

## **Planning Commission Workshop – 9.4.25 - ITEM 10.C**

### **Planning Review of MPO’s Street Design Guide - 8.29.25**

*Note: Planning has reviewed the Street Types section, the “Standards Table”, and the Community Context section in the draft Street Design Guide. We will work on further review and comment of other sections. These comments may be revised after further conversation.*

1. Planning agrees that the Street Design Guide recommends several beneficial changes to the existing CH 14 standards, including:
  - a. Bringing street functional classifications (arterials, collectors, etc) up to date for today’s conditions
  - b. Reduces vehicular lane widths to improve safety
  - c. More strategic inclusion of bike lanes and shared use paths, improving safety
  - d. Sets a foundation and parameters for flexibility on “innovative street designs”
  
2. Planning and the MPO and Public Works team are discussing revising the Streets Design Guide to coordinate with Chapter 14 street standards on the following items:
  - a. To the list of Street Types in the Guide, add the existing Chapter 14 low-traffic Street Types (“lanes”, “lot access driveways”, standards for “private roads”, or other types identified in the Chapter 14 rewrite). These types and standards provide flexibility for development and are in harmony with the Design Guide.
  
  - b. We agree that the Guide needs to apply to both (a) City-led and funded projects, and (b) development-led and funded projects, with some differences in application. With City-led projects, the Guide should allow for more built-in flexibility. For development-led projects, it is important that clear standards be identified, with a more defined process for analyzing and approving flexibility. To achieve this, the Guide should:
    - i. ensure that the “target” values in the table are interpreted as firm “standards” for development.
    - ii. The “maximum” and “minimum” values in the table would be clarified as defining the range of flexibility
    - iii. When the Guide applies to development-led projects, replace the term “should” with “shall” where appropriate.

- c. The Guide should have an “applicability” section to clarify the kinds of development projects to which the Guide would apply, consistent with the applicability of an updated Chapter 14:
  - i. The guide would apply most frequently to large greenfield developments or subdivisions that are building new streets
  - ii. The guide would likely not apply (or not apply as much) to smaller development projects that do not involve building new streets. These development projects would go through the TIA process for modifications to existing streets, where there is a need to analyze needs like turn lanes, intersections, pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, trail connections, bike facilities, etc.
  
- d. The Guide creates a system of “zones” within streets (vehicular zone, pedestrian zone, flexible zone, etc). Planning requests a few clarifications to this section, which will be consistent with an updated Chapter 14:
  - i. Ensure the “Pedestrian Zone” has clear standards for sidewalk width, while allowing for appropriate incursions in the width from pedestrian amenities, utilities, etc as needed
  - ii. Ensure the “Flexible Zone” references that the CH 14 landscaping standards continue to apply, including Street Trees.
  - iii. For the “Bicycle Zone”, discuss how to create a “developer checklist” process that would analyze where and how bike facilities should be located. The checklist would make it clear that bike lanes are not the standard on every street, but must be included as appropriate for the context and the needs of the wider network.
  - iv. For the “Parking Zone”, discuss whether on-street parking should be the standard on Arterials with 35 MPH or less, or whether it should potentially required in some circumstances. For example, in Neighborhood Centers, main streets, or other criteria. (note: construction of a new Arterial will be a rare occurrence in development-led projects, more common with city-led street redesigns)
  
- e. The Community Context section of the Guide (neighborhood centers, historic districts, industrial etc) will be rarely applied to development-led street projects, which are usually on the edge of the City. City-led corridor studies and designs will be the predominant use of Community Context. Therefore, the Community Context section could be put on pause because: (a) as written there are inaccuracies due to confusions on the Future Land Use Map, and (b) we should wait on the General Plan update to be concluded to incorporate new community

goals and visions.

- f. We will work on clarifying the method by which the appropriate “Street Type” is selected for a development project, and by whom. CH 14 includes standards for ADT and DUA, which currently provide a methodology for picking the Street Type. The MPO Guide recommends removing these standards. If we remove this, we need an alternate method to identify the street type. (i.e. does the developers propose a street type? How would we push back if a developer selected a street type based on cost and convenience, rather than based on the City’s goals like safety or multimodal options?)
- g. Clarify the process by which flexibility and “innovative street designs” are analyzed and approved by the Land Use Director. We request to explore creating a Public Infrastructure Manual for this purpose. The Manual could merge similar standards in CH 14 and the Guide into one location.
- h. Discuss the consideration for maintenance costs when applying landscape standards.
- i. Discuss whether it is important to retain the “street cross section” images. The image is helpful to understanding the desired arrangement of street elements, and interpret how measurements apply.
- j. Discuss whether it is important to retain other criteria in the CH 14 table that is not in the Design Guide table, such as “Total ROW Width”.

