

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

CITY STAFF COMMENTS			
Commentator	Referenced Section	Comment	Response
Public Works	2.2-2.4	Is this document going to trump the LDC entirely?	No, the document will not trump the LDC entirely. Where a conflict exists between the Overlay and the underlying land development regulations, the Overlay will prevail. The Overlay will not alter allowable land uses under the current zoning, however, it will, in some instances modify dimensional standards and provide additional clarifying language related to the existing zoning. The Overlay's provisions will be limited to the Urban Core, Westside and Eastside Redevelopment Areas, excluding the City's existing Special Review Districts (SRD's) and the Port of Pensacola.
Public Works	Table 5.4.1.(D)	Tree cannot reduce required width for 5' wide pedestrian path.	Correct, trees cannot reduce the required width for a 5' wide pedestrian path. All ADA regulations must be adhered to. Table 5.4.1.(D) does not supersede ADA, not does any other section of this Overlay.
Public Works	Section 5.5.1.e.i. (1)	First floor elevation shall be a minimum of 9 feet above sea level. 9' above sea level? Having a hard time understanding that elevation requirement.	Section deleted.
Public Works	Section 5.5.1.e.iii	"Mixed-use and non-residential building entries be at sidewalk grade." What if you're in a flood zone and your FFE has to be elevated?	Section 5.5.1.e.iii relates to minimum elevation, and will not impact flood zone requirements. Existing regulations pertaining to ADA and flood zone requirements must be adhered to.
Public Works	Table 5.5.1.D	"Encroachments are permitted according to Section 5.5.3. No encroachment into the City right of way is allowed without a license to use (LTU).	Added language re: LTU for all encroachments.
Public Works	Table 5.5.1.E	Arcade & Colonnade states "Encroachments are permitted according to Section 5.5.3. No encroachment into the City right of way is allowed without a license to use (LTU).	Removed arcades and colonnades as possible encroachments.
Public Works	Entirety of Section 5.6	No encroachment into the City right of way is allowed without a license to use (LTU). This entire section promotes/encourages the idea of encroachments.	Added language re: LTU for all encroachments.
Public Works	5.7 Intent	This is going to impede development.	Your Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan encourage on-street parking already.
Public Works	5.7.1.d	So is this saying if no on-street parking is allowed they have to build a garage? Then in 5.7.3.ii they force them back into the lot?	If on-street parking is not allowed then parking will be placed behind the front facade or in the rear of the lot, however, a garage is not required.
Public Works	5.7.1.e.i	So who determines if the rear lane is possible?	Rear lane feasibility will be subject to the discretion of the developer.
Public Works	5.7.2.a	How is this even possible to enforce? Also in the ROW requires LTU.	Language included to coordinate with Public Works. As for enforcement, it is same as meeting parking requirements. Submissions will have to show how and where bicycle parking is provided.
Public Works	5.7.3.a.ii	How do you do this if the lot is 30 ft wide and no on-street parking.	It requires that covered or garage parking be placed towards the back of the lot for theses narrowest of lots to ensure garages do not overwhelm the front yard. Uncovered parking is also permissible.
Public Works	5.7.3.a.iv	LDC requires 42 feet, 20 feet is way to close and will clutter up City right of way. Also poses a safety issue.	Modified language to 42 feet. This makes circular driveways for single-family lots not possible. Not a bad thing!
Public Works	5.7.3.a.vi	Shared driveways are not good. They're contradicting themselves in iv and vi.	No contradiction. Shared driveways are encouraged not required.
Public Works	5.7.3.b.i	How is this going to be enforced after the building is built and they park in front of the house?	For multi-family buildings, off-street parking cannot be provided in the front yard. If the front yard is not designed as a parking lot it should be simple This is an enforcement issue.
Public Works	5.8.4.c	Chain link is actually allowed in Old East Hill Preservation District but according to these standards would not be allowed in the CRA.	Chain link is prohibited in many of the SRD and should be also in the CRA areas for commercial and residential properties. For industrial, it is permitted.
Public Works	6	Landscaping is subject to visibility triangles like everything else.	It was always the intention to have visibility triangles maintained. We have added that language as a reminder.
Public Works	6.1.1.a	How do you do this with a 30' or 50' lot? Is the City going to take ownership of said tree due to requirements imposed?	Any lot 50 feet or less requires a tree planted in private yard, with restrictions, so property owner's responsibility.
Public Works	6.1.1.b	Enforcement...most sidewalk owners don't keep clear now let alone 2' from them.	Agreed, enforcement issue.
