CITY OF KING
PLANNING BOARD

MEETING DATE:
JULY 28, 2025

PART A

Subject:	**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 32, ARTICLE III, SEC. 32-163 AND SEC. 32-164; PROPOSED ADDITION TO CHAPTER 32, ARTICLE V, DIVISION 1, SEC. 32-261**
Action Requested:	**To review and approve or deny requested amendments.**
Attachments:	• **Proposed changes to Art. III, Sec. 32-163, 164, and add to Art. V, Sec. 32-261.** • **Paper public notice.**

Todd Cox **Todd Cox, Int. Planner/Zoning Official**	**This abstract requires review by:**	
	City Manager	**City Attorney**

PART B

Introduction and Background:

We have an applicant, Arden Group, Inc., who is proposing a zoning text amendment that would add a new zoning use district, Mixed-Use (M-U), to the zoning ordinance in Sec. 32-163,164, and in Sec. 32-261. We currently have in Sec. 32-248 Planned Unit Development (PUD), and it mainly applies to residential uses and is used to create a mixed-use site plan. In the past, our PUDs have consisted of single-family, multi-family apartments or townhomes with up to 20% of the total tract that could be used for business-type uses that would service the residential uses.

The new proposed M-U district would apply to almost all uses listed in Sec. 32-198 to 206, with a few uses excluded, such as agriculture and heavy-industrial. If approved, this would be a CZ M-U district only, and it would be reviewed and approved or denied based on the requirements of Sec. 32-164 and the newly adopted requirements of Sec. 32-261. This request comes to the city to broaden the existing PUD in Sec. 32-248. This text amendment would allow the designer/developer the means to do a more conceptual site plan with fewer restrictions on it.

Discussion and Analysis:

Budgetary Impact:
Cost of adding to our codified ordinance.
Recommendation:
Staff have reviewed this request at length, and I interpreted the first version as a commercial type of PUD, rather than a mixed-use district, for any uses listed in the ordinance. This is why the item was postponed at the June meeting. Since then, we have the correct proposal for the planning board to review. **I've included a review of this proposed text amendment against using our existing PUD (see below), as it is very similar to what our PUD is used for – mixed-use development. Our attorney has also been in communication with our staff from a defensible perspective. I see some merits to having a mixed-use district in our ordinance, but I do not feel that this is the best approach. There are several aspects of this proposal that lack the specific details necessary to protect the citizens of King. Maybe this district could be revisited in the future and studied by the planning board, and another version could be developed that would better satisfy the health, welfare, and safety of the citizens of King.** **Staff recommends – planning board review and make a recommendation to the city council on the Proposed Amendment to Chapter 32, Article III, Sec. 32-163 and Sec. 32-164; Proposed Addition to Chapter 32, Article V, Division 1, Sec. 32-261.**