

Problem statement:

The existing circumstance is that community facilities provide significant benefit and create significant consternation due to the following problem statement components:

- A. The regulations or the conditions, that are intended to mitigate impacts of community facilities are insufficient or unknown in some cases.
 - 1. The impacts to the neighbors of community organizations are insufficiently regulated, specifically with regard to the intensity of building and site use, noise, light, traffic, and other similar impacts;
 - 2. Current rules do not support flexibility to promote good design that addresses neighborhood impacts;
 - 3. No provision encouraging community facilities to coordinate expansion, the use of resources, and upgrades with adjacent community facilities;
- B. The public process does not support sufficient community input in the decision-making.
 - 1. The community does not have sufficient influence in the decision-making process;
 - 2. The community input is too late in the process to influence design;
- C. There is a lack of a predictable outcome for organizations and neighbors.
 - 1. The current CUP process results in conditions of approval that cannot be known in advance;
 - 2. The current process results in the “re-review” of previously discussed designs resulting in community fatigue, a change in previous commitments, etc;
 - 3. The City lacks a regulatory mechanism to limit the growth and evolution of community facilities subject to sufficiently strict and enforceable mitigation measures;
 - 4. Ongoing expansions of organizations, without long term planning or a vision, can be disruptive to the neighborhood;
 - 5. Any residentially zoned properties may be the subject of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application for community facilities;
- D. Regulations are not sufficiently enforceable.
 - 1. Conditional Use Permit historical records are incomplete;
 - 2. Code compliance is based on complaints

Alternative Approach Summary

| Amend: | Alternative 1: No Change | Alternative 2: Limited CUP ¹ Change | Alternative 3: Expanded CUP and MP ² | Alternative 4: Current Approach ³ |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Criteria for Approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend current CUP criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend current CUP criteria Develop MP criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current CUP criteria Develop MP criteria |
| Development / Design Standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current standards Allow limited modification of current standards as part of MP or CUP process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop new standards specific to the zone Allow modification of new standards as part of MP process |
| Process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current CUP process Develop MP process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current CUP process Develop MP process |

¹ Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

² Master Plan (MP)

³ Based on June 2019 PC discussion

Problem Statement / Alternative Mapping

The existing circumstance is that community facilities provide significant benefit and create significant consternation due to the following problem statement components:

| Problem Statement | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2: Limited CUP | | Alternative 3: Expanded CUP / MP | | Alternative 4: Current Approach | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | Advantages | Limitations | Advantages | Limitations | Advantages | Limitations |
| A. <u>The regulations or the conditions, that are intended to mitigate impacts of community facilities are insufficient or unknown in some cases.</u> | Alternative 1 is the “No change” alternative and represents the current circumstance against which other alternatives are evaluated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria can be developed to address expected impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of specific development standards may be a better tool to address this item | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria can be developed to address expected impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of specific development standards may be a better tool to address this item | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt new standards specific to community facilities Additional decision criteria can be developed to address expected impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community perception that new standards are too permissive |
| 1. The impacts to the neighbors of community organizations are insufficiently regulated, specifically with regard to the intensity of building and site use, noise, light, traffic, and other similar impacts; | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval criteria related to these impacts will ensure consideration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative does not establish a specific development standard for these impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria can be developed to address expected impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative does not establish a specific development standard for these impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria can be developed to address expected impacts Additional development standards specific to these impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community perception that new standards are too permissive |
| 2. Current rules do not support flexibility to promote good design that | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility is not a component of this alternative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative allows flexibility to standards to | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative allows flexibility to standards to | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility may “diminish” adoption of new standards |

| Problem Statement | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2: Limited CUP | | Alternative 3: Expanded CUP / MP | | Alternative 4: Current Approach | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| addresses neighborhood impacts; | Alternative 1 is the “No change” alternative and represents the current circumstance against which other alternatives are evaluated. | | | promote good design | | promote good design | intended to mitigate impacts |
| 3. No provision encouraging community facilities to coordinate expansion, the use of resources, and upgrades with adjacent community facilities; | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination, shared resources / design is not addressed by this alternative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Plan criteria could be established to require coordination, use of shared resources in order to obtain desirable flexibility | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Plan criteria could be established to require coordination, use of shared resources in order to obtain desirable flexibility | |
| B. <u>The public process does not support sufficient community input in the decision-making.</u> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria relevant to community concerns would increase attention to community input | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community influence will be weakest where not related to the criteria for approval or standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria relevant to community concerns would increase attention to community input The MP process would include additional opportunity for community input | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community influence will be weakest where not related to the criteria for approval or standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria relevant to community concerns would increase attention to community input The MP process would include additional opportunity for community input Additional standards may further support | |

