

**University City Area Plan – Issue Matrix**  
**Staff Proposed Revisions to Draft Plan**  
As of April 29, 2015

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
1	Entire Document	Minor edits to correct text, graphics, or tables that don't affect the content or intent of the document. Staff will make these changes as needed.	Entire Document	Not identified.
2	A-3: North Bridge cross section (Pg. 97) – Requested by CDOT.	To be consistent with Policy Area 8 #14. Since the cycle-track and/or multi-use path are being investigated.	Pg. 97, Cross Section dimensions	Sidewalk: TBD (footnote 1) Planting Strip: 8' (footnote 2) Bike Lane: TBD (footnote 1) Travel Lanes 11'-NA-NA-NA-11' (footnote 3) Bike Lane: TBD (footnote 1) Planting Strip: 8' (footnote 2) Sidewalk: TBD (footnote 1)  <i>Footnotes:</i> 1. Determinations of the appropriate pedestrian and bicycle treatments to be deferred to project planning process for the I-85 North Bridge project. 2. Across the bridge, the planting strip can be deleted. Add additional width to pedestrian and/or bicycle treatment as appropriate. 3. 11-foot left-turn lanes permitted where needed
3	<i>Character Area 2: Regional Services South</i> description (Pg. 30)	Sentence in summary needs to be revised to be consistent with the actual policy area language which does allow these uses in some areas, but focuses on how they are designed.	Pg. 30, paragraph 3	Existing sentence: "Pedestrian unfriendly uses are discouraged, such as drive-throughs, strip shopping centers, heavy industrial uses, and parking or ancillary structures between buildings and key streets.  Revision: "Pedestrian unfriendly design is discouraged in this area. Uses with drive through facilities, gasoline pumps, or large surface parking lots should be designed to comfortably accommodate

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				pedestrians.
4	<i>Character Area 10: Primarily Residential</i> (Pg. 72) Opportunities bullet	UCP and the University believe we have adequate supply [of housing] for the University's projected growth for the next 3-5 years. Restate Character Area description for Character Area 10 - Opportunities	Pg. 72, Opportunities and Challenges	Existing sentence: "Strong demand for student housing, but need to provide housing for other residents as well"  Change to: Need to provide adequate supply and mix of housing options to meet demand
5	Implementation Guide	Library is not sure when funding will be available.	Pg. 112, Action Items for Policy P-6	Change from: Long (>10 years)  Change to: As funding becomes available
6	Street Activation  Transit Station Areas and Policy Areas 5 and 8	Street activation policies (E.g. Pg. 23 Policy 1a #8) are too limiting.	Pg. 23 Policy Area 1a #8; Pg. 26 Policy Area 1b #7; Pg. 29 Policy Area 1c #5; Pg. 42 Policy Area 3 #8; Pg. 51 Policy Area 5 #10; Pg. 57 Policy Area 7a #11; Pg. 60 Policy Area 7b #6; Pg. 63 Policy Area 8 #11	The intent is to provide a menu of options to achieve street activation. Staff proposes the following change for this policy in every applicable Policy Area.  Existing Policy: The ground floor of buildings should be designed to activate streets and open space through a variety of design techniques that may include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Non-residential ground floor uses should have clear glass windows and prominent entrances with operable doors allowing access from the sidewalk.</li> <li>b. Non-residential and multi-family building facades should have architectural elements that will help distinguish the ground floor from upper stories. Building corners at street intersections should be designed to feature prominent entrances and distinctive architectural features.</li> <li>c. Multi-family residential development should include direct connections to the sidewalk. Where feasible, ground floor units should also have direct connections to the sidewalk. For the privacy of residents, ground floor units should include vertical separation and/or increased setbacks from the sidewalk.</li> </ul>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>Proposed Revision: Both residential and non-residential buildings should be designed to activate the public realm (i.e. sidewalks, streets, parks, plazas, greenways, trails, and open space). Street level building activation will promote walking and cycling, thus enhancing the area’s safety and security and contributing to better public health. The following are but a few of the ways to achieve ground floor activation of the public realm. Other methods may be equally or more appropriate based on unique site criteria, as long as they contribute toward this goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Non-residential ground floor uses with clear glass windows and prominent entrances with operable doors allowing access from the sidewalk.</li> <li>b. Non-residential and multi-family building facades with architectural elements that will help distinguish the ground floor from upper stories.</li> <li>c. Building corners that feature prominent entrances and/or distinctive architectural design.</li> <li>d. Multi-family residential development with direct connections to the sidewalk, preferably for ground floor Encourage a units, where feasible. Ground floor residential units may have vertical and/or horizontal separation from the sidewalk for privacy or to address site issues.</li> </ul>
