100281

# Urban Design Element
# DRAFT Evaluation and Appraisal

## Element Assessment

### Key Findings for the Urban Design Element

1. The City of Gainesville has substantially met the goals, objectives, and policies of the Urban Design Element.

### Successes

1. The City has adopted and implemented several special area plans during this planning period that have helped to preserve and promote traditional urban character. These include University Heights, College Park, and Traditional City, Central Corridors, and SW 13th Street.

2. Many of the urban design policies are implemented through new policies that define and expand the City's use of activity centers. These new policies are being considered at the time of the writing of the EAR, and are referred to throughout this document as the '2010 activity centers update .'

3. The City has continued to implement a variety of policies that provide for the comfort and safety of bicycles and pedestrians, including expanded facilities, connectivity, and design requirements.

4. The City has effectively collaborated with the Community Redevelopment Agency to implement projects in a variety of special areas including the University Avenue and Main Street corridors, the 5th Avenue/Pleasant Street area, the Depot Stormwater Park, east Gainesville, and the College Park and University Heights neighborhoods.

5. The Traditional Neighborhood Development and Planned Development ordinances have been implemented.

6. The City continues to support neighborhood planning efforts.

7. The City enhanced its off-street trail network, including development of a rail trail along 6th Street.

### Shortcomings

1. The Urban Design Element articulates a vision for the city that provides limited direction in terms of implementation. In many cases the ideas are excellent but are difficult to translate into policy.

2. As an Element of the Comprehensive Plan, Urban Design is generally overlooked.

3.  The additional layer of regulation created by overlay districts is often perceived as confusing.

4.  The requirements of the Urban Design Element apply to special areas and certain other locations, but do not address the form of development outside these specified areas.

5.  The City did not adopt an Urban Design Master Plan or Urban Design Toolbox as directed by the policies below.

6.  Design requirements for large corporate chain stores have not been adopted. The 2010 activity centers update addresses some concerns related to large-format retail.

7.  The City did not adopt special area plans for the NW 13th Street or Westgate Shopping Center areas. However, both are addressed by the 2010 activity centers update.

**Impact of Rule Changes on the Urban Design Element**

There are no changes to Rule 9J-5, Chapter 163, the State Comprehensive Plan, or the Strategic Regional Policy Plan that impact the Urban Design Element.

**Recommended Changes**

Gainesville is unique in its inclusion of Urban Design as an optional element of the Comprehensive Plan. While the addition of this element is a strong statement of the City's priorities, in practice the unfortunate result is that the policies of this element are frequently overlooked.

Evaluation of this element finds that it is in need of substantial revision. Some of the policies have been implemented, and others have not as priorities have shifted. The focus of the element is on special area plans, while staff's focus is shifting away from zoning overlays toward form-based zoning and other methods for improving the built environment. Finally, the visionary writing style of the element has resulted in policies that are difficult to implement, leading staff to conclude that many policies need to be rewritten and clarified.

Having considered the scope of changes needed in the Urban Design Element and its status in the Comprehensive Plan as a whole, staff recommends that this chapter be eliminated. All policies recommended for retention should be incorporated into other elements, including a new goal in the Future Land Use Element that specifically addresses urban design. As such, the matrix below evaluates each policy of the Urban Design Element, and provides a preliminary recommendation as to where the policy should be moved. It should be assumed that recommended changes apply to these policies at their final destination.

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective 1.1** By 2003, the City shall adopt urban design standards in select locations in the city. Any adopted urban design standards shall reflect the particular character of that portion of the city, and shall reflect that the city includes transitions in character from urban to suburban. In general, the most comprehensive set of urban design standards should be applied to those areas which were built before World War II, which contain design elements that were common before World War II, or which are designed primarily for pedestrian activity, in addition to traditional, pedestrian-oriented quality-of-life design features in other areas when the need is identified. The City should also seek to establish these traditional, pedestrian-oriented quality-of-life design features in other areas when the need is identified. The City shall review its existing urban design standards for the Traditional City and Central Corridors as to appropriate boundaries, and establish urban design standards for other particular areas of the city as appropriate. | The City has adopted several special area plans that function as zoning overlay districts to guide urban design standards. | Incorporate into Future Land Use Element, with the following recommendations:<br><br>▪ Completely rewrite this Objective and its Policies for clarity.<br>▪ Re-frame to address the relationship of urban form to greenhouse gas reduction (Major Issue 2).<br>▪ Consider consolidating overlay districts into one form-based code that serves all areas where higher urban design standards are desired. |
| **Policy 1.1.1** Indicators of traditional, pedestrian-oriented, urban areas appropriate for urban design standards should include some or all of the following characteristics:<br>• Building facades pulled up close to the street, facing the street, and generally aligned.<br>• Relatively high-density mixed use, compactly laid out to accommodate walking.<br>• A mixture of housing types or prices.<br>• Multi-story buildings.<br>• Connected, narrow streets, or streets with modest turning radii.<br>• A connected network of sidewalks.<br>• Mature street trees lined up along the street.<br>• On-street parking.<br>• Off-street parking at sides or rear of buildings.<br>• Narrow, smaller lots.<br>• Front porches.<br>• Garages subservient to primary building.<br>• Short block faces.<br>• Terminated vistas. | Yes, these indicators of traditional urban design are found to some degree in each special area. | Revise to provide policy direction, rather than just a list of characteristics. |
| **Policy 1.1.2** The City shall establish urban design standards which protect and promote quality of life, in order to encourage redevelopment and new development within city limits rather than in outlying areas by amending the City Land Development Code to adopt additional urban design standards for any particular parts of the city. | Yes, the LDC includes eight zoning overlays that provide additional urban design standards for select locations: Traditional City, College Park, University Heights, Southwest 13th Street, Five Points, Central Corridors, Corporate Park, and 39th Avenue. | See above. |

