

Memorandum

Date: March 19, 2014

To: City of Sherwood Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update Project Management Team

From: Darci Rudzinski and Shayna Rehberg, Angelo Planning Group

Re: Draft Policy and Implementation Language (Task 5.2)

This memorandum presents draft proposed amendments to the City of Sherwood transportation policies and Zoning and Community Development Code (“development code”), pursuant to Task 5.2.

Proposed policy and code amendments will be reviewed and considered for adoption in conjunction with the updated TSP, as they include amendments that implement recommendations from the updated City of Sherwood Transportation System Plan (TSP), create consistency between the TSP and other adopted local documents, and comply with state and regional transportation planning regulations.

Proposed Policy Amendments

[Insert policy section after PMT review]

Proposed Development Code Amendments

Draft code amendments presented in this memorandum were developed according to findings of compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP).¹ Recommendations for potential code amendments to better address compliance with TPR and RTFP requirements were summarized in Table 6 of the Needs, Opportunities, Constraints and Tools Technical Report (Task 3.2). These recommendations were discussed with City staff in order to determine which issues would be pursued and developed into draft code amendments.

For reference, that summary table is included in this memorandum as Table A-1 in Attachment A, and includes commentary indicating which recommendations have been developed into proposed code amendments.

¹ Detailed and updated findings of compliance will be included in the City’s staff report (Task 5.6).

SHERWOOD TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE
DRAFT POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION LANGUAGE
MARCH 2014

Proposed code amendment text is presented in adoption-ready format in this memorandum. New language that is proposed to be added is underlined and proposed deletions are ~~struck through~~. The draft amendments are numbered consistent with the structure of the City development code, and are presented in the order of issues included in Table A-1.

Note: In addition to the amendments proposed in this memorandum, the entire development code should be checked to amend all references to the updated TSP, as needed.

Consistency of transportation facility standards (Recommendation DC-2 in Table A-1)

[Check/coordinate with Draft TSP]

[APG will complete this set of potential amendments once we have reviewed the Draft TSP.]

Definitions of access way and shared-use path (Recommendation DC-3 in Table A-1)

[Check/coordinate with Draft TSP]

CHAPTER 16.10 DEFINITIONS

16.10.020 SPECIFICALLY

[...]

Access: The way or means by which pedestrians and vehicles enter and leave property.

Access way: A pathway providing a connection for pedestrians and bicyclists between two streets, between two lots, or between a development and a public right-of-way. An access way is intended to provide access between a development and adjacent residential uses, commercial uses, public use such as schools, parks, and adjacent collector and arterial streets where transit stops or bike lanes are provided or designated. An access way may be a pathway for pedestrians and bicyclists (with no vehicle access), a pathway on public or private property (i.e., with a public access easement), and/or a facility designed to accommodate emergency vehicles.

Accessory Building/Use: A subordinate building or use which is customarily incidental to that of the principal use or building located on the same property.

[...]

Setback: The minimum horizontal distance between a public street right-of-way line, or side and rear property lines, to the front, side and rear lines of a building or structure located on a lot.

Shared-use pathway: A facility for pedestrian and bicycle access conforming to City standards and separated from the roadway, either in the roadway right-of-way, independent public right-of-way, or a public access easement. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

Sidewalk: A pedestrian walkway with hard surfacing.

[...]

Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and rough proportionality requirements (Recommendation DC-4 in Table A-1)

CHAPTER 16.90 SITE PLANNING

16.90.030 Site Plan Modifications and Revocation

[...]

D. Required Findings

No site plan approval shall be granted unless each of the following is found:

[...]

6. ~~For developments that are likely to generate more than 400 average daily trips (ADTs)~~ Pursuant to Section 16.106.090, or at the discretion of the City Engineer, the applicant shall provide adequate information, such as a traffic impact analysis (TIA) or traffic counts, to demonstrate the level of impact to the surrounding street transportation system. The developer shall be required to mitigate for impacts attributable to the project, pursuant to TIA requirements in Section 16.106.090 and rough proportionality requirements in Section 16.106.100. The determination of impact or effect and the scope of the impact study shall be coordinated with the provider of the affected transportation facility.