Public Works	6.1.1.3	Depending on location visibility triangle will not allow this.	Visibility triangles must be adhered to.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Public Works	6.3.2	Replace “city engineer” with “A certified arborist and the Engineering Division of the City’s Public Works and Facilities Department.”	Currently, tree plantings within the public right-of-way are subject to review and approval by the Engineering Division of the City’s Public Works and Facilities Department. A certified arborist is not currently required or available on staff. The Overlay standards would maintain the City’s existing procedure for trees in the public right-of-way. Tree selections shall be limited to species identified within the City’s recommended plant list contained within Section 12-6, Appendix B.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	6.3.5.a and 6.3.5.c:	Shall include root barrier to not shift sidewalks at maturity.	Added language.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	6.3.5.b	Enforcement? Owner? Which brings us back to the first question.	Yes, enforcement issue.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	6.3.5.d	What if you only have a 30’ lot?	This section addressed tree planting in public ROW, not private lots.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	6.3.6.a and 6.3.6.c:	Again not without “A certified arborist and the Engineering Division of the City’s Public Works and Facilities Department.”	Resolved per revised 6.3.2. Any tree planted in public ROW must be approved by the Engineering Division of the City’s Public Works and Facilities Department.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	6.3.6.c, 6.3.6.d, and 6.3.6.e	Shall include root barrier to not shift sidewalks at maturity.	Added language once at beginning of section 6.3.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	7.1.2	Refers to “driveway apropos”. Don’t think that is the correct word you are wanting to use...aprons?	Correction made.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	8	Define the following: buffer yard, and greenway.	Greenway already defined (see Parkway/Greenway/Verge in Section 8) Buffer yard is already defined in your zoning code, in Section 12-14.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	12-2-82 (1)(a) (C)	Driveway width reduction may be detrimental to large commercial development.	Proposed reduction minor. For maximum driveways it is reduced from 24 feet to 22 feet. The proposed reduction for minimum driveway is to permit a single travel lane minimum driveway width of 10 feet, verses 20 feet.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	12-6-01	Gulf Power and other aerial utility providers may want a chance to review this.	Coordination is required with Engineering Division of the City’s Public Works and Facilities Department.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	General/Admin Comments	Is it the intent to have a LDC for the City and a completely separate LDC that only applies to the CRA? This creates confusion for staff. I don’t fully understand this Context Classification concept, but the more rules we create, the harder it’s going to be for staff to enforce.	We are proposing an Overlay District for the CRA areas, much like the existing Special Review Districts (SRD) work today. This is not a completely separate LDC. Please review the Transportation Support Document written by Hall Planning & Engineering as part of this scope of work.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	5.7.2.c.ii	Does not meet clear recovery zone requirements.	While the AASHTO Green Book and the Roadside Design Guide provide excellent guidance for areas of general context, the Florida Greenbook Chapter 19 applies to Traditional Neighborhood Design context. The entire Community Redevelopment Area is characterized as a traditional neighborhood design, based on features such as the universal small block grid layout originally platted. Clear zone considerations are addressed and will be guided by the Florida Greenbook.																																																																																																																																																															
Public Works	5.7.2.c.ii	Again there are many considerations on determination of the distance of a clear zone but this is just the basic lengths. Most of the City lands under the very top one of 40MPH or lower and under 750 ADT but depending on what road it is the ADT does rise and the distance gets bigger.																																																																																																																																																																
		<table><tr><th rowspan="2">DESIGN SPEED</th><th rowspan="2">DESIGN ADT</th><th colspan="3">FORESLOPES</th><th colspan="3">BACKSLOPES</th></tr><tr><th>6:1 or Flatter</th><th>5:1 to 4:1</th><th>3:1</th><th>3:1</th><th>5:1 to 4:1</th><th>6:1 or Flatter</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">40 mph or less</td><td>Under 750c</td><td>7-10</td><td>7-10</td><td>b</td><td>7-10</td><td>7-10</td><td>7-10</td></tr><tr><td>750-1500</td><td>10-12</td><td>12-14</td><td>b</td><td>10-12</td><td>10-12</td><td>10-12</td></tr><tr><td>1500-6000</td><td>12-14</td><td>14-16</td><td>b</td><td>12-14</td><td>12-14</td><td>12-14</td></tr><tr><td>Over 6000</td><td>14-16</td><td>16-18</td><td>b</td><td>14-16</td><td>14-16</td><td>14-16</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">45-50 mph</td><td>Under 750c</td><td>10-12</td><td>12-14</td><td>b</td><td>8-10</td><td>8-10</td><td>10-12</td></tr><tr><td>750-1500</td><td>14-16</td><td>16-20</td><td>b</td><td>10-12</td><td>12-14</td><td>14-16</td></tr><tr><td>1500-6000</td><td>16-18</td><td>20-26</td><td>b</td><td>12-14</td><td>14-16</td><td>16-18</td></tr><tr><td>Over 6000</td><td>20-22</td><td>24-28</td><td>b</td><td>14-16</td><td>18-20</td><td>20-22</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">55 mph</td><td>Under 750c</td><td>12-14</td><td>14-18</td><td>b</td><td>8-10</td><td>10-12</td><td>10-12</td></tr><tr><td>750-1500</td><td>16-18</td><td>20-24</td><td>b</td><td>10-12</td><td>14-16</td><td>16-18</td></tr><tr><td>1500-6000</td><td>20-22</td><td>24-30</td><td>b</td><td>14-16</td><td>16-18</td><td>20-22</td></tr><tr><td>Over 6000</td><td>22-24</td><td>26-32a</td><td>b</td><td>16-18</td><td>20-22</td><td>22-24</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">60 mph</td><td>Under 750c</td><td>16-18</td><td>20-24</td><td>b</td><td>10-12</td><td>12-14</td><td>14-16</td></tr><tr><td>750-1500</td><td>20-24</td><td>26-32a</td><td>b</td><td>12-14</td><td>16-18</td><td>20-22</td></tr><tr><td>1500-6000</td><td>26-30</td><td>32-40a</td><td>b</td><td>14-18</td><td>18-22</td><td>24-26</td></tr><tr><td>Over 6000</td><td>30-32a</td><td>36-44a</td><td>b</td><td>20-22</td><td>24-26</td><td>26-28</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">65-70a mph</td><td>Under 750c</td><td>18-20</td><td>20-26</td><td>b</td><td>10-12</td><td>14-16</td><td>14-16</td></tr><tr><td>750-1500</td><td>24-26</td><td>28-36a</td><td>b</td><td>12-16</td><td>18-20</td><td>20-22</td></tr><tr><td>1500-6000</td><td>28-32a</td><td>34-42a</td><td>b</td><td>16-20</td><td>22-24</td><td>26-28</td></tr><tr><td>Over 6000</td><td>30-34a</td><td>38-46a</td><td>b</td><td>22-24</td><td>26-30</td><td>28-30</td></tr></table> <p>Source: AASHTO <u>Roadside Design Guide</u>, Chapter 3.