

Appendix C: Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria

PURPOSE:

The implementation of numerous policies contained within the Master Plan hinges on the creation of three mixed-use zoning districts to align with the Mixed-Use Commercial (MUC), Mixed-Use Employment (MUE), and Mixed-Use Residential (MUR) land use categories. Recognizing that mixed-use development proposals have already been and will continue to be submitted within these areas prior to the completion and adoption of the future mixed-use zoning districts, a set of Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria have been developed to:

- Facilitate higher intensity, mixed-use development in locations designated on the Land Use Plan for mixed-use development, but where mixed-use zoning is not currently in place;
- Encourage the incremental transition of existing uses in locations designated on the Land Use Plan for mixed-use development, recognizing that in some locations, mixed-use development may be perceived as incompatible with existing adjacent uses in the short term;
- Establish a consistent method for reviewing mixed-use development projects until mixed-use zone districts can be established; and
- Ensure that mixed-use development is consistent with the General Mixed-Use policies contained in the Master Plan, as well as with specific MUC, MUE, and MUR policies, as applicable.

The Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria will continue to be used as a tool to review mixed-use development proposals until mixed-use zone districts can be established.

MIXED-USE EVALUATION CRITERIA:

APPLICABILITY

The following Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria shall apply to all development proposed within the Mixed-Use Residential (MUR), Mixed-Use Commercial (MUC), and Mixed-Use Employment (MUE) land use categories. The application of these Criteria shall be triggered in one of the following ways:

- *Existing Zoning/Special Use Permit*—Development is proposed within a mixed-use land use category where the underlying zoning may permit the types and mix of uses proposed using

the Special Use Permit process as outlined in Section 18.02.80 of the City's Municipal Code. The Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria are applied in addition to the standard list of Findings outlined in the Code.

Example: If a mixed-use project (commercial/residential) were proposed within the Mixed-Use Commercial land use category on a property that is currently zoned for General Commercial, the residential portion of the project would be considered using the Special Use Permit process under the existing Code. Once the Master Plan is adopted, the project would also be subject to the Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria as part of the Special Use Permit Process.

- **Re-Zoning/Special Use Permit**—Development is proposed within a mixed-use land use category where the underlying zoning does not permit the types and mix of uses proposed. In this instance, the subject property would need to be re-zoned to the most appropriate zoning district and then followed for the project and combined with a Special Use Permit or Planned Unit Development request to allow the mix of uses desired and to trigger the application of the Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria.

Example: If a mixed-use project (commercial/residential) were proposed within the Mixed-Use Commercial land use category on a property that is currently zoned for Light Industrial, the residential portion of the project would not be eligible for consideration using the Special Use Permit process under the existing Code. Therefore, the subject property would need to be rezoned to General Commercial prior to beginning the Special Use Permit Process that would allow the residential portion of the project to be considered under the Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria.

- **Planned Unit Development (PUD)**—Development is proposed within a mixed-use land use category where the underlying zoning does not permit the types and mix of uses proposed. As an alternative to the Re-Zoning/Special Use Permit process outlined above, a Planned Unit Development request could be submitted for the subject property, within which it could be re-zoned to the most appropriate zoning district(s) for the project. As part of the PUD process, the Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria would be applicable all other conditions of approval outlined in the City's Municipal Code.

GENERAL INTENT

The Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria provide an overview of key mixed-use development features that should be addressed by proposed mixed-use developments occurring to ensure they are consistent with Master Plan policies. They are intended to be used in conjunction with the land use specific review criteria that follow this section based on the applicable mixed-use land use designation.

MIX OF USES

Background and Intent:

Mixed-use developments should incorporate a variety of uses in a compact, pedestrian-friendly environment. Uses are encouraged to be mixed vertically (“stacked”), but may also be integrated horizontally. Recommended types and proportions of uses vary by mixed-use land use category and will also vary according to a project’s location, size, and the surrounding development context. For example, a MUC development located on an individual parcel away from a primary street frontage may reasonably contain a higher percentage of residential development than one that is located with direct access and visibility from the primary street frontage. On some smaller parcels, integrating multiple uses may not be feasible at all, therefore, the consolidation of properties to create larger, mixed-use activity centers is encouraged. These factors should be considered and weighed in conjunction with the evaluation criteria listed below.