[...]

CHAPTER 16.106 TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

16.106.020 Required Improvements

[...]

D. Extent of Improvements

1. Streets required pursuant to this Chapter shall be dedicated and improved consistent with Chapter 6 of the Community Development Plan, the TSP and applicable City specifications included in the City of Sherwood Construction Standards. Streets shall include curbs, sidewalks, catch basins, street lights, and street trees. Improvements shall also include any bikeways designated on the Transportation System Plan map. Applicant may be required to dedicate land

for required public improvements only when the exaction is directly related to and roughly proportional to the impact of the development, pursuant to Section 16.106.100.

[...]

16.106.040 Design

Standard cross sections showing street design and pavement dimensions are located in the City of Sherwood Transportation System Plan, and City of Sherwood's Engineering Design Manual.

[...]

K. Traffic Controls

- ~~1. An application for a proposed residential development that will generate more than an estimated 200 average daily vehicle trips (ADT) must include a traffic impact analysis to determine the number and types of traffic controls necessary to accommodate anticipated traffic flow.~~
- ~~2. For all other proposed developments including commercial, industrial or institutional uses with over an estimated 400 ADT Pursuant to Section 16.106.090, or as otherwise required by the City Engineer, the an application must include a traffic impact analysis to determine the number and types of traffic controls necessary to accommodate anticipated traffic flow.~~

[...]

16.106.090 Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)

A. Applicability. A traffic impact analysis (TIA) shall be required to be submitted to the City with a land use application at the request of the City Engineer or if the proposal is expected to involve one or more of the following:

1. An amendment to the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan or zoning map.
2. A new direct property approach road to Highway 99W is proposed.
3. The proposed development generates [50] or more PM peak-hour trips on Highway 99W, or 100 PM peak-hour trips on the local transportation system.
4. An increase in use of any adjacent street or direct property approach road to Highway 99W by 10 vehicles or more per day that exceed the 20,000 pound gross vehicle weight.

5. The location of an existing or proposed access driveway does not meet minimum spacing or sight distance requirements, or is located where vehicles entering or leaving the property are restricted, or such vehicles are likely to queue or hesitate at an approach or access connection, thereby creating a safety hazard.
6. A change in internal traffic patterns that may cause safety problems, such as back up onto the highway or traffic crashes in the approach area.

B. Requirements. The following are typical requirements that may be modified in coordination with [City planning staff/the City Engineer] based on the specific application.

1. Pre-application Conference. The applicant shall meet with the City Engineer prior to submitting an application that requires a TIA. This meeting will be coordinated with Washington County and ODOT when an approach road to a County road or Highway 99W serves the property, so that the TIA will meet the requirements of all relevant agencies.
2. Preparation. The TIA shall be prepared by an Oregon Registered Professional Engineer qualified to perform traffic engineering analysis and will be paid for by the applicant.
3. Typical Average Daily Trips and Peak Hour Trips. The latest edition of the Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), shall be used to gauge PM peak hour vehicle trips, unless a specific trip generation study that is approved by the City Engineer indicates an alternative trip generation rate is appropriate. [Note: Alternative, stricter trip generation study provisions: A trip generation study can be used as a reference to determine trip generation for a specific land use which is not well represented in the ITE Trip Generation Manual and for which similar facilities are available to count.]
4. Intersection-level Analysis. Intersection-level analysis shall occur at every intersection where the analysis shows that [50] or more peak hour vehicle trips can be expected to result from the development.
5. Transportation Planning Rule Compliance. The requirements of OAR 660-012-0060 shall apply to those land use actions that significantly affect the transportation system, as defined by the Transportation Planning Rule.

C. Study Area. The following facilities shall be included in the study area for all TIAs:

1. All site-access points and intersections (signalized and unsignalized) adjacent to the proposed development site. If the site fronts an arterial or collector street, the analysis shall address all intersections and driveways along the site frontage and within the access spacing distances extending out from the boundary of the site frontage.
2. Roads through and adjacent to the site.

3. All intersections needed for signal progression analysis.

4. In addition to these requirements, the City Engineer may require analysis of any additional intersections or roadway links that may be adversely affected as a result of the proposed development.