100284

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 1.1.3**<br>By 2002, based on the indicators in Policy 1.1.1, the Traditional City boundaries shall be analyzed to determine whether the existing boundaries are appropriate, and whether any adjustments need to be made. | Staff prepared preliminary analysis but it was not adopted. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.1.4**<br>By 2002, based on the indicators in Policy 1.1.1, the Central Corridors standards and boundaries shall be analyzed to determine whether the existing standards and boundaries are appropriate and whether any adjustments need to be made. | Staff prepared preliminary analysis but it was not adopted. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.1.5**<br>By 2002, based on the indicators in Policy 1.1.1, the City shall prepare an analysis of any additional areas where urban design standards shall apply in order to create livable areas designed for comfortable travel by walking, bicycling and transit, as well as car, in order to protect and promote quality of life and create a sense of community in those areas. | This analysis was not completed. However, these standards are implemented through the Concurrency Management Element. | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.1.6**<br>In order of priority, new development and redevelopment in the Traditional City, Central Corridors, and existing activity (mostly shopping) centers shall be designed, as guided by appropriate land development regulations, to make these areas accessible for pedestrians, transit and bicycles, as well as cars. | This has been adopted in the Traditional. City and Central Corridor SAPs | Revise to read "All new development and redevelopment shall…"<br><br>Revise "as well as" to read "and." |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 1.1.7**<br>In order to encourage neighborhood-serving town centers, the City shall allow for the designation of new town centers only if they, at a minimum, meet the following standards:<br>• Modest commercial build-to lines that pull the building up to a wide streetside sidewalk with a row of trees.<br>• Modest instead of abundant off-street parking, located at the rear or side of buildings, and away from pedestrian areas.<br>• A sense of arrival and departure.<br>• A connected sidewalk and path system promoting safety, comfort and convenience by linking buildings within the Center and to adjacent properties.<br>• Building facades facing the street and aligned to form squares, streets, plazas or other forms of a pleasant public realm.<br>• A vertical mix of residences above non-residential uses within the center, and a required percentage of Center floor area that is residential and retail.<br>• No free-standing retail establishment within the center exceeding 30,000 square feet (or some set maximum) of first floor area.<br>• First floor uses promoting entertainment and retail uses, and articulation and glazing for pedestrian interest.<br>• Rules that restrict establishment of auto-oriented uses, or uses that generate significant noise, odor, or dust. | No. The Comprehensive Plan and LDC do not adequately define "neighborhood-serving town centers" or explain how they would be designated.<br>The 2010 activity centers update addresses these definitions. | Revise as needed to reflect the 2010 activity centers update.<br>Revise to address how new activity centers are designated. |
| **Policy 1.1.8**<br>The City shall encourage the conversion of activity centers and conventional shopping centers into more traditional, livable town centers through redevelopment or addition of uses, features and structures specified in Policy 1.1.7. Design of such redevelopment shall be supportive of transit. The City should encourage new, additional buildings relatively near the street where site planning allows adequate space, addition of residential units in existing activity centers, and design features that encourage a transformation of shopping centers into appealing, "destination" town centers. The City shall encourage the conversion of surface parking lots to buildings in activity centers being transformed into town centers. Minimum car parking requirements in activity centers shall be reduced as one incentive for the creation of mixed-use activity centers (allowing that former parking area to be used for "liner" buildings). | Activity centers have been poorly defined and inconsistently applied in the LDC.<br>The 2010 activity centers update refines the Comp Plan and LDC language related to activity centers. | Revise to state that specific strategies for infill and redevelopment shall be addressed through the LDC.<br>Revise as needed to reflect the 2010 activity centers update.<br>Remove diagram. |