7	<p>Diversity of housing/building types</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 1c, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3, 4a, 5, 8, 9a, 9c, 10a, 10b, 10c</p>	<p>Policy language to require at least two building types for residential development is not clear. Seems to indicate that every development must include at least two types of housing. May not be feasible on smaller sites.</p>	<p>Pg. 22 Policy Area 1a #3 and add new design policy; Pg. 26 Policy Area 1b add new design policy, Pg. 28 Policy Area 1c #1 and add new design policy; Pg. 33 Policy Area 2b #1 and add new design policy; Pg. 35 Policy Area 2c #1 and #5; Pg. 37 Policy Area 2d #2 and add new</p>	<p>The intent is to minimize the potential for several large multi-family buildings and to achieve a diversity of building types of different height, sizes, and scales – regardless of the type of housing.</p> <p>Existing Policy: E.g. Pg. 22 Policy Area 1a #3: Development outside of the core and beyond approximately 500 ft. of N. Tryon St. should include more than one building type, such as single family, duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and multi-family buildings. Retail services...area.</p> <p>Proposed Revision: Land Use Policy revision</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
			<p>design policy; Pg. 41 Policy Area 3 #3 and add new design policy; Pg. 45 Policy Area 4a #1 and #6; Pg. 50 Policy Area 5 #4 and #9; Pg. 57 Policy Area 7a add new design policy, Pg. 60 Policy Area 7b add new design policy, Pg. 62 Policy Area 8 #1 and #10; Pg. 66 Policy Area 9a #4 and add new design policy; Pg. 70 Policy Area 9c #2 and add new design policy; Pg. 73 Policy Area 10a #1 and #6; Pg. 75 Policy Area 10b #2 and #6; Pg. 77 Policy Area 10c #1 and #3</p>	<p>E.G. Pg. 22 Policy Area 1a #3: Development outside of the core and beyond approximately 500 ft. of N. Tryon St. is appropriate for moderate to high density residential development (8 to above 22 DUA). <b>Development in this area is encouraged to include a variety of housing options</b> (e.g. single family, duplex, triplex, quadraplex, multi-family, etc.). Retail services...area. <i>(Highlighted sentence is recommended revision – rest of the policy language should remain as is for each Policy Area).</i></p> <p><b>Add Community Design Policy:</b> Buildings should be designed to avoid the appearance of having a long, continuous building wall and to break up visual mass and bulk. Consider a combination of design techniques to achieve this including, but not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Façade modulation that provides variation in the building wall.</li> <li>b. Building mass separation between all, or part, of a single building to create the appearance of multiple buildings.</li> <li>c. Use of varying architectural styles, building heights, and/or roof pitches to reduce the apparent size of a building.</li> <li>d. Multi-family residential development with a variety of building mass, scale, and type (e.g. townhomes, carriage houses, apartments, etc.).</li> </ol>
8	<p>Land Use Recommendations related to areas currently developed as primarily retail</p> <p>Policy Areas 3, 7a, and 7b</p>	<p>These areas are developed as primarily retail uses. While these areas are in transit station areas, they are outside the “core” area where TOD is more likely to occur in the short term. The proposed revision is intended to allow flexibility for future redevelopment, and transition to a mixed use, walkable, urban form.</p>	<p>Policy Area 1b #2 and #4; Policy Area 3 #2 and #5; Policy Area 7a #2 and #7; Policy Area 7b #1 and #3; Pg. 107 Implementation Guide, Land Use and Community Design Policies</p>	<p>The proposed revision is intended to allow flexibility for future redevelopment, and transition to a mixed use, walkable, urban form.</p> <p>Existing Policy: (e.g. Pg. 56, Policy Area 7a, #2)</p> <p>2. In areas outside of the core, existing businesses and residences are anticipated to remain in the near term. Over time, properties should be redeveloped for residential, office, and civic/institutional uses. Retail uses are also appropriate if located within multi-storied</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>buildings. Ground floor retail uses may include drive through facilities only if they meet the Community Design criteria below (#7). Structured parking should be lined with active uses along the street or screened from view from streets and sidewalks. Commercial uses with gasoline pumps are not appropriate in the transit station area.</p> <p>7. In areas outside of the core, buildings should be multi-storied (typically 3-5) and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk. Surface parking lots should be located to the rear or side of buildings. No more than 35% of a site's street frontage should be devoted to surface parking or driveway access. Drive-through facilities may be appropriate in areas indicated above (#2) if located on the interior of a parking deck and are designed to minimize conflicts with pedestrians.