Evaluation Criteria:

CRITERIA	CRITERIA SATISFIED?	COMMENTS
1. Are the types of uses and percentages of different uses consistent with the relevant Master Plan policies listed below? (MUC 1.6, MUR 1.5, MUE 1.5)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Are activity generating uses (e.g., retail/commercial) concentrated along primary street frontages and in other locations where they may be easily accessed and may be readily served by transit in the future?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Are large activity generating uses (e.g., retail/commercial) located so as to minimize impacts of loading areas and other facilities on existing neighborhoods?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Are residential uses well-integrated with non-residential uses (either horizontally or vertically) and the surrounding development context?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

5. Do the proposed housing types and densities promote activity and support non-residential uses in the development or in close proximity to the development, as applicable?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
--	--	--

Relevant Master Plan Policies:

- Chapter 3: 2.1b, 2.3b, GMU 1.1, GMU 1.2, MUC 1.56, MUR 1.5, MUE 1.5
- Chapter 6: 7.2a, 7.2b

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

Background and Intent:

Each of the mixed-use land use categories allow for the incorporation of a variety of housing as a part of a broader mix of uses. Although a mix of housing types and densities is encouraged within each category, the scale, size, type, and location of each development should play a significant role in determining what makes sense. For example, a 200 acre MUR development on a vacant parcel should generally contain a broader mix of housing types and densities than a 10 acre MUR development working within an established development context. However, the MUR development will likely have higher average densities due to its proximity to a primary street frontage and it's more urban context. Given the range of scenarios that may emerge, the evaluation criteria listed below are intentionally broad to allow for maximum flexibility.

Evaluation Criteria:

CRITERIA	CRITERIA SATISFIED?	COMMENTS
6. Does the development contain a mix of housing types that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and planned land use in terms of its scale and intensity?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Does the development contain a mix of housing types that is appropriate to its scale, location, and land use category?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

Relevant Master Plan Policies:

- Chapter 3: 2.2a, 2.2b
- Chapter 6: 8.1a

DENSITY RANGE

Background and Intent:

Average densities within mixed-use developments are generally expected to be higher than those typically found within the City today. Recognizing the many factors that influence the ultimate density of a mixed-use development (e.g., location, type), the Master Plan provides a suggested range of floor area ratios (FAR) and dwelling units/acre for each of the mixed-use land use categories. For the purposes of the evaluation criteria listed below, densities that fall below the low end of a density range for a particular land use category will be strongly discouraged in order to promote the Plan's objective of creating a more compact pattern of development. The Plan also acknowledges that there may be instances where densities that exceed the suggested range are appropriate in some locations, such as within a mixed-use activity center, provided other land use policies are followed. These instances will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

Evaluation Criteria:

CRITERIA	CRITERIA SATISFIED?	COMMENTS
8. Does the development achieve at least the minimum density range for the applicable land use category?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Does the development exceed the maximum density range for the applicable land use category?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
10. If yes to #9 above, is the development located within a designated mixed-use activity center?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
11. If yes to #9 above, is the largest concentration of density concentrated away from primary street frontages and surrounding neighborhoods?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Relevant Master Plan Policies:

- Chapter 3: MUC 1.3, MURI.3, MUE 1.3

CIRCULATION AND ACCESS

Background and Intent:

Mixed-use developments should be designed using an interconnected network of streets to provide efficient connections between uses and to accommodate vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation, as well as existing or future transit service. Direct vehicular and pedestrian connections to adjacent neighborhoods, commercial, and civic uses should be provided, as should linkages to existing and planned trail systems.