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 1.1.9**<br>The City shall strive to achieve a land use and transportation vision described in "Concept A" in the Urban Design Data and Analysis. This future growth concept features compact development, mixed use, infill, and higher densities in appropriate locations. Conventional shopping centers are transformed into walkable town centers, and the city is rich in transportation choices. Civic pride is high because of the high quality of urbanism. Residences and commercial development is increasingly attracted to in-town locations because urban qualities, such as walkability, vital and livable streets, safe and human-scaled neighborhoods, sociability, and unique character provide a quality urban experience unavailable in outlying suburbs. | The activity centers concept has been partially applied, as mentioned above. | Remove, as this is redundant with Policy 1.1.8. |
| **Objective 1.2** Promote urban livability and aesthetics, including the safety, comfort, and convenience of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, while still providing for the needs of car drivers. | Yes. | Incorporate Objective and its Policies into the TME and FLUE. |
| **Policy 1.2.1**<br>By 2002, the City shall inventory and prioritize areas in need of street trees, streetside sidewalks (either the filling of gaps or enhancement of the material), modest street light structures, the removal of utility structures and other obstructions from sidewalks, and the undergrounding of utilities. By 2003, the City shall identify funding for such needed public improvements. | This has been partially completed, primarily in CRA areas. | Remove date in first sentence.<br>Remove last sentence. |
| **Policy 1.2.2**<br>By 2002, the City shall establish requirements and incentives in the City Land Development Code for new development to install street trees and sidewalks in instances in which they are not required as of the date of adoption of this Element. | Yes. | Remove date and revise to state that the City will 'continue to require' street trees and sidewalks. |
| **Policy 1.2.3**<br>The Land Development Code should require street trees that will provide appropriate canopy and shading benefits, and that will be aligned in a disciplined manner along streets in order to properly frame the street. | Yes. | Revise "should" to "shall continue to." |
| **Policy 1.2.4**<br>The City shall encourage on-street parking in new developments, and shall re-introduce it in existing areas that would benefit from it—particularly in the Traditional City area. | Yes. | Retain, and revise to encourage on-street parking anywhere in the City that it is feasible. |
| **Policy 1.2.5**<br>Sidewalks shall have a minimum clear width of five feet wide—wider in areas with large pedestrian volumes. | Yes, this is implemented through TME 2.1.16. | Remove. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 1.2.6** The City shall prohibit the installation of permanent structures—such as utility and traffic signal poles—within sidewalks, unless a clear width of at least 5 feet is maintained. The City shall require dedication of the necessary right-of-way or provision of an easement to keep such structures out of the sidewalk when clear width is otherwise inadequate. | Yes, this is implemented through TME 2.1.16 and CME 1.1.4. | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.2.7** By 2002, the City shall identify areas of the city where pedestrian street lighting is appropriate, and develop a plan for installing such lighting by an identified date. Where appropriate, street lighting should be pedestrian-scaled (in both intensity and height), and directed to the street. | | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.2.8** The City shall reduce minimum off-street parking space requirements, as appropriate. | Yes. Several SAPs have low or no minimum parking standards. | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.2.9** The City shall encourage or require primary building entrances to be physically and visually oriented toward streets, parks, and plazas, rather than to interior squares or parking areas. | This is implemented in the SAPs but not in the LDC. | Revise to state that land development regulations shall provide standards for the placement of buildings relative to other buildings, and buildings relative to the street and other features of the surrounding area. |
| **Policy 1.2.10** When allowed by the underlying zoning district, some or all of at least the first floor of multi-level parking garages shall be a wrap of residential, retail or office space. | Yes, in some SAPs. | Expand to allow options such as façade treatments and other architectural elements that create visual interest. |
| **Policy 1.2.11** Terminating certain streets with a prominent vista—such as a government building, park, or clock tower—should be encouraged when a prominent civic building is to be constructed. | Not in LDC. | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.2.12** CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles shall be incorporated, where feasible and appropriate, in new projects. | Not in LDC. | Incorporate into Future Land Use Element. |
| **Objective 1.3** Any additions or changes to the existing city street network pattern shall be designed to provide interconnected patterns that promote effective circulation of car, transit, bicycle, and foot traffic, and to take some of the pressure off the major arterial streets in the city as the city grows. | Yes, ongoing. | This Objective and its Policies should be incorporated into the TME and FLUE, as appropriate. |
| **Policy 1.3.1** Gridded, interconnected street networks with a generally north-south, east-west orientation are encouraged. Streets should be connected with other streets to the maximum extent feasible. | See above. | See above. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 1.3.2** Blocks are encouraged to be generally rectangular in shape. Block length and perimeter are encouraged to be modest. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.3.3** Alleys for rear access, when feasible and appropriate, are encouraged. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.3.4** The design of the street network shall make walking within the neighborhood and to neighborhood edges convenient and pleasant. | See above. | See above. |
| **Objective 1.4** The City should ensure that the location of off-street surface parking lots reflects quality urban design. | Yes, ongoing. Implemented through the SAPs. | Incorporate Objective and Policies into the FLUE. |
| **Policy 1.4.1** In areas where the City seeks to promote transportation choices, all non-residential off-street parking shall be placed to the rear or side of the building, rather than in the front or otherwise adjacent to a street. | This policy is redundant, as transportation choice is sought in all areas of the City. | Remove "In areas where the City seeks to promote transportation choices." If this is to apply City-wide, revise to acknowledge that one double-loaded row of parking is permitted in some areas. |
| **Policy 1.4.2** In locations where the City continues to allow parking in front, off-street parking adjacent to a street should be visually screened with a wall, fence, hedge, or berm | No such design guidelines are in place in areas where parking is allowed in front of the building. | Remove. |
| **Objective 1.5** Walls, fences and berms, where provided, shall be designed for aesthetics, security, durability, and access. | Implemented in the College Park and University Heights SAPs. | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.5.1** New non-residential and mixed use access points (breaks or openings in walls, fences or berms) shall be required along the side and/or rear of the property, rather than just along the major access street. | No. | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.5.2** Off-street parking lots shall be linked with off-street vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connections. | Implemented through CME 1.1.4. | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.5.3** Chain link fences shall be discouraged in pedestrian-oriented areas. | Implemented in SAPs. | Remove. |
| **Objective 1.6** The City shall expand the citywide trail network and park system. | Yes. This is redundant with Objective 5.1 of the Transportation Mobility Element (trails) and Objective 2.1 of the Recreation Element (parks and trails). | Remove. |
| **Policy 1.6.1** The City shall continue efforts to acquire and reserve corridors for future trails throughout the city. | Yes. Purchase of the 6th Street Rail Trail was completed in 2009, and construction is underway. | See above. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 1.6.2**<br>The City shall identify funding for the development of trails and support facilities. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.6.3**<br>The City shall continue to obtain dedication of trail right-of-way in designated trail corridors and other corridors. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.6.4**<br>Trail designs shall be such that land use linkages, trail continuity, minimal interaction with roads, environmental conservation and education, and minimal maintenance costs are promoted. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.6.5**<br>The City will enhance and add to its park system to improve its quality of life for all residents. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.6.6**<br>The City shall provide access to nature within the City | Yes. The City's Nature Operations division of the Parks and Recreation Department continues to provide nature access and resource conservation throughout the City. | See above. |
| **Objective 1.7** The City shall encourage walkable, vibrant, appealing mixed-use developments through its Traditional Neighborhood Development and Planned Development ordinances. | Yes. These adopted ordinances contain the desired characteristics. | Remove this Objective and its Policies. |
| **Policy 1.7.1**<br>The City shall maintain a traditional neighborhood development ordinance that ensures walkable, vibrant mixed-use developments. | No development has ever proceeded under the TND ordinance, and while it represents excellence in urban design, it is unlikely that it will be used. | See above. |
| **Policy 1.7.2**<br>The City shall maintain a planned development ordinance that establishes objectives for walkable developments with their orientation toward streets and street-side sidewalks. | Yes. | See above. |
| **Objective 1.8** Guide large, corporate, national chain sales and service establishments toward a design that promotes the unique character and identity of Gainesville. | No. | The 2010 activity centers update contains language that addresses "big box" retail and defines where large-format businesses may be located.<br>This Objective and Policy should be incorporated into the FLUE. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 1.8.1**<br>By 2002, the City shall establish land development regulations that control wall articulation, entrance orientation, building colors, location, drive-throughs, building setbacks, location and amount of parking, side and rear facades, number of stories, outdoor lighting, building footprint, compatibility with context, and quality of materials for large, retail and service establishments in a manner that promotes civic pride, unique identity and land use objectives. | Such urban design elements have been adopted in SAPs that will regulate large-format retail when it is established within the overlay area, but a targeted "big box" ordinance has not been adopted. | See above. |
| **Objective 2.1** The City shall, through appropriate land development regulations, provide residential buildings and neighborhoods that meet the diverse needs of all citizens. | Yes. | Incorporate these Policies into the Future Land Use Element as part of the new Urban Design goal and revisions associated with Major Issue 3. |
| **Policy 2.1.1**<br>While providing other housing forms and types at appropriate locations in order to diversify housing choice, the City shall maintain and enhance its existing conventional, single-family neighborhoods as essential and valuable in their provision of stable housing in the city and in their support of nearby mixed-use, commercial, office and retail activity centers. | Yes. The City continues to feature four single-family residential zoning districts with a range of densities. | See above. |
| **Policy 2.1.2**<br>The City shall, through appropriate land development regulations, allow and encourage a range of housing patterns, including row house developments, vertical mixed-use-, and other multi-family development at appropriate locations–particularly near town centers. | Yes. | See above. |
| **Policy 2.1.3**<br>The City shall revise the "density bonus points manual" referenced in Article IV of the Gainesville Land Development Code to further encourage the development of quality walkable, urban development patterns. | Yes. The density bonus points manual contains a variety of factors that encourage walkable urban development. | Remove. |
| **Objective 2.2** The City shall strive to stabilize neighborhoods within the city. | Yes, implemented through Goal 5 of the Future Land Use Element. | Incorporate this Objective and its Policies into the Future Land Use Element, as needed. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 2.2.1** The City shall provide neighborhood planning services in order to stabilize and enhance the city's residential neighborhoods. The neighborhood planning program shall work in partnership with residents, citizen groups, and other interested parties in the neighborhoods in order to improve the planning and physical appearance of the neighborhood, including identification and implementation of appearance-related improvements. These improvements shall include street resurfacing and other modifications, where appropriate and feasible, sidewalk improvements, enhancements to street shoulder areas and rights-of-way, when needed and appropriate, beautification of public and open spaces, provision of features that strengthen neighborhood identity, and other such enhancements. | Yes. The City provided neighborhood planning services as described. | Delete the last sentence ("These improvements shall…"). Change all references to the Neighborhood Planning Program (NPP) to "the City," "Neighborhood Services," or something similar. Due to budget and reorganizing issues, the future of the NPP is unclear. |
| **Policy 2.2.2** The City shall support neighborhood stabilization through effective code enforcement. | Yes, there is ongoing coordination between the Neighborhood Planning Program and Code Enforcement. | See above. |
| **Policy 2.2.3** The City shall explore creation of heritage, conservation or other appropriate overlay districts as needed for neighborhood stabilization. | This Policy is the same as Future Land Use Policy 5.1.4. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.1** By 2001, the City shall develop a Citywide Urban Design Master Plan which will establish high-quality public spaces and accompanying high-quality private development in the city. | No. | Revise to state that the LDC shall include design standards for commercial and mixed-use areas City-wide. Remove all Policies. |
| **Policy 3.1.1** The Urban Design Master Plan shall guide a coordinated set of physical improvements in at least the Traditional City portion of the city to link together improvements being undertaken by the City in a variety of focus areas. | No. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.1.2** The Master Plan shall include the design of special street corridors (including University Avenue – the Signature Street, Main Street, Central Corridors, and designated Gateways) that will feature modest, human-scaled dimensions, modest and livable design speeds, on-street parking (where feasible), awnings, modest and consistent signs, street trees and street furniture (benches, trash receptacles, bicycle parking, planters, etc.), substantial sidewalks, and other elements which encourage transportation choice and encourage, where appropriate, vital mixed-use and retail environments. | These design features are achieved, to varying extents, by the Special Area Plans. | See above. |

