



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

P&ZC & CC – December 10, 2024



Agenda

I. Changes to the Code

- By Article
- Policy Changes Proposed

II. Discussion



Guiding Principles

Implement Forward SGF

Improve Useability

Raise Expectations & Streamline Procedures

Provide Flexibility



Forward SGF

Development Policies
Neighborhood Revitalization
Placed-based Development
Infill & Redevelopment
Corridor Redevelopment
Connecting to Nature
Planned, Sustainable, Responsible Growth





QUALITY OF PLACE!

Single biggest determinant to sustained community prosperity.



Please Remember

Land Development Code

You already regulate development.

This is different.

- **Design & Context Emphasis**
- **Simplified / Streamlined**
- **Flexible / Problem-solving Code**

Forward SGF is the Foundation.



Code Changes



Articles 1 & 2: Administration, Applications & Procedures

Current Standards

- Redundant procedures; confusing format
- Mix of permits, development applications, and public decision processes
- Inconsistent administration; interpretation (BDS lead vs P&D lead)
- Reliance on discretionary decisions and hearings

Forward SGF

- Update development code
- Improve usability
- Raise expectations; simplify + clear criteria
- Streamline procedures; effective + efficient
- Provide flexibility

Proposed Approach

- Shift administration and interpretation; BDS to P&D.
- Update administrative plats
- Administrative flexibility; site plan (minor/major modifications)
- Consolidate discretionary decisions (CUP, rezoning, planned zoning)

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

- 1.A** Do you support the change of primary administrator of the Community Development Code from the Director of Building and Development Services to the Director of Planning and Development?
[See Section 1.05.A, Administration.]
- 2.A** Do you agree that subdivision of property, under five lots or less, (whether platted or unplatted) and does not require public improvements should be able to be approved administratively?
[See Section 2.02.A. and B. Plats, and specifically B.1.c Minor Subdivisions]
- 2.B** Do you support distinct criteria for zoning without a plan (site plan or concept plan) vs. rezoning according to a binding site plan (a plan that at the applicants' option could limit uses or commit to specific or increased design elements on a site)?
[See 2.05.C.1 and 2. Rezoning, Review Procedure]

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

- 2.C** Do you support the Planning Development Director (in consultation with other department directors) having the authority to approve minor modifications to site plans (subject to specific criteria and defined parameters for the extent of deviations)?
[See Section 2.03. C. Site Plan, Modifications]
- 2.D** Do you support the Planning and Zoning Commission having the authority to approve major modifications (in a similar manner but with greater deviations than minor modifications) and with an option of appeal to the City Council?
[See Section 2.03 C. Site Plan, Modifications]
- 2.E** Do you support the Planning and Zoning Commission having the authority to approve Conditional Use Permits with an appeal to City Council?
[See Section 2.04 Conditional Use Permit]

Article 3: Subdivision & Community Design

Current Standards

- Technical / procedural standards;
- Lack of community design
- Streets - ROW and street width; no streetscape design standards
- Sidewalk standards minimal; generic city-wide application
- Required improvements timing inflexible

Forward SGF

- Quality of Place
- Community physical image
- Street design types
- Complete streets policy
- Beautify multimodal corridors
- Context sensitive design
- Transit- or trial-oriented development
- Promote active, healthy lifestyles
- Vision zero principles

Proposed Approach

- Promote broad application of Street Design Types
- Specify connectivity standards by context / Place Type
- Coordinate access and streetscape design standards with PW specifications & standards
- Adjust timing of required improvements with development schedules

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

- 3.A** Do you support improving streetscape design based on distinct contexts and place types, provided the function and continuity of street networks is maintained?
[See Section 3.01, Streets]
- 3.B** Do you support a city-wide approach to street design types (a policy emphasized in Forward SGF) to set expectations for a higher level of civic design applied to a variety of contexts?
[See Sections 3.01.C, Streets, Street Design & Street Types.]
- 3.C** Do you support the Public Works Director having the authority to accept one of three different levels of public improvement upgrades (a) accepting existing conditions or minor upgrades when there are no capacity or public safety issues; (b) requiring a proportionate share of code-compliant improvements when there is a pending or potential CIP project for larger and more efficient solutions; or (c) requiring code-compliant improvements where there are quality or capacity issues or the full improvement is consistent with adjacent improvements?
[See Section 3.04.D, Required Improvements, Upgrade of Existing Improvements]

Article 4: Zone Districts & Uses

Current Standards

- Lists of specific and sometimes conflicting uses for each districts
- Districts lack distinctions in development standards.
- Districts not clearly aligned with Place Types or with comparable districts
- Increasing reliance on plan districts or special use / project approvals

Forward SGF

- Quality of Place
- Distinct Place Types; community design
- Complete neighborhoods
- Mixed use corridors and districts
- Walkable neighborhood hubs
- Diverse special purpose districts
- More flexibility in uses; greater emphasis on design

Proposed Approach

- Generalize uses for greater flexibility; use table
- Distinguish more uses by scale or format
- Promote more mixed uses and emphasize mixed residential in some districts
- All districts retain current status – either additional options and/or new scale, format, design standards.
- Combine some districts; few existing or new distinctions

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

4.A Do you support generalizing permitted land uses (a concept emphasized in forward SGF) to allow more flexibility, to allow better integration of complimentary uses within, and to allow more adaptivity over time?

[See Section 4.02, Permitted Use (Use Table) and Table 4-3 Permitted Uses]

4.B Do you support the consolidation of 25 zoning districts down to 13 to simplify the code (combining districts where there was little or no distinctions in development standards or allowed uses; yet distinguishing districts more on scale and intensity of uses or development)?