</p>	DESIGN SPEED	DESIGN ADT	FORESLOPES			BACKSLOPES			6:1 or Flatter	5:1 to 4:1	3:1	3:1	5:1 to 4:1	6:1 or Flatter	40 mph or less	Under 750c	7-10	7-10	b	7-10	7-10	7-10	750-1500	10-12	12-14	b	10-12	10-12	10-12	1500-6000	12-14	14-16	b	12-14	12-14	12-14	Over 6000	14-16	16-18	b	14-16	14-16	14-16	45-50 mph	Under 750c	10-12	12-14	b	8-10	8-10	10-12	750-1500	14-16	16-20	b	10-12	12-14	14-16	1500-6000	16-18	20-26	b	12-14	14-16	16-18	Over 6000	20-22	24-28	b	14-16	18-20	20-22	55 mph	Under 750c	12-14	14-18	b	8-10	10-12	10-12	750-1500	16-18	20-24	b	10-12	14-16	16-18	1500-6000	20-22	24-30	b	14-16	16-18	20-22	Over 6000	22-24	26-32a	b	16-18	20-22	22-24	60 mph	Under 750c	16-18	20-24	b	10-12	12-14	14-16	750-1500	20-24	26-32a	b	12-14	16-18	20-22	1500-6000	26-30	32-40a	b	14-18	18-22	24-26	Over 6000	30-32a	36-44a	b	20-22	24-26	26-28	65-70a mph	Under 750c	18-20	20-26	b	10-12	14-16	14-16	750-1500	24-26	28-36a	b	12-16	18-20	20-22	1500-6000	28-32a	34-42a	b	16-20	22-24	26-28	Over 6000	30-34a	38-46a	b	22-24	26-30	28-30	
DESIGN SPEED	DESIGN ADT	FORESLOPES			BACKSLOPES																																																																																																																																																													
		6:1 or Flatter	5:1 to 4:1	3:1	3:1	5:1 to 4:1	6:1 or Flatter																																																																																																																																																											
40 mph or less	Under 750c	7-10	7-10	b	7-10	7-10	7-10																																																																																																																																																											
	750-1500	10-12	12-14	b	10-12	10-12	10-12																																																																																																																																																											
	1500-6000	12-14	14-16	b	12-14	12-14	12-14																																																																																																																																																											
	Over 6000	14-16	16-18	b	14-16	14-16	14-16																																																																																																																																																											
45-50 mph	Under 750c	10-12	12-14	b	8-10	8-10	10-12																																																																																																																																																											
	750-1500	14-16	16-20	b	10-12	12-14	14-16																																																																																																																																																											
	1500-6000	16-18	20-26	b	12-14	14-16	16-18																																																																																																																																																											
	Over 6000	20-22	24-28	b	14-16	18-20	20-22																																																																																																																																																											
55 mph	Under 750c	12-14	14-18	b	8-10	10-12	10-12																																																																																																																																																											
	750-1500	16-18	20-24	b	10-12	14-16	16-18																																																																																																																																																											
	1500-6000	20-22	24-30	b	14-16	16-18	20-22																																																																																																																																																											
	Over 6000	22-24	26-32a	b	16-18	20-22	22-24																																																																																																																																																											
60 mph	Under 750c	16-18	20-24	b	10-12	12-14	14-16																																																																																																																																																											
	750-1500	20-24	26-32a	b	12-14	16-18	20-22																																																																																																																																																											
	1500-6000	26-30	32-40a	b	14-18	18-22	24-26																																																																																																																																																											
	Over 6000	30-32a	36-44a	b	20-22	24-26	26-28																																																																																																																																																											
65-70a mph	Under 750c	18-20	20-26	b	10-12	14-16	14-16																																																																																																																																																											
	750-1500	24-26	28-36a	b	12-16	18-20	20-22																																																																																																																																																											
	1500-6000	28-32a	34-42a	b	16-20	22-24	26-28																																																																																																																																																											
	Over 6000	30-34a	38-46a	b	22-24	26-30	28-30																																																																																																																																																											

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Public Works	5.7.2.c.ii	When the Green Book and the Roadside Design Guide were last updated, the AASHTO committees coordinated to dispel the misunderstanding that 2 feet (actually, 18 inches) behind a curb constituted a clear zone. Since curbs are now generally recognized as having no significant containment or redirection capability, clear zone should be based on traffic volumes and speeds, both without a curb. The AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (Green Book) enumerates a clear zone value for two functional classes of highway. For local roads and streets, a minimum clear zone of 7 to 10 feet is considered desirable on sections without curb. In the discussion on collectors without curbs, a 10-foot minimum clear zone is recommended. The general discussion on Cross-section Elements also indicates a clear zone of 10 ft. for low-speed rural collectors and rural local roads should be provided. Resulting in the previous email of the clear zone to be minimum of 7 to 10 ft with or without a curb. Again this is just for a flat roadway... when you get into drop offs or where the side of the road is higher than the roadway these can increase in distance. Therefor making a standard outside the AASHTO/FHWA standards is not recommended and is difficult to perform correctly. Sidewalk are not considered to be impediments in the recovery zones like a bike rack, a tree, or utility pole.	
