University Heights Innovation District

<u>Summary comment regarding the overall approach</u> – Planning staff is of the opinion that it would be more worthwhile to create a subset of regulations in the University Heights special area plan that addresses the limited differences in the 'innovation'/UMU-2 area. We are viewing this as an opportunity to address other issues within the existing special area plan. We are also hoping to add greater flexibility and reduce the need for waivers for individual projects, and to set consistent methods for measuring glazing and build-to lines that could apply throughout the various special area plans. In reviewing the draft document, it is clear that it is already on the right track toward clarifying and simplifying the existing University Heights regulations. The only significant components of the existing special area plan that are missing from the draft document are the building typology, signage regulations, and architectural guidelines. Regarding the building typology, staff feels that we need to revisit the use of building types to determine whether this has added to the quality of development in University Heights, or simply made it more complicated to develop there.

I. Intent

- We think this is good language that defines the purpose of the University Heights District as a whole.

II. Administration

- This could be combined with the existing language in the University Heights District so that it applies to both.

III. Definitions

- There is already a definition for block face within the LDC – we should probably keep or modify that definition, rather than create a new separate one.
- Regarding the 'fenestration' definition, not sure what is the best way to create a new definition or standard without creating more inconsistency between our various glazing requirements and how we measure glazing. ('Glazed area' is defined within the Traditional City overlay and defined by standards elsewhere).

IV. Uses

- Make sure that accessory uses such as chiller plants are accounted for.

V. Private Realm Dimensions

- Refer to the 'Private Realm Dimensions' as 'Dimensional Requirements' for consistency with the rest of the LDC.
- Recommend including the build-to line within the table and removing the standards for lot area, lot width, lot depth, front yard and side yard street setbacks.
- The requirements column for 'Two-family dwellings and rowhouses' can be combined with 'Multi-family dwellings'
- Add a note to table or in some other way describe the restrictions on building height where adjacent to historic district properties

- Remove separate dimensional standards for accessory structures.
- Subsection B on ‘Building relationship to the street’: under 1) - windows should not count as architectural features that delineate building floors (since they are required already to meet glazing); under 4) - we recently received suggestions from the Commission on how to identify an entrance as the primary entrance, and it may be worthwhile to include such language here.
- Really just semantics but we refer to our requirement for windows as ‘glazing’ not ‘fenestration’. Also, subsection C on ‘Facades and Fenestration’ could be called ‘Building Articulation’ for consistency with the other Special Area Plans.
- A separate conversation on the various glazing standards would be a good idea.
- The use of the term ‘primary street’ might be confusing, since we use this term elsewhere to determine appropriate building orientation and façade treatments
- Requirements e, f, and g for ‘Storefront streets’ seem redundant.

V. Public Realm Dimensions

- Should we call this ‘Streetscape Regulations’, since streetscapes are a concept that most people around here are familiar with?
- It would probably be clearer if the Street Regulating Plan were described under a separate subheading from the Street Framework Plan.
- The soon-to-be-adopted new landscape code requires street trees every on 50’ average within all of the special area plans (rather than every 30’ or 35’ on center)
- A separate conversation on how to measure build-to line would also be a good idea.

THANKS