D. Analysis Periods. To adequately assess the impacts of a proposed land use action, the following study periods, or horizon years, should be addressed in the transportation impact analysis where applicable:

1. Existing Year.

2. Background Conditions in Project Completion Year. The conditions in the year in which the proposed land use action will be completed and occupied, but without the expected traffic from the proposed land use action. This analysis should account for all City-approved developments that are expected to be fully built out in the proposed land use action horizon year, as well as all planned transportation system improvements.

3. Full Buildout Conditions in Project Completion Year. The background condition plus traffic from the proposed land use action assuming full build-out and occupancy.

4. Phased Years of Completion. If the project involves construction or occupancy in phases, the applicant shall assess the expected roadway and intersection conditions resulting from major development phases. Phased years of analysis will be determined in coordination with City staff.

5. 20-Year or TSP Horizon Year. For planned unit developments, comprehensive plan amendments or zoning map amendments, the applicant shall assess the expected future roadway, intersection, and land use conditions as compared to approved comprehensive planning documents.

E. Approval Criteria. When a TIA is required, a proposal is subject to the following criteria, in addition to all criteria otherwise applicable to the underlying land use proposal:

1. The analysis complies with the requirements of 16.106.090.B;

2. The analysis demonstrates that adequate transportation facilities exist to serve the proposed development or identifies mitigation measures that resolve identified traffic safety problems in a manner that is satisfactory to the City Engineer and, when County or State highway facilities are affected, to Washington County and ODOT;

3. For affected non-highway facilities, the TIA demonstrates that mobility and/or other applicable performance standards adopted by the City have been met; and

4. Proposed public improvements are designed and will be constructed to the street standards specified in Section 16.106.010 and to the access standards in Section 16.106.040.

F. Conditions of Approval. The City may deny, approve, or approve a development proposal with conditions needed to meet operations and safety standards and provide the necessary right-of-way and improvements to ensure consistency with the future planned transportation system. Improvements required as a condition of development approval, when not voluntarily provided by the applicant, shall be roughly proportional to the impact of the development on transportation facilities, pursuant to Section 16.106.100. Findings in the development approval shall indicate how the required improvements directly related to and are roughly proportional to the impact of development.

16.106.100 Rough Proportionality

The purpose of this section is to ensure that required transportation facility improvements are roughly proportional to the potential impacts of the proposed development. The rough proportionality requirements of this section apply to both frontage and non-frontage improvements. A proportionality analysis will be conducted by the City Engineer for any proposed development that triggers transportation facility improvements pursuant to this chapter. The City Engineer will take into consideration any benefits that are estimated to accrue to the development property as a result of any required transportation facility improvements. A proportionality determination can be appealed pursuant to Section . The following general provisions apply whenever a proportionality analysis is conducted.

- A. Mitigation of impacts due to increased demand for transportation facilities associated with the proposed development shall be provided in rough proportion to the transportation impacts of the proposed development. When applicable, anticipated impacts will be determined by the TIA in accordance with Section 16.106.090. When no TIA is required, anticipated impacts will be determined by the City Engineer.
- B. The following shall be considered when determining proportional improvements:
1. Condition and capacity of existing facilities within the impact area in relation to City standards. The impact area is generally defined as the area within a one-half (1/2) mile radius of the proposed development. If a TIA is required, the impact area is the TIA study area.
 2. Existing vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit use within the impact area.
 3. The effect of increased demand on transportation facilities and other approved, but not yet constructed, development projects within the impact area that is associated with the proposed development.

4. Applicable TSP goals, policies, and plans.
5. Whether any route affected by increased transportation demand within the impact area is listed in any City program including school trip safety; neighborhood traffic management; capital improvement; system development improvement, or others.
6. Accident history within the impact area.
7. Potential increased safety risks to transportation facility users, including pedestrians and cyclists.
8. Potential benefit the development property will receive as a result of the construction of any required transportation facility improvements.
9. Other considerations as may be identified in the review process.

Preferential carpool and vanpool parking (Recommendation DC-6 in Table A-1)

CHAPTER 16.94 OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

16.94.010 General Requirements

[...]