</p> <p>Proposed Revision:</p> <p>Land Use Policy  In areas outside of the core, existing businesses and residences are anticipated to remain in the near term. Over time, properties should be redeveloped with a mix of residential, office, retail, and civic/institutional uses. To ensure the area remains economically viable as it awaits redevelopment, a limited expansion of existing buildings may be appropriate. Ground floor retail uses may include drive through facilities only if they meet the Community Design criteria below (#7). Structured parking should be lined with active uses along the street or screened from view from streets and sidewalks. Commercial uses with gasoline pumps are not appropriate in the transit station area.</p> <p>Design policy:  In areas outside of the core, buildings should be multi-storied and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk. Surface parking should be located to the rear or side of buildings, and not between</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>the building and the street. Not more than 35% of a site’s street frontage should be devoted to surface parking or driveway access. Uses should activate the street with appropriate building orientation, accessible entrances, and space for outdoor seating and display near the sidewalk. Structured parking is strongly encouraged to reduce the need for surface parking. Drive-through facilities may be appropriate in areas indicated above (#2) if located on the interior of a parking deck and are designed to minimize conflicts with pedestrians.</p> <p>Add Implementation Action Item: Evaluate “limited expansion” based on how non-conforming sites and uses are addressed within the Transit Supportive Overlay (TS-O) District and subject to the design standards in the University City Area Plan.</p> <p>Project Type: Land Development</p> <p>Lead Agency: Planning</p> <p>Time Frame: As development occurs</p>
9	<p>Community Design recommendations for Transit Station Area Core</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 1b, 3, and 7a</p>	<p>To clarify height guidance and indicate there is not a height limitation in the policy guidance and that multistoried buildings are encouraged.</p>	<p>Policy Area 1a #4; Policy Area 1b #3; Policy Area 3 #4; Policy Area 7a #5</p>	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy: <b><u>Within the core</u></b> (shown in blue on Transportation Network Map above, as defined in the glossary on page 12) of the transit station area, buildings should be a minimum of 2 storied (typically 5-10 stories) and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk, with a greater setback when needed to accommodate outdoor seating and display. <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only</i></p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p><i>this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:  <b>Within the core</b> (shown in blue on Transportation Network Map above, as defined in the glossary on page 12) of the transit station area, buildings should be a multi-storied and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk, with a greater setback when needed to accommodate outdoor seating and display.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
10	<p>Community Design recommendations for Transit Station Area, outside the Core</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3, 7a, and 7b</p>	<p>To clarify height guidance and indicate there is not a height limitation in the policy guidance and that multistoried buildings are encouraged.</p>	<p>Policy Area 1a #5; Policy Area 1b #4; Policy Area 1c #3; Policy Area 3 #5; Policy Area 7a #6; Policy Area 7b #3</p>	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:  <b>In areas outside of the core</b>, buildings should be multi-storied (typically 3-5 stories) and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:  <b>In areas outside of the core</b>, buildings should be multi-storied and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
11	<p>Community Design recommendations for areas adjacent to established neighborhoods</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 3, 10a, 10b, 10c</p>	<p>To clarify height guidance and provide language for protection of visual and physical impacts to adjacent established neighborhoods with the provision to increase height as you move away from those neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Policy Area 1a #6; Policy Area 3 #7; Policy Area 10a #4; Policy Area 10b #5; Policy Area 10c #4; Implementation Guide, Land Use and Community Design Policies</p>	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:  Development [in areas outside of the core and beyond 500 ft. of N. Tryon St.] can be up to 4 stories.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>Development [in areas outside of the core and beyond 500 ft.] should be sensitive to the character, views, and privacy of existing neighborhoods. Base height adjacent to existing neighborhoods should be no greater than 4 stories and incrementally increase in height away from the neighborhood.</p> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Add Implementation Action Item: Evaluate appropriate height plane dimensions adjacent to established neighborhoods based on the context of the area compared with height planes dimensions within the zoning ordinance and determine which is most appropriate for that circumstance. Current zoning districts with height plane ordinances include Transit Oriented Development (TOD), Urban Residential (UR), and Pedestrian Overlay District (PED).</p> <p>Project Type: Land Development</p> <p>Lead Agency: Planning</p> <p>Time Frame: As development occurs</p>