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.1.3** The Master Plan shall include the design of a trail corridor network that is citywide, interconnected, and designed to carry all forms of non-motorized travel. Priority shall be given to the 6th Street Rail Trail and associated linear park near University Avenue. | This policy is redundant with Goal 5 of the Transportation Mobility Element. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.1.4** The Master Plan shall be complemented by regulations addressing placement and design of buildings and parking so that, in selected locations, buildings are pulled up relatively closely to streets, and parking is to the rear or side of buildings. | No; redundant with various other policies. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.1.5** The Master Plan shall include the design of important public spaces such as the downtown Community Plaza, the Thomas Center, and the Stormwater Park. | No. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.1.6** In general, physical improvements undertaken by the City shall be designed to encourage travel by transit, foot, bicycle, as well as by car, and encourage complementing development and redevelopment by the private sector. | Yes. This policy is redundant. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.1.7** The City shall construct or redevelop civic buildings in a manner which increases the high quality of urban design within the Master Plan, including the renovation of the historic train depot as a destination use of high visual quality, and development and redevelopment of the Kelly Power plant in a manner in which the design serves as an impetus to further high-quality development and redevelopment in the depot area. Civic buildings will be designed to serve as role models for private projects. Civic design goals shall be implemented through guidelines for civic buildings. | Yes, the development of Depot Park includes renovation of the train depot, and improvements have been made at the Kelly Power Plant. The City has implemented a design review process for public buildings. | Delete reference to Master Plan. Revise Policy to be either specifically directed to the Depot Park area, or generally applicable to all civic projects. |
| **Policy 3.1.8** The City shall encourage the establishment of an Urban Design Center, which will feature displays of current development plans and urban design efforts within the city, enabling increased and on-going citizen participation in, and awareness of, such projects. | The Urban Design Center is established, but due to budget constraints it is no longer funded by the City. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.2** The City shall encourage University Avenue to become Gainesville's "Signature Street" as a potential magnet for high-quality development. The City's investments in infrastructure on this corridor, from West 38th Street to Waldo Road, shall be the highest priority in the city. | Yes, through the Traditional City, College Park, and University Heights SAPs. | Many of these policies are redundant with policies elsewhere. Staff recommends removing redundant policies and moving the rest to the FLUE and TME. Policies related to University Avenue should be addressed together under one Objective. |
| **Policy 3.2.1** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install durable and appealing street furniture. | Yes, on-going. | Remove. |