Public Works	5.8.3.b	May conflict with building code, though was 6' not 8'.	Zoning currently permits up to 6.5 feet in rear, but residents have asked for taller for privacy issues. 8 feet does not conflict with Building Code.
Public Works	6.0 Intent	Trees in tight spaces block sight triangles, lift up sidewalks, grow into utilities (below grade and aerial). Trees aligned closely to the street edge are a safety hazard. They need to be outside the clear recovery zone and meet site visibility triangle requirements.	The benefits of trees in public ROWs are well documented. 6.3 requires any tree planted in the ROW to be approved by the Engineering Division of the City of Pensacola Public Works and Facilities Department and comply with the existing requirements. We have also added language to ensure they are also planted outside of clear recovery zone and meet site visibility triangles. 6.3.5 c) replaced with section reference as already in your Code under Sec 11-4-88.
Public Works	6.3	Who is responsible since mandating the placement of tree?	The adjoining property owner is responsible under the current City Code of Ordinances. However, tree placement must be coordinated with the Engineering Division of the City's Public Works and Facilities Department.
Public Works	5.7 Intent	Fire/EMS is probably not going to support this. Not to mention, sight visibility triangle when trying to get out into traffic.	The Overlay will not alter "no parking" areas, and parking will be subject to sight visibility triangle requirements, as it currently is. However, where on-street parking is feasible it should be encouraged.
Public Works	5.7.2.b.i (1-4)	All things listed are located in the ROW and would require LTU to be placed.	Correct, language for LTU and coordination with Public Works included. It does require an LTU.
Public Works		For bike racks to be placed in City right of way, it would need to be approved by the appropriate City staff with regards to aesthetics, any sight distance issue it may create, and ensure it doesn't encroach upon required widths for pedestrians to get around the bike rack. From there, the owner of the bike rack would have to obtain a license to use. Once it cleared the above described hurdles, there's a chance we could do the license to use administratively through Engineering.	
Public Works	7.1.1:	Remove "Florida Greenbook, Chapter 19 Traditional Neighborhood Design." CRA does not trump LDC, FDOT, etc.	Requiring that local streets be designed to Chapter 19 standards does not trump FDOT standards. If there is a conflict with the LDC, Chapter 19 shall prevail for local streets within the Overlay boundaries
Planning Dept. (PD)	Section 4	Are these intended to be actual zoning changes? Need to add a section pertaining to appeals of decisions. Something similar to the text below: "Sec. ---. - Appeal. Any person directly and adversely affected by a decision of the Building Official, the City Engineer, the Parks and Recreation Department, or the Mayor or his or her designee in the interpretation or enforcement of the provisions of this section may appeal such decision to the zoning board of adjustment. Such appeal shall be submitted in writing to the within thirty (30) days of the rendering of the subject order, requirement, decision or determination."	The overlay will not alter allowable land uses under the currently zoning, however, it will, in some instances modify dimensional standards and provide additional clarifying language related to the existing zoning Instead of copying LDC language into the Overlay District, we will reference Section 12-12-2 for appeals and variances.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Planning Dept.	Section 4	It was mentioned (at least once by a member of the public) that this would help with “preservation” in these districts, but the context in which that was stated referred to demolition of existing structures. Sections 5 & 6 in the Table of Contents actually describe the contents of Appendix A, so my suggestion would be to consider either removing Section 4 from the Table of Contents or revising it to say “Amendments to Land Development Regulations” or something similar that is less specific to zoning.	This section and the Appendix A reference has been removed in its entirety. The contents of Appendix A have been incorporated into the Overlay, as appropriate.
Planning Dept.	12-2-8 Table 12-2.7	The Dense Business Area has a maximum setback of 10' for all commercially zoned properties (C-1, C-2A, C-2 and C-3). Is the intent to supersede that requirement with this table in the CRA? If so, is C-1 excluded from having a build-to line/max setback intentionally?	According to the tables, commercial is restricted to a maximum 5 foot setback. Our proposed regulations will supersede.