E. Location

3. Vehicle parking is allowed only on improved parking shoulders that meet City standards for public streets, within garages, carports and other structures, or on driveways or parking lots that have been developed in conformance with this code. Specific locations and types of spaces (car pool, compact, etc.) for parking shall be indicated on submitted plans and located to the side or rear of buildings where feasible.
 - a. All new development with twenty (20) employees or more shall include preferential spaces for ~~either~~ car-pool and vanpool designation. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of ADA parking spaces. Carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked as reserved for carpool/vanpool only.

Exemptions for structured parking and on-street parking (Recommendation DC-8 in Table A-1)

16.94.010 General Requirements

[...]

K. Structured parking and on-street parking are exempt from the parking space maximums in Section 16.94.020.A.

"Housekeeping" amendments, parking standards table footnotes (Recommendation DC-9 in Table A-1)

Section 16.94.020, Parking Standards Table

¹ Parking Zone A reflects the maximum number of permitted vehicle parking spaces allowed for each listed land use. Parking Zone A areas include those parcels that are located within one-quarter (¼) mile walking distance of bus transit stops, one-half (½) mile walking distance of light rail station platforms, or both, or that have a greater than 20 minute peak hour transit service.

² ~~Parking Zone B. Parking Zone B reflects the maximum number of permitted vehicle parking spaces allowed for each listed land use. Parking Zone B areas include those parcels that are located within one-quarter ¼ mile walking distance of bus transit stops, one-half ½ mile walking distance of light rail station platforms, or both, or that have a greater than 20 minute peak hour transit service.~~ Parking Zone B areas ~~also~~ include those parcels that are located at a distance greater than one-quarter (¼) mile walking distance of bus transit stops, one-half (½) mile walking distance of light rail station platforms, or both.

Transportation Planning Rule consistency requirements (Recommendation DC-11 in Table A-1)

CHAPTER 16.80 PLAN AMENDMENTS

16.80.030 Review Criteria

[...]

C. Transportation Planning Rule Consistency

1. The applicant shall demonstrate consistency with the Transportation Planning Rule, specifically by addressing whether the proposed amendment creates a significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060. If required, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to Section 16.106.090.

~~Review of plan and text amendment applications for effect on transportation facilities. Proposals shall be reviewed to determine whether it significantly affects a transportation facility, in accordance with OAR 660-12-0060 (the TPR). Review is required when a development~~

application includes a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or changes to land use regulations.

2. ~~"Significant" means that the transportation facility would change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility, change the standards implementing a functional classification, allow types of land use, allow types or levels of land use that would result in levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of a transportation facility, or would reduce the level of service of the facility below the minimum level identified on the Transportation System Plan.~~
3. ~~Per OAR 660-12-0060, Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or changes to land use regulations which significantly affect a transportation facility shall assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity, and level of service of the facility identified in the Transportation System Plan. This shall be accomplished by one of the following:~~
 - a. ~~Limiting allowed uses to be consistent with the planned function of the transportation facility.~~
 - b. ~~Amending the Transportation System Plan to ensure that existing, improved, or new transportation facilities are adequate to support the proposed land uses.~~
 - c. ~~Altering land use designations, densities or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.~~

Major driveway connectivity requirements (Recommendation DC-13 in Table A-1)

[Note: The City engineering manual allows residential driveway widths up to 24 feet for lots with frontage up to 60 feet, and wider driveway widths for lots with frontage more than 60 feet. Thus, 24 feet was used as a threshold for the proposed amendments below.]

CHAPTER 16.90 SITE PLANNING

16.90.030 Site Plan Modifications and Revocation

[...]

D. Required Findings

No site plan approval shall be granted unless each of the following is found:

[...]

9. Driveways that are more than 24 feet in width shall align with existing streets or planned streets as shown in the Local Street Connectivity Map in the adopted Transportation System Plan (Figure 17), except where prevented by topography, rail lines, freeways, pre-existing development, or leases, easements, or covenants.

CHAPTER 16.106 TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

16.106.030 Location

[...]

B. Street Connectivity and Future Street Systems

[...]

