

## **LIST OF PROPOSED YMC REVISIONS**

**LOREN DICKINSON**

02-21-2022

Items with an asterisk \* would be intended to add aesthetic conditions to individual sections, without having to write a separate Architectural Design Standards ordinance.

### **A. DEFINITIONS - YMC 9.04.030**

Propose to add / modify Definitions as indicated:

1. "Building Code" (add) – suggested: "means applicable building, fire and safety codes adopted by state, county and municipal agencies in which the subject property is located." Or similar wording.
2. "Clear Vision" (add) – is used several places within Title 9. Reference Ordinance section or write?
3. "Hotel" (revise?) – consider adding descriptions "on-site staff for check-in and management, cleaning. Does not have kitchen facilities."? Definition could be made clearer. Research other cities' & county definitions.
4. "Lot Line, Street Side" (add) – describes side lot line at abutting street.
5. "Parking Space" (revise) – delete last sentence "Required off-street parking shall not be located in a required yard that abuts a street" – this requirement belongs in Parking 9,48., if it is truly applicable to all zoning districts. If it is applicable only to the Commercial zone, it belongs within that zone's Standards.
6. "Parking Space, Accessible" (add) – Needed to make reference to ADA requirements, and proposed new paragraph in C., below.
7. "Yard" (clarify) – contains reference to a "court", but "court" not defined. Is a definition for "court" needed (research others' definitions)?
8. "Yard, Street Side" (add) – describes side yard at abutting street – used several places in YMC

### **B. IN INDIVIDUAL SECTIONS, AS NOTED:**

1. In Standards sections of R1, R2, R3, and R4 (,040.E of 9.12, 9.16, 9.20, and 9.24) – suggest adding to "see also Definitions 9.04.030 parking space".

2. \*In Standards sections of R1, R2, R3, and R4 (,040.E of 9.12, 9.16, 9.20, and 9.24) – would it be beneficial to set a standard for maximum % of front yard paved, with remaining areas landscaped?
3. \*In C1 Standards (9.28.030) – consider making an F.1 and F.2, where F.2 would set a standard for parking setbacks from street lot lines: “Where parking is established between the building and Front or Street Side property lines, parking spaces shall be set back \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_) feet from the property line.” This would establish a landscape strip between parking and the street. It would require that parking requirement 9.48.010.H. also be revised. Since this as proposed would not apply to districts other than C1, it belongs in C1 Requirements rather than in Parking 9.48. It would need to be coordinated with Items C.4 and C.5., below.
4. Section 9.52.060, County Road 804 requirements – this section will require some revision when the City takes possession of that road. Perhaps keep the same requirements, review, add / remove some.
5. Section 9.52.070 Shoreland Setbacks – add “and Protection” to the title. The section includes protection standards in addition to setbacks.
6. Section 9.64 – perhaps should be renamed to “Street and Driveway Design and Construction” to better describe its contents.
7. Section 9.52.160.B. (clarify) – Clarify that the setback reduction to minimum 5 feet applies to the residence living areas as well, per recent City Planner interpretation.

**C. In Section 9.48.010 Parking General Requirements:**

1. Add a paragraph relating to “clear vision”, 9.64.010.A. May require different wording so as relate to private property instead of street design and construction.
2. Revisit D, distance from building to parking – the current 500 feet perhaps should be reduced given the scale of our community. That distance is half-way through town. I would suggest something more like 200 feet.
3. Revisit F., drainage – delete last word “sidewalks” and substitute “property”. That way the requirement would preclude drainage from private property across sidewalks, rights-of-way, etc.

4. Revise G., last sentence – the 5 foot high fence requirement appears to be in conflict with the “clear vision standards” – wording is unclear – clarify. Some clarification and coordination between G. and H. is needed, as noted in 5., below, and B.3., above.

5. \*Revise H., distance of parking to lot line – the current requirement of placing a parking bumper 4.5 ft. from the lot line yields a 2 ft. or less “no-man’s” land strip, unsuitable for shrubs or ground cover. It also does not take into account the screening fence required in G. **Along streets**, I suggest increasing required distance to perhaps 6 feet which would yield a more reasonable 3.5 ft. space for shrubbery between the fence required in G, and the property line. \*Shrubbery between the fence and the street would be an aesthetic enhancement. This would have to be considered taking into account B.3., above. \*Perhaps also add a requirement that the strip be landscaped with native shrubbery. Where **not along streets** but taking into account the required screening fence, consider reducing that setback to a distance sufficient for the fence. Consider making an H.1 and H.2 to separate the two conditions. Considerable rewriting would be required.

6. Revisit J., four spaces rule – could stand some clarification on how the required driveway intersects with the street and that all exiting of the parking lot must be by forward-moving actions. Safety consideration.

7. Introduce a section concerning parking lot drive aisles – required widths for 90 degree and angled parking, how drive aisles exit onto streets, how drive aisles need to conform to clear vision standards (by reference), etc.

8. Add a section that commercial and governmental use parking lots require “accessible parking spaces” in accordance with applicable requirements of the Americans With Disability Act. It appears to be included nowhere else in the Code. This important requirement and should be listed.

9. (add from 9.40.030 “Parking Space” definition) “Required off-street parking shall not be located in a required yard that abuts a street” **However** – this requirement is unclear. Does it apply to residential zones, Commercial and Public Facilities zones, or both? Is this really what is intended? It may conflict with other requirements. Review in broadscope.

10. \*Perhaps introduce a landscaping requirement within commercial and governmental use parking lots – possibly a percentage of the parking lot be landscaped / a minimum \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_) foot wide planter island be required for each 10 spaces, or both .... or something similar.

11. Perhaps introduce a section regulating how parking spaces abut sidewalks: That sidewalks in front of parking spaces are required to be a minimum of 7.5 feet wide where parking spaces abut without a curb bumper – and – sidewalks 5 feet wide shall have a curb bumper installed at 2 to 2.5 ft from the sidewalk edge (both to accommodate vehicle overhangs so they do not protrude into ADA-required sidewalk width).

12. Section 9.40.030 Standards, Public Facilities Zone – Are some of the standards listed in the C1 zone needed in this zone (parking, landscaping, etc.)?

**\*GENERAL ESTHETIC REVISIONS:**

There are probably several other Ordinance Sections which could be easily added to or modified to enact additional enhancement standards without causing undue hardship on the public. These could include landscaping, screening, etc.