Planning Dept.	General/Admin Comments	The overlay as written would not protect against demolition of existing structures, it preserves neighborhood character by determining what can be rebuilt. Given recent concerns regarding the demolition of older structures in neighborhoods that don't have a formal Board review of that process, I want to make sure we are clear to the neighborhood stakeholders that there is nothing in the proposed overlay that would prevent someone from coming in to get a permit to demolish a structure, and does not add a review process for approval of a demo permit.	Agreed with comment
Planning Dept.	12-2-81 (B)(1)	Is the intent to involve the ARB in the review process? It is referenced in the main section of the Code due to its applicability in some areas citywide, so might need to clarify if it is only referenced as it would pertain to areas in the CRA already under the purview of the ARB.	No, it is not the intent to involve ARB in the review process. All plans will be reviewed through the City's existing review processes. No special review will be required.
Planning Dept.	12-2-4 Table 12-2.2	Is the intent to actually create a zoning category of "CRA R-1AA" or is this prefix only used for clarification purposes in the document? If it will actually be an amendment to the zoning category title (creating a new category of CRA R-1AA) then the zoning map would need to be amended for consistency.	No, it is not the intent to create a separate CRA zoning categories. All dimensional modifications will be incorporated into the Overlay. Allowable land uses under the current zoning will not be impacted.
Planning Dept.	12-6-3 (A)	Is this specific to the CRA areas only? If so, would recommend editing the zoning districts to remove ATZ, R-C and any other districts that are not located in the CRA.	Yes, the Overlay is specific to the Urban Core, Westside and Eastside Redevelopment Areas, excluding the City's existing Special Review Districts (SRD's) and the Port of Pensacola. This section have been incorporated into the Landscaping Standards section of the Overlay.
Planning Dept.	12-2-81 (B)(1)	Department/Division titles are outdated (were being updated via recodification which was not approved by Council). Current titles are: Planning Services Division; Engineering is a Division under Public Works & Facilities (would check with Derrik for correct wording); Inspections Services Division; Parks and Recreation Department (no longer Leisure Services); Fire Department is unchanged; see my note regarding ARB; ECUA is now Emerald Coast Utilities Authority vs Escambia County Utilities Authority. Would also add CRA staff to the list.	Once 12-2-81 is amended, the changes becomes effective. It should not be necessary for CRA to be a formal party to the review process since it is the intent for the overlay to be concise and regulatory in nature, rather than subjective. Additionally, it is rare for projects located outside of the SRD's to be subject to this review process - most go straight through permitting.
Planning Dept.	5.5	Would add a provision for CRA staff to be involved in review and approval of building design/layout.	Review processes are intended to remain as they currently exist. Overlay requirements will not be subjective in nature and therefore will not require additional review or input. All requirements will be incorporated into an administrative checklist and subject to a "yes" or "no" response. In addition, CRA staff are not zoning experts.
Planning Dept.	12-2-82 (D)	This section reads “Design guidelines” but most of the language is changed from “should” to “shall” in the subsequent text. It should read “Design Standards” and be double-checked for any remaining “should” to be changed to “shall”.	This section has been removed.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	Table 5.4.1.(B)	Trees: Who maintains? What type? Are there limits?	Trees in private yards shall be maintained by property owner or HOA. See section 6.1 for restrictions on landscaping in private yards.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	Table 5.4.1.(D)	Tree grates: Who maintains?	This section related to the installation of tree grates, pits and pots on private property. Reference to installation of tree grates and pits have been removed. Installed pots on the private lot are to be maintained by the property owner. However, language has been added to Section 6.3 for installation of tree grate and pits within the public right-of-way to provide that grates and pits installed by private owners be maintained by the owner. Also, tree grate and pit installations must be consistent with surrounding grate/pit style and subject to review and approval by the Public Works and Facilities Department.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	5.7.2.b	who selects type, approves location, maintains and installs?	Language clarified.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.1.1.a	Trees: Who maintains?	Any landscaping / planting in private lots maintained by property owner.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.1.1.e	Hedges: Who maintains?	Any landscaping / planting in private lots maintained by property owner.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.3.2	Why not Parks and Recreation Dept. Director for approval?	Will follow current City procedure.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.3.5.f	No palms – redundant.	Agreed, reference removed.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.3.6.a-e	Trees maintained by who?	Trees planted in ROWs are maintained by the adjoining property owner.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	12-6-02	“Section XX (frontage yards)” – Section XX?	Response provided above.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	12-6-02	Where is section D?	No changes proposed to Section D. Only included those sections with proposed edits.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	Table 5.4.1.(A)	What type? Are there limits?	This standard requires that 50% of the front yard be pervious material. Paving, including pervious pavement, is limited to walkways and driveways. All pervious materials which do not constitute paving are permissible.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	Table 5.4.1.(C)	Landscape: Who regulates?	Landscaping to comply with existing landscape regulations. Any landscaping in private lots maintained by property owner.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.3.4	Tree fund – Who manages?	The CRA Tree Fund is proposed to be managed by the CRA.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.3.5.b	Trees maintained by who?	Adjoining property owner.
Parks & Recreation Dept.	6.3.5.e	Trees – who determines?	Subject to coordination with PW.
Building Inspections	5.1.2.b	Please address how this is determined if there is no sidewalk adjacent to the site.	Language revised to read average grade, as defined in building code.
Building Inspections	5.1.2e.ii	Clarify statement as to how ground floor height is measured.	Language revised to read average grade, as defined in building code.
Building Inspections	5.1.2.f.iv	Clarify statement as to how ground floor height is measured.	Language revised to read average grade, as defined in building code.
Building Inspections	5.1.2.g	This statement contradicts the definition of story height in the Florida Building Code.	Clarified language in code.
