



Zoning Framework

Workshop and Discussion

Roadmap

Let's address some lingering questions or concerns with the proposed zoning framework

Let's explore development standards and establish a path forward there

Let's discuss next steps and our projected timeline

Zoning

Context Areas

- ▶ **Should these have regulatory power?**
 - ▶ Current proposal treats context areas as regulatory and mapped areas
 - ▶ There are similar concepts applied with different degrees of strictness
 - ▶ [Tulsa](#)
 - ▶ [Louisville](#)
 - ▶ [Denver](#)
- ▶ **Should context areas be used for informal guidance?**
 - ▶ This might look like a technical memo, or a report on existing development patterns in Edmond with recommendations for how to apply proposed zoning districts beyond this project's remapping

Zoning

Legacy Districts and District Conversion

- ▶ **How do we address nonconforming districts/district conversions in the new Code?**
 - ▶ Legacy district designations may provide a more comprehensible approach to property owners wondering what the new zoning districts mean
 - ▶ Legacy districts could also be used to clarify that any rezoning or development activities which require that a property be brought into conformance must adhere to the newly created district standards
- ▶ **How do we handle existing PUDs in this process?**
 - ▶ Legacy district designations may present a flexible and adaptable tool to carry over PUDs into the new Code
 - ▶ [Tulsa](#) curbs new PUDs by establishing existing PUDs as Legacy Districts

Zoning

Legacy Districts and District Conversion

Conversion Method	Advantages	Disadvantages	Examples
Legacy Districts	- Optional for property owners to change to the new district standards - Safe conversion strategy - No rezoning can occur to legacy districts	- Property owners retain their current entitlements - Hinders the achievement of the preferred development outcomes	Raleigh UDO Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance Tulsa Zoning Code
Remapping (Repeal and Replace)	- All new development must meet new district standards - Clean break up from the old code to new code - Improved chances of producing the preferred development outcomes quicker	- Significant change at one time - Property owners likely to become agitated - Generally, a longer, more contentious adoption process	South Bend Zoning Ordinance
Opt-In	- Optional for property owners to change to the new district standards - Safe conversion strategy	- Property owners can retain their current entitlements - Hinders the achievement of the preferred development outcomes - Can create disjointed development patterns - Rezoning can occur to the current district	Loudoun County Route 28 Corridor Zoning Ordinance
Notes	Information in this table comes from a city perspective as opposed to a property owner's perspective		

Zoning

PUDs and SUPs

- ▶ **When and where should PUDs be allowed, even if we want them to be rare?**
 - ▶ Should they ever be allowed in Urban or Suburban areas, even if the new Code is meant to reduce their necessity and frequency?
 - ▶ Should they only be allowed in Rural areas?
- ▶ **How should we go about phasing out SUPs?**
 - ▶ Are the functions of SUPs to be performed via some other mechanism?
 - ▶ Are these functions to be blocked entirely by removing the SUP permitting process?

Zoning

Dimensional Requirements

- ▶ **How much should we pare these down?**
 - ▶ Whole tables of dimensions are flagged for removal in the proposed Code – is the goal to fully or nearly remove dimensional standards?
 - ▶ In this vein, discussion of building permits is highlighted for removal – how streamlined and succinct do we want the Code to be? How specific do we want it to be?

Zoning

Dimensional Requirement Examples

- ▶ **Regulatory Examples**
 - ▶ [Denver Zoning Code: Urban Edge Neighborhood Context](#)
 - ▶ [McKinney UDC](#)
 - ▶ [Lafayette Development Code](#)
 - ▶ [Raleigh UDO](#)
- ▶ **Real-World Example**
 - ▶ [Grapevine \(TX\) Dallas Corridor](#)

Zoning

Subsections

- ▶ **Where should we go with Special Regulations?**
 - ▶ Should we use different nomenclature?
 - ▶ Should we integrate these requirements into other sections of each District's language?
 - ▶ Should we relocate these requirements to some other dedicated section or sections?
- ▶ **How should we approach some other specific subsections like Access and Circulation, or those addressing building frontages in mixed-use Districts?**

Development Standards

Proposed Sections

- ▶ Off-Street Parking and Loading
- ▶ Landscaping
- ▶ Screening, Fences, and Walls
- ▶ Architectural Design Standards
- ▶ Outdoor Lighting
- ▶ Outdoor Storage
- ▶ Trash
- ▶ Infill Development
- ▶ Performance Standards
- ▶ Transfer of Development Rights

Development Standards

Next Steps

- ▶ **Are these the right topics?**
 - ▶ Should we add anything? Remove anything? Address any of these topics in other parts of the Code?
- ▶ **On which ones would you like to do a deep dive?**
 - ▶ Discussions of the level of change needed, desired, or proposed?
 - ▶ Do we need to get specific with Performance Standards as we move toward LID implementation?
 - ▶ Should we drill down on Architectural Design Standards given our prior discussion of building and housing types?
 - ▶ How would you like to address Infill Development to accompany the goal of establishing a TDR program?
 - ▶ Have there been reoccurring administrative issues or concerns from the community with things like Parking, Outdoor Lighting, or Trash that prompt a more nuanced discussion?

Downtown

Form-Based Code Committee

- ▶ **Who will comprise it?**
 - ▶ Prominent property owners?
 - ▶ Local developers?
 - ▶ Neighborhood representatives?
 - ▶ Former elected officials?
 - ▶ Others with vested interests in Downtown
- ▶ **What will its role be?**
 - ▶ Determine most applicable standards?
 - ▶ What are the non-negotiables of Downtown? (e.g. We do not want this, we must have this...)