12	<p>Community Design recommendations near the future Auto Mall</p> <p>Policy Areas 2a and 2b</p>	To clarify height guidance.	Policy Area 2a #7; Policy Area 2b #4	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy: If <b>automobile services and sales uses</b> are introduced in this area, the following design guidelines apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings should be a minimum of 2 stories and/or designed to have the appearance of a 2 story building.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>Proposed Revision:            If <b>automobile services and sales uses</b> are introduced in this area, the following design guidelines apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings should be multistoried and/or designed to have the appearance of a multistoried building.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
13	<p>Community Design recommendation for Policy Area 4a</p> <p>Policy Area 4a</p>	To remove height limitation.	Policy Area 4a #5	<p>The original intent was to encourage taller buildings to be located closer to the transit station; however after further review there is no reason that taller buildings are not appropriate in this area as it is adjacent to the transit station area and I-85.</p> <p>Existing Policy:            Buildings should be no greater than 5 stories.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:            Delete policy.</p>
14	<p>Community Design recommendation for Policy Area 9b</p> <p>Policy Area 9b</p>	To clarify height guidance and establish a strong building presence at this intersection that the community identifies as a gateway.	Policy Area 9b #4	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:            As a gateway to University City, buildings should be oriented to the corner at the intersection of Mallard Creek Church Rd. and N. Tryon St., at least 2 stories in height and designed to feature prominent entrances and distinctive architectural features.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:            As a gateway to University City, buildings should be oriented to the corner at the intersection of Mallard Creek Church Rd. and N. Tryon</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				St., multistoried and designed to feature prominent entrances and distinctive architectural features <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i>
15	Community Design Policy for Policy Area 5  Policy Area 5	To clarify height guidance.	Policy Area 5 #5	The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.  Existing Policy: Along Hampton Church Rd. properties with frontage on or within approximately 400' of N. Tryon St., should be developed with multi-storied buildings (typically 3 stories) that are oriented to both streets. <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i>  Proposed Revision: Along Hampton Church Rd. properties with frontage on or within approximately 400' of N. Tryon St., should be developed with multi-storied buildings that are oriented to both streets. <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i>
16	Mobility Policy for Policy Area 7a	To account for the uncertainty of future connectivity options.	Policy Area 7a #17	The proposed revision intends to provide connectivity options, assuming that the intent to create appropriate connections and block lengths within a transit station area is achieved through development regulations.  Existing Policy: Extend Olmstead Dr. as a local street to Grove Lake Dr. (not shown)  Proposed Revision: Extend Olmstead Dr. as a local street to the north, parallel to N. Tryon St. (not shown)
17	Implementation Guide	To address Zoning Implementation strategies.	Pg. 107, Implementation Strategies	Add Action Item: Further evaluation should be conducted to include identification of

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning.</p> <p>Project Type: Land Development</p> <p>Lead Agency: Planning</p> <p>Time Frame: Immediate to Short (0-5 years)</p>
18	<p>Transportation Policies</p> <p>South Area Street Cross Sections E. McCullough Dr.</p>	<p>To align with CATS development plans and appropriate cross section for remaining segment.</p>	<p>Pg. 91, Cross Section A4: East McCullough Drive (N. Tryon St. to E. McCullough Dr. extension)</p>	<p>Add a note to the cross section to address on-street parking.</p> <p>On-street parking dimension should remain at 7' but with double asterisk (**), add note below: "*** Option to widen for recessed parking, in which case bike lanes shall be 6'"</p>
19	<p>Transportation Policies</p> <p>South Area Street Cross Sections Local Streets</p>	<p>To correct an error in the posted and design speeds of typical local streets.</p>	<p>Pg. 95, Cross Section: Areas with Specific Setbacks on Local Streets, Urban Street Design Guidelines note</p>	<p>Existing text: Urban Street Design Guidelines (2007) recommends: Posted Speed – 35-45 mph Design Speed – up to 45 mph</p> <p>Proposed Revision: Urban Street Design Guidelines (2007) recommends: Posted Speed – 25 mph Design Speed – 25 mph</p>