2. Connectivity Map Required. New residential, commercial, and mixed use development involving the construction of new streets shall be submitted with a site plan that implements, responds to and expands on the Local Street Connectivity map contained in the TSP.

[...]

- d. Driveways that are more than 24 feet in width shall be treated as streets and shall align with existing streets or planned streets as shown in the Local Street Connectivity Map in the adopted Transportation System Plan (Figure 17), except where prevented by topography, rail lines, freeways, pre-existing development, or leases, easements, or covenants.

On-street loading (Recommendation DC-14 in Table A-1)

CHAPTER 16.94 OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

16.94.030 Off-Street Loading Standards

[...]

- C. Exceptions and Adjustments. The review authority, through Site Plan Review, may approve loading areas within a street right-of-way in the Old Town Overlay District when all of the following conditions are met:

1. Short in duration (i.e., less than one hour);

2. Infrequent (less than three operations occur daily between 5:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m. or all operations occur between 12:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m. at a location that is not adjacent to a residential zone);
3. Does not unreasonably obstruct traffic; [or] Does not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
4. Does not obstruct a primary emergency response route; and
5. Is acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

Bicycle parking (Recommendation DC-15 in Table A-1)

[Note: The language proposed in this section is based primarily on bicycle parking provisions adopted by the City of Wilsonville and includes existing City of Sherwood provisions as noted.]

CHAPTER 16.94 OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

16.94.020 Off-Street Parking Standards

[...]

C. Bicycle Parking Facilities

1. ~~Location and Design~~
 - a. ~~Bicycle parking shall be conveniently located with respect to both the street right of way and at least one (1) building entrance (e.g., no farther away than the closest parking space). Bike parking may be located inside the main building or near the main entrance.~~
 - b. ~~Bicycle parking in the Old Town Overlay District can be located on the sidewalk within the right of way. A standard inverted "U shaped" design is appropriate. Alternative, creative designs are strongly encouraged.~~
2. ~~Visibility and Security. Bicycle parking shall be visible to cyclists from street sidewalks or building entrances, so that it provides sufficient security from theft and damage.~~
3. ~~Options for Storage. Bicycle parking requirements for long term and employee parking can be met by providing a bicycle storage room, bicycle lockers, racks, or other secure storage space inside or outside of the building.~~
4. ~~Lighting. Bicycle parking shall be at least as well lit as vehicle parking for security.~~

- ~~5. Reserved Areas. Areas set aside for bicycle parking shall be clearly marked and reserved for bicycle parking only.~~
- ~~6. Hazards. Bicycle parking shall not impede or create a hazard to pedestrians. Parking areas shall be located so as to not conflict with vision clearance standards.~~

1. General Provisions

- a. Applicability. Bicycle parking spaces shall be provided for new development, changes of use, and major renovations, defined as construction valued at 25% or more of the assessed value of the existing structure.
- b. Types of Spaces. Bicycle parking facilities shall be provided in terms of short-term bicycle parking and long-term bicycle parking. Short-term bicycle parking is intended to encourage customers and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for at least several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.
- c. Minimum Number of Spaces. The required total minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 4, Minimum Required Bicycle Parking Spaces. [Note: Tables in Chapter 16.94 are not currently numbered, so it is recommended that the previous tables in the chapter be numbered Tables 1, 2, and 3.]
- d. Minimum Number of Long-term Spaces. A minimum of one long-term bicycle parking space is required per use. At least 50% of the required bicycle parking spaces in Table 4 shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking, with a minimum of one long-term bicycle parking space, in the following situations:
- (1) Ten percent (10%) or more of vehicle parking is covered;
 - (2) More than six (6) bicycle parking spaces are required; or
 - (3) Multifamily residential development with nine (9) or more units.
- e. Multiple Uses. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

