Signage

Comprehensive Plan Guidance

Policy/SP-1-A-1a: Maintain and enhance the district's intimate scale and character.
Policy/HP-3-A: Review local guidelines to ensure continued adequacy of project review for new development within historic district.

Preliminary Concepts

10. Prohibit internally-lit signs in the historic downtown core?

While internally-lit signs have been around for over 50 years, many other similar historic Washington communities don't allow them (new internally-lit signs), since they weren't used during the era of construction and many consider them incompatible with the historic character.

What do you think?

Local Signs

- Individual letter signs
- Window & awning signs
- Neon signs
- Awning signs

Other Signs

- Internally-lit signs
- Internally-lit signs were common on pre-1950s storefronts
- Internally-lit individual letter signs

11. Tall pole signs - except for commercial areas near I-90, emphasize lower monument signs (for new signs only) rather than tall pole signs?

Current standards allow signs up to 35 feet and up to 300 square feet in area.

Local Examples

Other Monument Sign Examples

Land Development Code Update
Lot Design: Garages

Comprehensive Plan Guidance:

- Policy F 4-14: Enhance the appearance of public rights-of-way.
- Non-Motorized Transportation Plan: Build a more attractive pedestrian environment on local and collector streets.

Issue

Garages, driveways, and parked cars are the most dominant visual feature of most new subdivisions. This contrasts with the appearance of most older Ellensburg residential neighborhoods. Should the City do more to emphasize a more pedestrian-friendly design over the auto-dominated design typical of recent developments?

Preliminary Concept/Options

4. Garage location/design options:
   a. Provide standards that limit the visual prominence of garages along streets.
   b. Provide a density bonus for subdivisions that limit the visual prominence of garages along streets.

Possible standards to limit the visual prominence of garages

- At least 15% of the facade shall be transparent windows or doors.
- Porches and covered entries can project into front yard by up to 6 feet.
- Garage fronts shall occupy no more than 50% of the ground level facade.

Land Development Code Update
Concepts for Density Bonuses?

Comprehensive Plan Guidance
- Policy LU-2-B: Create a density bonus system for infill development.
- Policy LU-2-A: Encourage housing type variety.
- Policy LU-2-C: Create affordable housing opportunities.
- Policy LU-2-B-C: Promote water and energy efficiency and alternative energy sources.

Current Code
- Density bonuses are available only through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinance, which has only been used once.

Preliminary Concept

2. Density bonuses – Allow them in exchange for the following amenities:
   a. Greater energy efficient design (site and homes)
   b. Greater mix of lot sizes and housing types (such as mix of housing sizes, cottages, perhaps some attached single family)
   c. Incorporating off-street trails
   d. Incorporating additional park space or protected/enhanced natural areas.
   e. Other item(s)?

Land Development Code Update
Comprehensive Plan Guidance

Policy C14-1-A-2: Revise zoning to incorporate specific standards for compact urban-style projects in planned unit developments in the UGA.
Policy 10-5-A-3: Revise zoning and subdivision standards to permit a variety of less-consumptive housing types.
Policy H-2-A: Encourage housing type variety.
Policy H-2-8-2: Ensure that regulations allow for accessory dwelling units.

Current Code

Zoning and subdivision standards encourage standardized lot sizes and consistent housing type. The City has a Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinance that allows for alternative lot configurations including smaller lot sizes, larger open spaces, and some limited density bonuses. To date, the PUD process has been used only once.

Newer Development Examples

Proposed Concept

1. Encourage innovative subdivision designs by allowing greater diversity of lot sizes and subdivision configurations through the standard subdivision process.

Lot Clustering Examples

These subdivisions incorporate reduced and mixed lot sizes in exchange for greater open space. The example to the left also includes multiple housing types. Issaquah Highlands, WA

Centralized neighborhood park with a mixture of housing types around it

The two “park blocks” are a unique feature – alleys provide vehicular access to the homes adjacent to the parks.
Subdivision Issue: Fences

Comprehensive Plan Guidance:
- Policy T-4.1: Enhance the appearance of public rights-of-way.
- Policy T-10.4.1: Implement the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan that increases the number of residents who choose to walk or bicycle in lieu of driving.

Issue: Tall fences lining streets
The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan contains policies to minimize the use of tall fences lining arterial streets. More recently, the Non-Motorized Transportation Committee has discussed strategies to address the issue. Purpose:
- Fences are monotonous and a visual blight
- Fences are a safety concern since they prohibit views into street
- Fences create an environment that promotes speeding
- Fences are not in keeping with the pattern of historic residential neighborhoods in Ellensburg.

Preliminary Concepts/Options
3. Subdivision with tall fences backing up to street:
   a. Prohibit subdivision design that incorporates continuous tall fences adjacent to sidewalks/streets on local/collector streets.
   b. Limit tall fences adjacent to sidewalks on arterial streets to 50% of the street frontage. Encourage homes, but not driveways, to face the street.
   c. Place limits on subdivision design that includes tall fences along sidewalks/streets, and where they do - require landscaping between sidewalk and fence.

Examples
- Townhouses fronting an arterial street rather than fences; garages are in back.
- Example of a busy street where adjacent lots front onto street and vehicular access is provided by alley.
- In cases where fences are adjacent to sidewalk, provide some landscaping between sidewalk and fence.

Land Development Code Update