Building Inspections	5.1.4.a	Provide the definition and use of towers and loggias.	Deleted this section since your underlying regulations are more permissive in this case.
Building Inspections	5.1.5.a	Explain how this roof pitch was determined. Minimum 6:12	Discussed in meeting on 3/19. It is in keeping with the character of your neighborhoods and your SRDs recognize this already. It is our recommendation to extend this regulation across the CRA areas.
Building Inspections	Table 5.3.1	States front setback is 20’ minimum, with a façade type of porch. When viewing Table 5.5.1Facade Types a covered porch is a requirement and must be a minimum of 6’ deep and no more than 10 feet. This seems to be a large encroachment into a required setback.	Discussed in meeting on 3/19. This will permit existing homes to add a porch.
Building Inspections	Table 5.3.1	(Setbacks – Accessory Structures) the minimum side yard setback is 1 foot. Please take into account eave overhangs, water runoff and fire rating requirement of walls.	Discussed in meeting on 3/19. This will permit existing homes to add a porch.
Building Inspections	Table 5.3.2	(Setbacks – Accessory Structures) the minimum side yard setback is 1 foot. Please take into account eave overhangs, water runoff and fire rating requirement of walls.	Discussed in meeting on 3/19. Retaining water on own lot is a requirement. We encourage smaller setbacks for accessory structures given narrow width of many lots. Building code standards will have to be adhered to for fire-rating.
Building Inspections	Table 5.3.5	Define Hybrid Commercial.	Defined.
Building Inspections	5.4.1	Identifies urban design guidelines, but all sections state “shall” which indicates these are in fact standards and not guidelines.	Section removed.
Building Inspections	Section 5.5.1.e.i. (1)	States first floor elevation shall be a minimum of 9 feet above sea level. I don’t understand this requirement as Main Street is basically where the 9 foot seal level occurs and anything below that must meet the floodplain requirements.	Deleted this section as already addressed in the underlying regulations and we do not want to repeat anything in the Overlay that is already covered.
Building Inspections	Section 5.5.1.e.ii and iii	Once again mention sidewalk grade. This is assuming sidewalk exists	Changed to average grade as defined within the Building Code Standards
Building Inspections	Table 5.5.1	Do not address the Florida Accessibility Code as far as accessible entrances. The Stoop type entry at 36” minimum would require a 41 foot long ramp for accessibility and the Common Entry would require a minimum 18 foot long accessible ramp.	Revised minimum height to 34 inches, instead of 36 inches.
Building Inspections	Section 5.5.3.b	Prohibits the use of extruded aluminum storefronts. Since Florida Product Approval is required for external building components, please identify what components can be used for storefronts that will meet the code requirements.	Revised language to read use of extruded aluminum storefronts permitted with decorative trim.
Building Inspections	Section 5.6.3 and Table 5.6.2:	The illustration show the actual building encroaching the right of way by 8 feet. Please advise as to how this would be possible.	Arcades and colonnades removed from Overlay.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Building Inspections	5.8	This section is totally contrary to the fence requirements in the Land Development Code for every other area in the City, including historic and preservation districts in regard to heights.	Our recommendation is a slightly lower height in the front (42", instead of 48" max) but a taller height in the rear (up to 8 feet).
Building Inspections	5.8.4.d	Requiring adjacent wood fences to have a different picket design is not even a requirement in the historic districts.	Removed this section.
Building Inspections	5.8.4.e:	This section stating that you can only have wrought iron or brick fences only in conjunction with masonry buildings. Where did this come from? And please explain why they would not be allowed.	Discussed in meeting on 3/19. This regulation included in your SRDs. Removed this section.
Building Inspections	General/Admin Comments	Where is the appeals process for reconsideration of a decision by whichever office conducts the review?	Appeals process will remain as it currently is. All appeals will be processed in accordance with Section 12-12-2.
Building Inspections	General/Admin Comments	Has there been any cost studies conducted to determine how much these standards will add to the cost of a home, multifamily or commercial building?	Not in scope and difficult to quantify accurately. Generally, we would urge you to look at cost reductions too, if you are to look at cost increases, in addition to appreciating property values.
Building Inspections	General/Admin Comments	At yesterday's meeting it was stated that there were still changes being made so this list of comments may not be complete.	Changes are being tracked for ease of review.
Building Inspections	Section 5.5.3.b/5.9.2	Florida Energy Code encourages the use of reflective glass to cut energy costs.	Clarified language to apply only to ground floor commercial uses.
Building Inspections	General/Admin Comments	Who or what board is going to do the actual review of plans to verify compliance with the Overlay Standards? No one has approached my office with any requests to do reviews, or asked for my recommendations	Review processes are intended to remain as they currently exist. All requirements will be incorporated into an administrative checklist and subject to a "yes" or "no" response. No additional review board will be necessary.
Building Inspections	General/Admin Comments	Is there to be a review fee associated with verification of compliance?	No new fee structure is proposed.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS			
Commentator	Referenced Section	Comment	Response
Sandy Walker	5.8.4.b	In the area regarding fences, why does it not permit vinyl? Typically it holds up better than wood, especially if the wood is not treated or stained.	We can, however your most beloved neighborhoods do not permit vinyl, it is an inferior material that looks and feels cheap, in comparison to more authentic materials.
