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Background

Streetcar commercial corridors

- Walkable
- Lots of windows – inviting!
- Small shops
- Lots of variety
- Design change or entryway every ~25 feet
- Over time homes converted to commercial uses
Background

- 2010 new Zoning Code
  - U-MX-3
  - U-MS-3 and -5
- Allow mixed use
- Both allow 100% residential
Background

- 26 developments since 2010
- Only 6 have had commercial/retail
- Majority are 100% residential
- Majority have occurred in U-MX-3
- Majority used “General” form
Background

• Years of discussion about changing nature of Tennyson

• Concerns:
  • Loss of commercial overall
  • Poor design quality

• Need for “quick wins”

• Focus on Tennyson, but applies to other streetcar nodes too
Proposal
Overlay Proposal

Set the Stage
1. Rezone MX to MS
2. Limit building forms

Address loss of Commercial Space
3. Non-Residential uses at street level

Address Design Issues
4. Residential Setback
5. Required Porch
6. Increased Build-to
7. Stricter window requirements
Proposal 1. Rezone any MX to MS

- MS doesn’t allow “General” building form
- MS requires more windows
- MS provides a better “base” for the overlay.
Proposal 2. Building Forms

• MS currently allows:
  • Shopfront
  • Town House
  • Drive-thru Services
  • Drive-thru Restaurant
Proposal 2. Limit Building Forms

- Proposed:
  - Shopfront
  - Town House
  - Drive-thru Services
  - Drive-thru Restaurant

Goals:
- Only shopfront is appropriate to a main street area
- Makes it easier to adjust standards
Proposal 3: Non-residential active use

Currently allowed

100% of frontage residential
Proposal 3: Non-residential active use

75% of frontage Non-residential
And 25-foot hard cap
Proposal 4: Residential Setback

Currently allowed:

- No setback required
- Unit can be right up to the sidewalk
Proposal 4: Residential Setback

Proposed:

- A setback of 7 feet for residential units
- Does not apply to lobbies/entrances

Goals:

- Create transition between public and private space
- Incentivize open curtains!
Proposal 5: Porch Requirement

Proposed:

• Any residential unit on the street level must also have a usable outdoor space in the setback, i.e. patio, porch, or deck.
  • Minimum dimensions
  • Cannot be recessed

Goals:
• Create transition between public and private space
• Incentivize active space
Proposal 6: Increase Build-to Range

“Build-to”:
Length of building that must be built up to a certain point.

60% of building frontage

Build-to range of 0-10 feet
Proposal 6: Increase Build-to Range

Current MS (shopfront)

- 75% of building must be between 0-5' of property line
- Makes it hard to create usable outdoor space, especially for smaller lots
- When a business wants patio seating, often must ask for permit to put in sidewalk
Proposal 6: Increase Build-to Range

Proposed:

• Increase build-to range to 0-10’ of property line
• Provides more flexibility
• Partly informed by CPD feedback
Proposal 7: Increase required windows

- Under MS, code requires “Transparency” of 60% (for residential only 40%)
- But there are “Alternatives”...

![Diagram showing total length of windows / total length of façade]
Proposal 7: Increase required windows

Transparency Alternatives: Example of Permanent Art
Proposal 7: Increase required windows

Transparency Alternatives: Example of Permanent Outdoor Eating/Serving Area
Proposal 7: Increase required windows

Transparency Alternatives: Example of Display Cases

Figure 13.1-103
Proposal 7: Increase required windows

Transparency Alternatives: Example of Wall Design Elements

*Horizontal Scaling Elements, Vertical Scaling Elements, Change of Material, and Windows Outside of Zone of Transparency create a system of wall design elements.
Proposal 7: Increase required windows

- In MX, alternatives can make up 80% of that, resulting in 12% transparency
- In MS, that number is 50%, which is better. But...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current MS</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Cases and ATMs</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Design Elements</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent outdoor eating/service</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Art</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination MAX</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** Increase required windows, regardless
Discussion