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.2.2** The City shall encourage the use of mast arms for traffic signals, where needed. | Yes, on-going. | Revise to tie to existing MTPO policies. Move to TME and apply City-wide. |
| **Policy 3.2.3** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install, where feasible, ample sidewalks and prominent crosswalks. | Yes, on-going. This Policy is redundant. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.2.4** The City shall encourage excellence in development and redevelopment along University Avenue, recognizing that our most important corridor should be faced by development of the best feasible urban design. | Yes. This Policy is redundant. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.3** The City shall implement urban design policies for University Avenue from West 6th Street to West 13th Street to reflect the importance of this segment of University Avenue as a downtown-university connector. | Yes, on-going. | These policies are implemented by the University Heights SAP. Staff recommends removing redundant policies and moving the rest to the FLUE and TME. |
| **Policy 3.3.1** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install widened sidewalks, quality street furniture, and street trees. | Yes. | Retain Policy, expand to apply to CRA redevelopment areas. |
| **Policy 3.3.2** Where needed, the City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install sheltered bus stops. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.3.3** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install modest height, pedestrian-scaled lights that reduce glare. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.3.4** The City should encourage the establishment of on-street parking. The City should encourage off-street parking to be in the rear or on the side of buildings. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.3.5** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install prominent crosswalks (such as textured, colored crosswalks). | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.3.6** The City shall encourage buildings to be a minimum of 2 stories or equivalent height that include retail and restaurants on the ground floor with awnings, and upper floors occupied by offices, residences, or shops. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.3.7** The City shall encourage new buildings to be relatively close to the streetside sidewalk, with large, streetfront building windows. | Yes. | Remove. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.3.8** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to encourage outdoor cafes and street vendors. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.4** The City shall encourage improvements on **University Avenue** east of Main Street to attract economic development and redevelopment, and encourage the extension of "downtown quality attractions" along that corridor. | Yes, ongoing. | Many of these policies are implemented by the Traditional City, College Park, and University Heights SAPs. Staff recommends removing redundant policies and moving the rest to the FLUE and TME. |
| **Policy 3.4.1** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install high-quality streetscaping. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.4.2** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install medians at centers in appropriate locations and crosswalks at appropriate locations. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.5** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to implement urban design improvements for **Downtown Gainesville.** | Yes. | Many of these policies are implemented by the Traditional City SAP and CRA projects. Staff recommends continued coordination with the CRA, as well as removing redundant policies and moving the rest to the FLUE and TME. |
| **Policy 3.5.1** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to focus design improvements on University Avenue streetscape as a first priority, since it is the "signature street" through downtown and sets the stage for the urban design character of the downtown in general. | Yes, ongoing. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.5.2** The City shall increase connections between downtown and the University, including physical improvement to the streetscape along University Avenue between downtown and the University that encourages pedestrian, transit and automobile connections between the two. | Yes, ongoing. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.5.3** The City shall increase connections, both pedestrian and vehicular, between downtown and the Depot area, to the extent feasible. | Yes, ongoing. | See above. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.5.4**<br>The City shall improve the streetscape in the downtown to provide better sidewalk connections, fill existing gaps in sidewalks, provide pedestrian-level lighting, provide public gathering spaces, and provide street trees. | Yes, ongoing. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.5.5**<br>The City shall increase the residential mix in the downtown, and ensure that affordable housing options are available in the downtown. | The City has seen several new housing developments in the downtown area, including student apartments and | See above. |
| **Policy 3.5.6**<br>The City shall encourage renovations of historic buildings downtown and new development or redevelopment that is sensitive to the context or scale of historic buildings near the new development or redevelopment. | | See above. Replace "sensitive to" with "compatible with." Add reference to the Design Guidelines for New Construction chapter of the Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guidelines. |
| **Policy 3.5.7**<br>The City shall establish more on-street parking downtown. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.5.8**<br>The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to enhance the downtown plaza by creating new dressing rooms for stage acts, encouraging more vendors and entertainment, creating more seating and tables, improving the restrooms, creating more dancing space, and improving the lighting. | Partially. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.6** The City shall enhance and maintain urban design standards in place for **College Park**, and invest in its streetscape and public infrastructure. | Yes. | Consolidate College Park and University Heights policies, and update to reflect ongoing and future City and CRA projects in these areas.<br>Consider consolidation of these special area plans at a minimum, and potentially other SAPs as well. |
| **Policy 3.6.1**<br>The City shall improve its existing College Park Special Area Plan so that the Plan is more readable, lends itself more simply to redevelopment, and includes originally omitted standards such as requiring appropriate room for sidewalks and street trees. | Yes, the SAP was updated in 2004. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.6.2**<br>The City shall recognize the potential of College Park to be a mixed-use, livable neighborhood proximate to the University by maintaining in place a Special Area Plan promoting urbane, mixed-use development. | Yes. | Remove. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.6.3** The City shall continue to coordinate with the Gainesville Community Redevelopment Agency to invest in high-quality pedestrian streetscape in College Park, using the NW 16th Street infrastructure near University Avenue as a general model for sidewalks, key crosswalks, street trees and pedestrian-scaled lighting. | Yes, ongoing. Streetscape upgrades have been constructed on NW 17th Street in the College Park area. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.7** The City shall adopt and maintain urban design policies for **University Heights** and invest in its streetscape and public infrastructure. | Yes. | See Objective 3.6 above. |
| **Policy 3.7.1** The City shall recognize the potential of University Heights to be a mixed-use, attractive neighborhood proximate to the University and downtown by adopting and maintaining a Special Area Plan for University Heights as an attractive place to live, work, and shop. | The University Heights SAP is adopted. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.7.2** The City shall continue to coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency to invest in appealing pedestrian streetscape in University Heights in order to encourage livability of this neighborhood near the city's center and provide walkable, and inviting sidewalks. | The University Heights – College Park area is established as a redevelopment area; completed projects include a pocket park, streetscape improvements, a façade grant program, and improvements to the Depot Rail Trail. | Update policy to reflect ongoing redevelopment activities in these areas. |
| **Objective 3.8** The City shall encourage the redevelopment of the **Depot area** as a vibrant area with a mix of uses. | Yes, ongoing. | Remove Objective and its Policies. |
| **Policy 3.8.1** The City shall rehabilitate the old train depot as a "destination" use. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.8.2** The City shall redevelop the Kelly power plant with attractive design and edges that enhance the Depot area. | This policy duplicates part of Policy 3.1.7 above. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.8.3** The City shall provide a junction of trails, and appealing civic infrastructure to encourage further investment in the area. | Yes, trail development is ongoing in this area. This Policy is redundant with TME Objective 5.1. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.8.4** The City shall plan and construct a stormwater park with a natural design to act as an enhancement for the area with input from neighborhood residents. | Yes, the Depot Park is under construction. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.8.5** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to fill sidewalk gaps, particularly along SE 4th Avenue. | Yes, ongoing. | Incorporate into Transportation Mobility Element. This Policy should be generalized to refer to all areas with sidewalk gaps. |

