



CITY OF KING CITY COUNCIL

MEETING DATE:

SEPTEMBER 2, 2025

PART A

Subject:	PROPOSED TO AMENDMENT BY ARDEN GROUP 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 the applicants 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 amendments with supporting documentation.

<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 something similar 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 (similar to King's Crossing).

The new proposed M-U district by Arden Group 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 (CZ rezoning requirements) 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 proposed amendment would allow the designer/developer the means to do a more conceptual site plan with a few less restrictions on it than the PUD and to expand the commercial percentage of the site from 20% in a PUD to a minimum of 37% in the proposed M-U district with a maximum of 63% residential.

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. *The need for an updated comp plan to see if or where the M-U district would work.
Budgetary Impact:	
Cost of adding to our codified ordinance.	
Recommendation:	
Staff and the chairman of the planning board have worked with the applicant's land planners and came up with a revised version of the applicants first version. We defined a lot of the items that the planning board and our attorney had pointed out as being potential issues. Just to review a few of the major issues – • Setbacks not defined. • Commercial and residential use percentages not defined. • Height restrictions not clear. • The traffic memorandum. We have tried to better address the above concerns listed above in the new version. The land planners will be going over these during the review period. They've also included copies of a traffic memorandum that has been used in other projects in the state for you to review. Staff recommends – that council review the revised ordinance amendment and see if it's a tool that the city is ready to have in the city ordinance. Also, it needs to be in line with our comp plan which hasn't been updated yet. If approved, staff does not see any potential user of the district anytime soon but could see some issues in where the new district would be used when we still need to update our city comp plan. It does have some good merits but we may want to hold on it until we can update our comp plan and define where this district may be used. If there's a motion to approve – please include in your motion to approved <u>ordinance 2025-04 and a statement that the text amendment is in keeping with the city's comp plan.</u> Planning Board Recommendation – The planning board voted 3 - 2 to recommend approval of the text amendment.	