[See 4.01.A Establishment of Districts, Intent and 4.01.C Transition of Previous Districts.]

4.C Do you support allowing detached ADUs in all single-family districts subject to similar design and operation conditions in the current regulations? (Note - the ordinance currently allows internal ADUs, but detached ADUs only in existing “carriage houses” – termed “accessory apartments” in existing code)?

[See 4.04.C. Accessory Uses, Accessory Dwelling.]

Article 5: Residential Development & Design

Current Standards

- Some building type distinctions; but competing density standards
- Subtle but insignificant shifts in some standards between districts
- Lack of meaningful distinctions in higher-density / multi-family types.
- Design addressed in overlays or special districts

Forward SGF

- Complete neighborhood / walkable neighborhood
- Housing choices
- Neighborhood design, beautification, revitalization
- Traditional neighborhood
- Center City neighborhood
- Mixed residential
- Mixed use

Proposed Approach

- Improve and strengthen building type approach
- Promote mix of compatible types based on Place Type / district
- Retain status quo in some districts (R-SF, R-TH); increase options in others (R-LD, R-MD, R-HD)
- Tie districts and design standards to Place Type
- Focus design on frontages + street design type

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

- 5.A** Do you support a city-wide approach to neighborhood design using simplified and basic elements (streetscape; frontage; building form/format; open space) and refining for different contexts, Place Types and zone districts (suburban, neighborhood, urban)?
[See Section 5.04, Neighborhood Design]

Article 6: Nonresidential Development & Design

Current Standards

- Lack of development distinctions between nonresidential districts (16)
- Few design standards; primarily general performance criteria
- Inconsistent approaches to “mixed use” among districts

Forward SGF

- Quality of Place
- Distinct Place Types; Community Design
- Mixed use corridors and districts
- Walkable neighborhood hubs
- Diverse special purpose districts

Proposed Approach

- Emphasize distinctions in uses (scale/format) and development standards (intensity)
- Promote mixed use in some districts
- Increase emphasis on design – streetscape; frontage design; building + site design
- Tie districts and design standards to Place Type

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

6.A Do you support a simplified and context-based approach to city-wide design for non-residential and mixed-use places based on pairing streets with frontage and building design standards in four contexts ranging from most pedestrian oriented to most car-oriented?

[See Section 6.04, Community Design]

Article 7: Access & Parking

Current Standards

- Limited flexibility / exempt districts (CC / COM)
- Lack pedestrian access standards
- Required parking rates are typical, but rigid
- Shared parking is complicated
- Design standards are minimal

Forward SGF

- Vary parking by Place Type
- Reduce visual and environmental impacts
- Promote walkability and multi-modal access.

Proposed Approach

- Optimize parking / add flexibility
- Improve parking design / location + landscape
- Coordinate access standards with PW specifications

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

7.A Do you support adding flexibility when assessing public access for all development applications providing one of three levels of study based on trip generation: (a) access plan; (b) driveway study; and (c) Traffic Impact Study?
[See Section 7.03.B Access, Vehicle Access]

7.B Do you support allowing more flexibility in minimum parking requirements? (Flexibility is provided by: (1) credits and exceptions based on context; (2) defined parameters for permitted modifications or reductions, with criteria; and (3) allowances for alternative data/rates, parking plans, or shared parking.)
[See Section 7.04.A.6 Required Parking, Vehicle Parking Rates; Section 7.04.C. Required Parking, Parking Reductions; Section 7.04.D Required Parking, Shared Parking; and Section 7.06 Modifications.]

Article 8: Landscape & Site Design

Current Standards

- Highly administrative / focus on submittals and process
- Low plant requirements; except buffers
- Complicated and impractical point system alternative
- Limited tree protection through existing tree credit

Forward SGF

- Connect to Nature / “Basecamp of the Ozarks”
- Protect / strengthen urban tree canopy
- Tree preservation, reforestation
- Neighborhood and corridor beautification
- Sustainable landscape / site design (stormwater + energy efficiency)

Proposed Approach

- Improve civic image
- Elevate natural elements in design
- Emphasize street trees and buffers
- Promote flexibility (design objectives and performance outcomes)

Policy Decisions

Key Questions

- 8.A** As part of improving streetscapes and implementing street design types, do you support prioritizing street trees as part of infrastructure investment?
[See Section 8.03, Required Landscape and Section 3.01.C, Subdivision & Community Design, Street Design Types.]
- 8.B** Do you support standards for the management and preservation of trees, and/or mitigation for removal of certain trees, based on their size and location?
[See Section 8.06, Tree Protection]
- 8.C** Do you agree that a licensed landscape architect should be required to stamp Landscape Plans for approvals?
- 8.D** Do you agree that approved planting/landscape plans should be inspected and enforced more consistently and rigorously?

Article 9: Signs

Current Standards

- Complicated and difficult to interpret
- Cumbersome procedures & organization
- Lenient to the quantity & types of signs
- Some “content neutrality” issues

Forward SGF

- Place based approach
- Neighborhood and corridor beautification
- Comprehensive city code update

Proposed Approach

- Simplify / Organize by Fewer Sign Types
- Clarify / Base allowance on scale of site and buildings
- Content neutral
- Implement comparable sign allowances

NEXT STEPS

- **Review & Comment (continued)– November - January**
 - Public, Place Teams, P&ZC, & CC
- **Finalize Recommended Adoption Draft – January / February**
- **Adoption Process – January – February/March 2025**
- **Map Revisions & Code Testing - January through May 2025**
- **Effective Date – TBD, 6-9 month target**



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

P&ZC & CC – December 10, 2024