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.8.6** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to create prominent crosswalks at appropriate locations. | Yes, ongoing. | Incorporate into Transportation Mobility Element. |
| **Objective 3.9** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to improve the streetscape along **NW 5th Avenue** as the physical centerpiece to the redevelopment and stabilization of the Fifth Avenue/Pleasant Street neighborhoods. | Yes, ongoing. | Update objective and policies to reflect ongoing redevelopment activities. Incorporate into Future Land Use and Transportation Mobility Elements. |
| **Policy 3.9.1** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to fill in sidewalk gaps and upgrade existing streetscape. | Yes, this project is underway in 2010. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.9.2** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install appealing pedestrian-oriented lighting. | Yes. This Policy is redundant. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.9.3** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to create connections to nearby parks and facilities | Yes. This Policy is redundant. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.9.4** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to install prominent streetscape and crosswalks at West 6th Street. | Yes. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.10** The City shall improve **West 6th Street** from Depot Avenue to NW 8th Avenue, in coordination with the Community Redevelopment Agency, and improve West 6th Street from S. Depot Avenue to SW 16th Avenue. | This roadway is an ongoing effort, and some segments are funded for construction. | Remove Objective and its Policies. |
| **Policy 3.10.1** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to enhance the quality of West 6th Street to encourage development and redevelopment along this corridor near University Avenue, and incorporate and complement the design of the adjacent linear park to be established. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.10.2** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to complement the linear park with crossings at prominent intersections. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.10.3** The City shall coordinate with the Community Redevelopment Agency, as appropriate, to encourage West 6th Street to be lined with Santa Fe Community College buildings, and commercial or residential buildings in the blocks just north and south of University Avenue. | See above. | See above. |

