



CITY OF KING PLANNING BOARD

MEETING DATE:
AUGUST 25, 2025

PART A

Subject:	PROPOSED TO 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. • Ordinance 2025-04, for proposed amendment.

<i>Todd Cox</i> G. Todd Cox, Int. Planning & 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 PUD's 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 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 as a way 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 less restrictions on it and expand the commercial percentage of the site from 20% in a PUD to 37% in the proposed M-U district.

Discussion and Analysis:	
Pro's *Would aid developers to have another tool besides using the PUD to develop a tract of land that isn't geared towards mostly residential development. *The proposed amendment does give us a nice mixture of mixed development which eventually will come to King. *The proposed amendment is set up as a conditional zoning for approval as opposed to a SUP/quasi-judicial process. This makes the process much easier.	Con's *Staff doesn't see a big push to use this district in the near future. *Some of the language in the proposed amendment is not as defined as what we have in our existing PUD and other use districts which could cause various legal issues. *
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 versus a mixed-use district for any use 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) since this is very similar to what our PUD is used for – mixed-use development. Our attorney has also included his thoughts from a defensible perspective (see below). I do see some merits to having a mixed-use district in our ordinance, I do not feel that this is the way to go. There are too many things in this proposal that do not give specifics that are needed 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. <u>8-18-2025 – Planning board chairman Jeff Walker and staff met with the applicant's land planners and worked through a few of the issues we found in the first version. We were able to negotiate some of the proposed sections for a more functioning ordinance that would benefit King in the long run. One major point was to define the maximum percentages of commercial and residential uses. At a worst case, we would always have a project with at least 37% commercial use (commercial and mixed-use) and no more than 67% residential use (single family, attached residential {townhomes}, multi-family {apartments and condos}). So, this would ensure that we have a true mixed-use project. The applicants' land planners will go over the various points of their proposal at the meeting.</u> Staff recommends – planning board review and make a recommendation to city council on ordinance amendment 2025-04. If the board is making a favorable recommendation, please also include a statement that you feel the amendment would be in keeping with the spirit of our comp plan.	