Evaluation Criteria:

CRITERIA	CRITERIA SATISFIED?	COMMENTS
12. Do vehicular and pedestrian ways provide logical and convenient connections between proposed uses and to adjacent existing or proposed uses?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
13. Does the hierarchy of perimeter and internal streets disperse development generated vehicular traffic to a variety of access points, discourage through traffic in adjacent residential neighborhoods and provide neighborhood access to on site uses?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
14. If the development is located along a primary street frontage, have existing or proposed transit routes and stops been incorporated?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Relevant Master Plan Policies:

Chapter 3: GMU 1.3, MUC 1.8
 Chapter 7: 10.2b, 11.1a, 11.1c

PARKING LOCATION AND DESIGN

Background and Intent:

The visual and physical barriers created by surface parking areas should be minimized within mixed-use developments. To promote a more compact, pedestrian-friendly environment, off-street parking for mixed-use developments should be located behind buildings and away from primary street frontages. The use of on-street parking or shared parking to provide a portion of the required parking for mixed-use developments is strongly encouraged, where feasible, to make the most efficient use of each development site. In addition, structured parking is encouraged where viable, provided it is integrated into the design of the overall development.

Evaluation Criteria:

CRITERIA	CRITERIA SATISFIED?	COMMENTS
15. Is surface parking distributed between the side and rear of primary buildings and away from primary street frontages?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
16. Are larger parking lots organized as a series of smaller lots with clear pedestrian connections and landscape buffers as dividers?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
17. Is surface parking screened from surrounding neighborhoods and pedestrian walkways?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
18. Is structured parking integrated with adjacent structures in terms of its design and architectural character?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
19. Are structured parking facilities "wrapped" with retail or residential uses at the street level to provide a more inviting pedestrian environment?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

Relevant Master Plan Policies:

- Chapter 3: GMU 1.4, MUC 1.8

RELATIONSHIP TO SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT

Background and Intent:

Many of the areas designated for mixed-use development are located within established areas of the City. As a result, much of the mixed-use development that occurs will occur through a combination of infill and redevelopment. Therefore, establishing a strong physical and visual relationship to adjacent neighborhoods and the community will be an important consideration.

Evaluation Criteria:

CRITERIA	CRITERIA SATISFIED?	COMMENTS
20. Are transitions in building massing and height provided to relate to surrounding development patterns?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
21. Is the new development well-integrated into the surrounding neighborhood, rather than “walled off”, consistent with the mixed-use policies contained in the Master Plan?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
22. If applicable, are lower intensity uses (e.g., residential) located along the periphery of the site where it adjoins an existing residential neighborhood to provide a more gradual transition in scale and mass and to minimize potential impacts of non-residential uses (e.g., loading areas, surface parking)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

Relevant Master Plan Policies:

- Chapter 3: MUC 1.7, MUR 1.7, MUE 1.6
- Chapter 6: 8.3b

PUBLIC SPACES, PARKS, OPEN SPACE, AND PATHWAYS

Background and Intent:

Mixed-use developments should be organized around a central gathering space or series of spaces, such as small urban plazas, pocket parks, or active open space areas. These types of public spaces

serve as urban recreational amenities for residents that may not have access to larger community parks or recreational amenities without getting in their cars and generally promote increased levels of pedestrian activity. Larger mixed-use developments, particularly within the MUR and MUE categories, may also need to incorporate more traditional recreational features, such as parks and trails, depending upon their size and location.

Evaluation Criteria:

CRITERIA	CRITERIA SATISFIED?	COMMENTS
23. Does the development provide public spaces to serve residents and the larger community?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
24. Are public spaces appropriate in terms of their size and active vs. passive features provided given the scale and location of the proposed development?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
25. Are public spaces easily accessible to pedestrians and the surrounding community, if applicable?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
26. Are parks and trails provided consistent with the Parks, Recreation, and Unified Pathways Master Plan?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

Relevant Master Plan Policies:

- Chapter 3: MUC 1.6, MUR 1.8, MUE 1.7