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.10.4** The City shall include a pedestrian-oriented linear park where the 6th Street trail crosses University Avenue. | See above. | See above. |
| **Objective 3.11** The City shall enhance **Waldo Road**. | This Objective has been achieved to the extent possible. | Update objective and policies to reflect ongoing redevelopment activities. Incorporate into Future Land Use Element. |
| **Policy 3.11.1** By 2001, the City shall create dramatic, low-maintenance landscaped medians along Waldo Road. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.11.2** By 2001, the City shall begin establishing oak street trees that are relatively large when planted, and limbed up, for shade along Waldo Road. Palm trees shall be installed for drama and formality, and understory landscaping for screening. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.11.3** By 2002, the City shall encourage use of large streetfront building windows along Waldo Road. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.11.4** The City shall continue to create a pleasant rail-trail designed for bicyclists, pedestrians, and the disabled along Waldo Road. | Yes. | Revise to state that the City will continue to enhance connectivity to the rail trail. |
| **Objective 3.12** The City should implement urban design policies for the **Westgate Activity Center**, complemented with a restored, more attractive Hogtown Creek at the Center, in order to encourage its redevelopment into a vital, mixed-use center with the creek as its design focus. | Partially. FDOT developed the design of the 34$^{th}$ Street /University Ave./SW 2$^{nd}$ Avenue project following a charrette facilitated by the MTPO, but urban design policies for the larger Westgate Activity Center were not developed. Redevelopment of Royal Park resulted in a successful mixed-use center, much of which has PD zoning. | Remove Objective and its Policies. |
| **Policy 3.12.1** The City shall coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation to restore the creek channel into more of a naturalized area that promotes aesthetics in this high-visibility location. | Yes, this project is completed. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.12.2** The City shall coordinate with private owners and developers to create more visual or physical public access to the creek with such features as overlooks, walkways, seating areas, and weed control. | No. | Remove. |

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.12.3** <br> Through appropriate regulations and incentives, the City shall allow and promote incremental orientation of retail and service shops in surrounding shopping and office areas so that at least one entrance faces (and interacts with) the creek. In part, this can be accomplished with creek seating areas or overlooks associated with the businesses. | This is allowed but not required. The 2010 activity centers update addresses this. | Remove. |
| **Objective 3.13** If feasible, the City should implement urban design policies for the **NW 13th Street Activity Center.** | No. A special area plan has not been adopted, but the area has been identified as an activity center in the 2010 activity centers update. The Central Corridors SAP applies to NW 13th Street from 8th Avenue to 29th Road. | Remove; this Objective and its Policies are implemented by the 2010 activity center update. |
| **Policy 3.13.1** <br> The City should encourage infill retail, office and residential buildings on portions of the existing parking lot sites. In general, the overall location of new buildings should be designed to eventually form a grid of streets with on-street parking and a modest width between facing buildings. New buildings and uses should be scaled and designed so that the intensity is compatible with nearby residences. Redevelopment of this activity center shall integrate the use of transit. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.13.2** <br> New buildings should be relatively close to the streetside sidewalk, so that those on the sidewalk can enjoy what is inside the building, feel more safe and secure and sheltered from weather, find a more convenient walking distance to the building, and increase the security of those on the sidewalk. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.13.3** <br> Appropriate land development regulations shall encourage the incremental replacement of surface parking with multi-story structured parking that has a liner building at least as high as the parking, and containing offices and retail. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.13.4** <br> New buildings should be at least 2 stories in height. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.13.5** <br> The town center should be designed to serve as a transit hub. | See above. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.13.6** <br> New sidewalks should be wide enough to comfortably carry large volumes of pedestrians and provide ample room for trees. | See above. | See above. |