2. Location and Design.

a. General Provisions

- (1) Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area, be accessible without moving another bicycle, and provide enough space between the rack and any obstructions to use the space properly.
- (2) There must be an aisle at least 5 feet wide behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.
- (3) Lighting. Bicycle parking shall be at least as well lit as vehicle parking for security. [Note: existing code language]
- (4) Reserved Areas. Areas set aside for bicycle parking shall be clearly marked and reserved for bicycle parking only. [Note: existing code language]
- (5) Bicycle parking in the Old Town Overlay District can be located on the sidewalk within the right-of-way. A standard inverted "U shaped" or staple design is appropriate. Alternative, creative designs are strongly encouraged. [Note: existing code language]
- (6) Hazards. Bicycle parking shall not impede or create a hazard to pedestrians. Parking areas shall be located so as to not conflict with vision clearance standards. [Note: existing code language]

b. Short-term Bicycle Parking

- (1) Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
- (2) Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building (or at least as close as the nearest vehicle parking space, whichever is closer), or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles. [Note: Partially existing code language]
- (3) If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50% of these shall be covered.

c. Long-term Bicycle Parking

- (1) Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
- (2) Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be accessed by the intended users.
- (3) All of the spaces shall be covered.

d. Covered Parking (Weather Protection)

- (1) When required, covered bicycle parking shall be provided in one of the following ways: inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures.
- (2) Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.
- (3) Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.

Table 4: Minimum Required Bicycle Parking Spaces

[Note: existing code language]

Use Categories	Minimum Required Spaces
Residential Categories	
Household living	Multi-dwelling — 2 or 1 per 10 auto spaces. All other residential structure types — None
Group living	1 per 20 auto spaces
Commercial Categories	
Retail sales/service office	2 or 1 per 20 auto spaces, whichever is greater
Drive-up vehicle servicing	None
Vehicle repair	None
Commercial parking facilities, commercial, outdoor recreation, major event entertainment	4 or 1 per 20 auto spaces, whichever is greater
Self-service storage	None
Industrial Categories/Service Categories	
Basic utilities	2 or 1 per 40 spaces, whichever is greater
Park and ride facilities	2 or 1 per 20 auto spaces
Community service essential service providers parks and open areas	2 or 1 per 20 auto spaces, whichever is greater
Schools	High schools — 4 per classroom Middle schools — 2 per classroom Grade schools — 2 per 4th & 5th grade classroom
Colleges, medical centers, religious institutions, daycare uses	2 or 1 per 20 auto spaces whichever is greater

Attachment A

Table A-1: Summary of Recommended Potential Development Code Amendments and Corresponding Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Requirements

	Recommended Potential Development Code Amendments	TPR and/or RTFP Requirements	Commentary
DC-1	Identify and update all references to the TSP in the code.		This has been made into a note in the introductory text of this memorandum.
DC-2	Ensure that code requirements in Chapter 16.96 (On-site Circulation) and Chapter 16.106 (Transportation Facilities) related to access spacing/management and design of streets, bikeways, sidewalks, and accessways/paths are consistent with the standards established in the updated TSP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPR Section -0045(2)(a) Access Control • TPR Section -0045(3)(b) On-site Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation and Connections • TPR Section -0045(7) Minimizing Roadway Width • RTFP Section 3.08.110B Street System Design for Pedestrian and Bicycle Access 	<p>Check/coordinate with Draft TSP.</p> <p>APG will complete this set of potential amendments once we have reviewed the Draft TSP.</p>
DC-3	<p>Define the following terms and ensure consistency between the TSP, code, and engineering manual: access way and shared-use path.</p> <p><i>Note: The City engineering manual includes a reference to pedestrian and bicycle access ways that can be provided at a maximum spacing of 330 feet in</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPR Section -0045(3)(b) On-site Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation and Connections • RTFP Sections 3.08.110 B & E Street System Design 	<p>Proposed code amendments to:</p> <p>Chapter 16.10 Definitions, Section .020 Specifically</p> <p>Check/coordinate with Draft TSP.</p>

	Recommended Potential Development Code Amendments	TPR and/or RTFP Requirements	Commentary
	<i>lieu of a street in some cases.</i>		
DC-4	Provide additional guidance regarding the applicability and preparation of traffic impact analyses (TIAs), including rough proportionality provisions.	TPR Section -0045(2)(b) Standards to Protect Roadways	<p>Proposed code amendments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 16.90 Site Planning, Section .030.D Required Findings • Chapter 16.106 Transportation Facilities, Section .020.D Extent of Improvements • Chapter 16.106 Transportation Facilities, Section .040.K Traffic Controls • Chapter 16.106 Transportation Facilities, Section .090 Traffic Impact Analysis [new section] • Chapter 16.106 Transportation Facilities, Section .100 Rough Proportionality [new section]
DC-5	Given TPR requirements for coordinated review, consider whether inviting transportation facility and service providers to pre-application conferences would be helpful to the review process and thus would be language to include in the code	TPR Section -0045(2)(d) Coordinated Review of Land Use Decisions	The City already allows for this level of coordinated review, so code amendments are not necessary.