| Problem Statement | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2: Limited CUP | | Alternative 3: Expanded CUP / MP | | Alternative 4: Current Approach | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| 1. The community does not have sufficient influence in the decision-making process; | Alternative 1 is the “No change” alternative and represents the current circumstance against which other alternatives are evaluated. | | | | | community input | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to community influence in decision-making process under this alternative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MP process would provide additional community influence | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MP process would provide additional community influence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community perception that new standards reduce influence in establishing conditions of approval |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timing of community input is not addressed by this alternative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MP process⁴ would require community input earlier in the process | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MP process⁵ would require community input earlier in the process | | |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the predictability of the outcome of a CUP review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval would establish long term anticipated development of the site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced predictability related to flexible standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval would establish long term anticipated development of the site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced predictability related to flexible standards New standards may support development too much | |
| 2. The community input is too late in the process to influence design; | | | | | | | |
| C. <u>There is a lack of a predictable outcome for organizations and neighbors.</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1. The current CUP process results in conditions of approval that cannot be known in advance; | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the current approach | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the current approach | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced reliance on “conditions of approval” based on the |

⁴ Based on June 2019 PC discussion

⁵ Based on June 2019 PC discussion

| Problem Statement | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2: Limited CUP | | Alternative 3: Expanded CUP / MP | | Alternative 4: Current Approach | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | adoption of new standards. |
| 2. The current process results in the “re-review” of previously discussed designs resulting in community fatigue, a change in previous commitments, etc; | Alternative 1 is the “No change” alternative and represents the current circumstance against which other alternatives are evaluated. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the “re-review” effect | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval reduces the likelihood of multiple “re-reviews” | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval reduces the likelihood of multiple “re-reviews” | |
| 3. The City lacks a regulatory mechanism to limit the growth and evolution of community facilities subject to sufficiently strict and enforceable mitigation measures; | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria may result in additional conditions of approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No overall limit on growth and evolution through the acquisition of adjacent properties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval process could result in mitigation for each phase of community facility development Additional criteria may result in additional conditions of approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No overall limit on growth and evolution through the acquisition of adjacent properties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval process could result in mitigation for each phase of community facility development Additional criteria may result in additional conditions of approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth consistent with new standards should be expected, and is undesirable to the community |
| 4. Ongoing expansions of organizations, without long term planning or a vision, can be disruptive to the neighborhood; | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to requirement for long term planning / vision | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval process will provide a long-term vision for community facility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing growth consistent with the MP is undesirable to neighbors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP approval process will provide a long-term vision for community facility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing growth consistent with the MP is undesirable to neighbors |
| 5. Any residentially zoned properties may be the subject of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the ability for properties to apply for a CUP | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the ability for properties to apply for a CUP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New standards associated with a new zoning designation will | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that rezone may spread to additional |
| | | | | | | | |

| Problem Statement | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2: Limited CUP | | Alternative 3: Expanded CUP / MP | | Alternative 4: Current Approach | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| application for community facilities; | | | | | | limit expansion into residential neighborhoods | community facilities and negatively impact residential character |
| D. <u>Regulations are not sufficiently enforceable.</u> | Alternative 1 is the “No change” alternative and represents the current circumstance against which other alternatives are evaluated. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to enforcement mechanism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional opportunity for enforcement as subsequent phases of development are received | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New standards are associated with the zone, limiting the reliance on site specific conditions of approval | |
| 1. Conditional Use Permit historical records are incomplete; | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to historic records | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to historic records | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less reliance on historical records to determine compliance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to historic records |
| 2. Code compliance is based on complaints | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Code compliance would be reviewed at each phase of MP development | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Code compliance would be reviewed at each phase of MP development | |