1002 81

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Objective 3.14** The City shall support the **University of Florida** design efforts contained in the Urban Design, Architectural Design Guidelines and Landscape Design Guidelines Elements of the Campus Master Plan. | See Policies below. | Incorporate into the Intergovernmental Coordination Element. Update element names to reflect the most recent UF Master Plan. |
| **Policy 3.14.1** The City shall consider the architecturally significant historic structures of the University when developing standards or guidelines for redevelopment within the areas adjacent to the campus. | Yes, ongoing. The College Park and University Heights SAPs maintain the historic character of these neighborhoods, and guide the form of new development so that it is complementary. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.14.2** The City shall work with the University to strengthen the image of the City and the University through better design along University Avenue and West 13th Street. | Yes, ongoing. | Combine all University Avenue policies with those regarding University Heights and College Park. |
| **Policy 3.14.3** The City shall work with the University to expand its efforts to encourage bicycling, walking, transit and carpooling to campus, through the Corridors to Campus plan and continued support for an employee transit program. | Yes, on-going. | Incorporate into Intergovernmental Coordination and Transportation Mobility Elements. |
| **Policy 3.14.4** The City and the University shall work together to enhance SW 34th Street on the western edge of campus in order to promote a more walkable, quality urbanism. | Yes, streetscape and intersection improvements have been implemented along SW 34th Street to support pedestrian activity. | Incorporate into Intergovernmental Coordination Element. |
| **Objective 3.15** The City shall work with **Santa Fe Community College** downtown to provide support to develop in a more traditional form. | No. City staff met with Santa Fe College representatives in an attempt to coordinate the City's Pleasant Street Historic District and the College's Master Plan for the Downtown Campus. Coordination efforts have not been successful, and the College to date has not provided the City with a copy of its Master Plan. | Remove Objective and its Policies, as this is addressed in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element. |
| **Policy 3.15.1** The City shall work with Santa Fe Community College downtown to develop design guidelines to construct new buildings at least two stories high; construct buildings to be set close to streetside sidewalks; construct buildings to form a public square encompassing the NW 6th Street rail corridor between University Avenue and NW 3rd Avenue; and construct buildings to form and face the square. | Design guidelines specific to the Santa Fe downtown campus have not been adopted. | Revise to reflect the fact that the Santa Fe College master plan for its downtown campus exists, and that its continuing implementation needs to be coordinated with the City. |

100281 Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Objective 3.16** The City shall implement urban design policies for designated **Gateway Corridors.** | Partially. The full intent of this objective was not realized in the Gateway Street District section of the LDC (sec. 30-306). | A Gateway Street District is established in the LDC, but it does not implement most of the policies below. Staff recommends removal of this Objective and Policies 3.16.1 – 3.16.6. |
| **Policy 3.16.1** Gateways should convey a sense of arrival and departure. | This was not adopted as part of the Gateway Street District. | Remove; this policy is not measurable or subject to implementation. |
| **Policy 3.16.2** Gateways should be lined with majestic trees, homes, and cultural and commercial buildings that inspire dignity and pride in Gainesville. | This was not adopted as part of the Gateway Street District. | Remove; this policy is not measurable or subject to implementation. |
| **Policy 3.16.3** Gateways should be free of visually obtrusive, human-built structures such as outdoor storage, auto sales and service, and junkyards, or other excessive clutter. | Yes. The Gateway Street District prohibits BA (automotive-oriented business) zoning and requires a Special Use Permit for the other uses. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.16.4** When feasible, gateway tree plantings should provide a tree canopy over the street through street trees, treed medians, or both. Plantings shall screen any utilities that remain, when feasible. | This is implemented in the Landscape Code. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.16.5** Landscape maintenance should be minimized through design, plant selection, and water conservation. | This was not adopted as part of the Gateway Street District, but is already in the Landscape Code requirements for all landscaping in Gainesville. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.16.6** Transportation choices (various forms of transportation) shall be emphasized along Gateways. | This was not adopted as part of the Gateway Street District, but is already emphasized through various policies including the Concurrency Management Element. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.16.7** The City should develop and implement a design prototype for Gateways into the City and into the Traditional City. | A Gateway Design study was adopted by the City and County Commissions in 2004, which included existing and proposed cross-sections for several roadways. It is not clear how well these prototypes have been implemented. | Move to the Transportation Mobility Element. |
| **Objective 3.17** The City shall enhance **public art.** | Yes, implemented through the Cultural Affairs Element. | Remove. This Objective and its Policies duplicate Objective 2.2 and Policies 2.2.1 through 2.2.3 of the Cultural Affairs Element. |

100281

## Urban Design Element Evaluation and Appraisal

| Objective or Policy | Objective or Policy Achieved? | Recommended Changes |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy 3.17.1** The City should encourage public and private display of art in visible locations. | Yes. Public Art Coordinator sits on the review panel for all new building projects. One percent of the costs are automatically transferred to the Art in Public Places account. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.17.2** The City should support public art projects through its Art in Public Places ordinance which dedicates at least one percent of the cost of new, renovated, and/or expanded buildings to public art. | The ordinance does require a one percent dedication for public art, but it applies only to public buildings. | See above. |
| **Policy 3.17.3** The City should fund public art and sculpture along its important thoroughfares and public spaces, identify appropriate locations for its placement, and sponsor design competitions to ensure public input into the process. | These goals are included in the Public Art Master Plan. There is now art at several major intersections, along a main corridor, and at the Airport. | See above. |
| **Objective 3.18** Educate citizens and provide awareness of the City position on various design principles with an Urban Design Toolbox and enhanced historic preservation guidelines. | Partially; see below. | Remove Objective and its Policies. |
| **Policy 3.18.1** By 2002, the City shall publish an Urban Design Toolbox. The Toolbox shall provide an array of urban design tools which may be used when developing or redeveloping in the city, in order to promote livability and best urban design practices. | No. An Urban Design Toolbox was drafted, but not adopted. | Remove. |
| **Policy 3.18.2** By 2001, the City shall publish enhanced historic preservation guidelines, not changing historic preservation requirements but providing clearer graphic guidance as to historic preservation design goals. | Yes. Adopted in 2001, the *Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guideline* is a nearly 300-page document that provides advice and assistance to property owners, building officials, and City officials on the purpose of maintaining, rehabilitating, and preserving historic buildings. | Remove. |