	Recommended Potential Development Code Amendments	TPR and/or RTFP Requirements	Commentary
	(Section 16.70.010).		
DC-6	Provide more direction about “preferential” carpool and vanpool parking spaces.	TPR Section -0045(4)(d) Employee Parking	Proposed code amendments to: Chapter 16.94 Off-Street Parking and Loading, Section .010.E Location
DC-7	Consider code changes if there are TDM program elements developed for the updated TSP that lend themselves to implementation in code.	TPR Section -0045(5)(b) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Programs	TDM program elements in the Draft TSP will be reviewed. However, it is not anticipated that these will result in proposed code amendments.
DC-8	Allow exemptions from maximum parking space standards for structured parking and on-street parking.	TPR Section -0045(5)(d) Parking Management	Proposed code amendments to: Chapter 16.94 Off-Street Parking and Loading, Section .010.K General Requirements [new subsection]
DC-9	Administrative/housekeeping amendments: Address typos and inconsistencies in the footnotes for the parking standards table.	TPR Section -0045(5)(d) Parking Management	Proposed code amendments to: Chapter 16.94 Off-Street Parking and Loading, Section .020 Off-Street Parking Standards
DC-10	Consider the feasibility of allowing a local street cross-section of 20-28 feet and under what conditions.	TPR Section -0045(7) Minimizing Roadway Width	This recommendation will be developed into proposed policy language.
DC-11	Modify the code provisions for plan and land use regulation	TPR Section -0060	Proposed code

	Recommended Potential Development Code Amendments	TPR and/or RTFP Requirements	Commentary
	amendments to make simpler reference to TPR Section -0060.	Plan and Land Use Regulations Amendments	amendments to: Chapter 16.80 Plan Amendments, Section .030.C Transportation Planning Rule Consistency
DC-12	Provide a variance process in Chapter 16.84 (Variances and Adjustments) and/or Chapter 16.94 (Off-Street Parking and Loading) that allows maximum parking standards to be exceeded.	RTFP Section 3.08.410 Parking Management	Section 16.94.010.A (Off-Street Parking Required) refers to procedures in Chapter 16.84 for varying from minimum or maximum parking standards.
DC-13	Require that major driveways that are proposed for mixed-use and residential developments align with existing and/or planned streets.	RTFP Section 3.08.410 Parking Management	Proposed code amendments to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 16.90 Site Planning, Section .030.D Required Findings • Chapter 16.106 Transportation Facilities, Section .030.B.2.d Connectivity Map Required [new subsection]
DC-14	Add on-street loading provisions in an appropriate location such as Old Town, including specific conditions for when on-street loading would be permitted.	RTFP Section 3.08.410 Parking Management	Proposed code amendments to: Chapter 16.94 Off-Street Parking and Loading, Section .030.C Off-Street Loading Standards [new subsection]
DC-15	Provide more requirements and guidance regarding short-term	RTFP Section 3.08.410	Proposed code

	Recommended Potential Development Code Amendments	TPR and/or RTFP Requirements	Commentary
	and long-term bicycle parking.	Parking Management	amendments to: Chapter 16.94 Off-Street Parking and Loading, Section 16.94.020.C Bicycle Parking Facilities
DC-16	Consider whether having a hierarchy of management to capacity strategies (RTFP Section 3.08.220A) would be effective as part of traffic impact analysis and legislative decision conditions of approval.	RTFP Sections 3.08.510 A & B Comprehensive Plan and TSP Amendments	This was determined to not be an effective or necessary set of potential code amendments.

DRAFT