Christopher Kariher, STOA Architects	None Referenced	I enjoyed yesterday's meeting yesterday and thank you for inviting architects. We really appreciate your efforts in making Pensacola a better community. Here is my comment: INTENT: To encourage parking toward the rear of lots in single family development; allowable size of accessory structures should be increased beyond the current zoning code. ACTION: Allow for larger accessory structures located in the rear of single family residential to accommodate parking in the back of lot with a detached garage. This would encourage standalone car garages and give some allowance for the lost buildable area square footage by using part of the lot buildable area for the driveway to get back to the detached garage.	Mr. Kariher, thank you for your comments. We will consider.
Wayne O'Hara	None Referenced	Thank you for the update on the CRA Overlay process. I would like to express my concern over the lack of notification to concerned and affected citizens, like me, about these proposed guidelines and standards. I own property in the CRA District and I was not notified by the City about this process being in place. The only way I knew about yesterdays "Lunch and Learn" was because of a discussion I had with a developer near my office. Fortunately, he let me know about this meeting and I was able to attend. This is a very lengthy and complicated proposal that will require hours of review to fully understand the potential impact this will have on future development and construction. We understand the City has good intentions by implementing this process/proposal, but we also believe the people of Pensacola deserve a reasonable amount of time to review and respond to this new Overlay District Proposal. The email you sent today, which notified us of two meetings this Monday, is greatly appreciated, but hardly gives ample time for us to plan to attend and formulate an educated response to this proposal. We would ask that you either postpone this meeting or provide additional opportunities for our input prior to this becoming the Law of the Land. I have meetings already scheduled during both of the meetings on Monday so will be unable to attend. I would like to ask, if possible, you read this message during the Q & A session at one or both of those meetings. Thanks again for all your help.	Mr. O'Hara, thank you for your comments. It has been the intent of the CRA to maximize public input and participation throughout the design standards overlay process. Please be advised that a postcard was sent to all property owners located within the affected area prior to the charrette that was held the week of February 12, 2018. The CRA has verified that your address was included on the charrette notification postcard mailing list. Additionally, the comment period was extended and additional public input sessions added to the schedule to provide additional opportunity for public comment and engagement.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Jarah Jacquay	None Referenced	I am writing to express my strong support for the CRA's Draft Urban Design Standard Overlays. I commend you, Ms. Helen Gibson, our City Council, the Planning Board, and Mayor Ashton Hayward for your vision and strong leadership in support of this project. I believe that the proposed standards will achieve their desired end-- "Strengthening Connectivity, Strengthening Neighborhoods, and Ensuring Quality in Design and Development"-- and will, by preserving our historic character and charm and by promoting high-quality development that is compatible with our vernacular form, have a transformative effect on our city. If implemented, I believe that the CRA's Urban Design Standard will make Pensacola a better place to "Live, Work, and Play" and will greatly enhance walkability and streetscape vibrancy, increase property values and tax revenue, promote place-based tourism, and facilitate talent recruiting/retention. Thank you again for your service to our community and your efforts to make Pensacola a more vibrant and livable city! I think these Urban Design Standards are a strong step in the right direction and am excited to see how they contribute to the revitalization of our CRA districts.	Thank you for your comments.
Griffin Vickery	5.1.2.g	Please accept the following comments on the proposed urban design standards. I am not familiar with the current city regulations more generally, and could not make a complete review of the proposed overlay standards in the time available, but the following are in response to what I was able to review: Section 5: Urban Standards & Guidelines 5.1 Building Height 5.1.2.g implies that building heights can exceed the maximums, but the intent appears to be that a building story that exceeds the maximum story heights in "e" or "f", as applicable, will be considered two stories.	No buildings are not encouraged to exceed the maximum - quite the contrary. It just means that if a building does exceed the height it is considered an additional story higher which may make it non-compliant.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	Detached Single-Family & Duplexes (R-1AA, R-1A) The identification of a "Front, Side" as item "b" of the principal building setbacks (and "f" for accessory buildings) would be less confusing if identified as "Front, secondary," consistent with both the illustration and "Frontage & Lot Occupation" section of the table. The front setback (a) would accordingly then be "Front, primary."	This was changed to side, so less need for primary.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	The "Frontage & Lot Occupation" section appears to only be frontage occupation, especially since a lot occupation section follows.	Correct, this has been changed.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	The referenced Section 5.6.1 regarding encroachments in note (2) does not appear to be the intended reference regarding principal building height.	Yes, these were updated in subsequent drafts.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	There is reference to note (3) in the parking section of the table, but no such note appears.	Yes, these were updated in subsequent drafts.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	The illustration would benefit from an accessory building buildable area. If not provided, the lettering of the individual setbacks (e-h) should be discarded.	Correct, this has been changed.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	The illustrations would benefit from more realistic and proportional representations of front and rear setbacks (i.e., closer to 4 and 6 times the side setback, respectively).	Correct, this has been changed, with the fixes that were tied to the prior comment.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	The illustration would benefit from enlargement to fully utilize the space.	Agreed, the illustrations have been enlarged.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1	Additionally, it is not necessary to show four different renderings of single-family dwellings – two would be adequate.	Thank you for your comments. We will consider reducing the number of renderings.


CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.2	Table 5.3.2: Attached Single-Family (Townhouses) (R-1A, R-1B). The principal building setbacks section of the table indicates a 0 or 5-foot minimum interior side setback. Since these are attached units, the 5-foot is assumed to apply only to an end unit on an interior lot. If so, it would be clearer to separate it in the table section or show a 10-foot separation between two midblock units in the illustration.	Thank you for your comments. We will clarify.
Griffin Vickery	Table 5.3.1/5.3.2	Some of the comments made on these two tables also apply to the other tables of the section. Tables are helpful to summarize information, but if too brief in content they can cause confusion.	We agree. Thank you for your comments.
Griffin Vickery	6.1.1.a	Section 6: Additional Landscape Standards 6.1 Landscape on Private Property In 6.1.1.a, DBH is used to identify the diameter of “trees planted to meet this requirement,” but Florida Grades and Standards indicate DBH is not an appropriate measure for nursery trees. It is presumed that those grades and standards are specified in the other landscaping standards to achieve quality tree plantings the City wants. If so, caliper is the standard diameter measure of such trees. If not, I would recommend their adoption as a common reference for all parties in development.	Agreed, we will change from DBH to caliper for standard diameter measurements.
Griffin Vickery	Section 8	Section 8: Definitions. Additional definitions. In the definition of Building height, single-family residential , the measure is proposed to be “to the bottom of the eave.” Since houses often have more than one eave height, the definition should specify which eave height – lowest, highest, average, or other.	Agreed. The definition of "Building height, single-family residential" will be clarified to mean "the vertical distance of a building measured from the average elevation of the finished grade to the bottom of the lowest eave.
Griffin Vickery	Section 8	In the definition of Facade, building , the phrase “set along a frontage line” may be less confusingly defined as “facing a frontage line,” which is the explanation included in the definition of Frontage line . That, or some other phrasing, would more clearly indicate the possibility of some area between the building facade and the frontage line as is revealed in the definition of Frontage yard type . As building facade is proposed to be defined, one must read several other definitions to conclude that the facade is not necessarily directly along or coterminous with the frontage line.	Agreed. The definition of "Façade, building" will be clarified to mean "an exterior wall of a building that faces a frontage line."
Fred Gunther	Not referenced	Can you define what Special Review Districts are exempted from the DPZ design requirements? I assume Gateway Redevelopment District, Governmental Center District, Palafox Historic Business District, South Palafox Business District, Dense Business District, Old East Hill Preservation District, Waterfront Redevelopmetn District, North Hill Preservation District and the Historic District, correct?	The Special Review Districts (SRD's) which are exempt from the CRA Urban Design Standards Overlay include the Gateway Redevelopment District, South Palafox Business District, Waterfront Redevelopment District, Governmental Center District, Old East Hill Preservation District, Palafox Historic Business District, Historic District, and the North Hill Preservation District. The Port of Pensacola is also exempt.
Fred Gunther	Not referenced	If so, will this be defined in writing within the standards?	Yes, the overlay district boundaries will be defined in writing within the standards, and is available on the project website (www.cityofpensacola.com/CRAOverlay).
Fred Gunther	None Referenced	Can you tell me where to find the maps for each existing Special Review District within the Urban Core CRA?	The Special Review District (SRD) boundaries are available for review through the CityView application located on the City of Pensacola website (www.cityofpensacola.com), however, please verify all SRD boundaries with the City of Pensacola Planning Department.
Fred Gunther	Table 5.5.1: Façade Types	Can you also tell me how grade is defined on page 21? There is nothing listed under definitions in the draft and I see a couple of façade types have an entry grade with a maximum height above grade. I am asking because my site is built up and sits approximately 2' higher than the sidewalk (slopes from sidewalk to 2' higher approximately 10' in from the sidewalk).	Grade shall be determined by the average grade along the front property line, as defined by Building Code Standards. This clarification will be included.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Fred Gunther	None Referenced	I appreciate the invitation to comment on the Community Redevelopment Agency's plan to implement design requirements and change the Land Development Code related to all properties within CRA overlays which are not within a Special Review District. I have become involved in the process because my brother and I are in the middle of creating a mixed use development, called Galveztown, at the NE corner of Palafox and Belmont Street on the former YMCA site. Over the last year we have hired engineers to create a site plan and held predevelopment meetings with City staff to confirm that all aspects of our project are compliant with the City of Pensacola's Land Development Code. After this, we contracted to have the building demolished and have engaged Gulf Power to have the power lines surrounding the site moved underground. Several of the lots are under contract with Buyers who are planning to build their personal residences on the site. In addition, we have hired architects to design two single family homes on the site which we will begin building this year. Essentially, we have invested an incredible amount of time and money creating a Class A development in our downtown core. As a result, we want to make sure this investment is protected and have been attending the recent charrettes.	Mr. Gunther, thank you for your comments. It is the intent of the CRA to preserve the traditional urban neighborhood environment by establishing urban design standards which adhere to a form-based methodology and result in a predictable development. We believe that adoption of these standards will, in fact, prove to protect the investments of developers and the investments of their buyers who chose to live here. Research proves that communities which adopt urban design standards expodentially outperfrom those who do not. The benefits of implementation include enhanced resident and visitor attraction, community health and economic viability, amongst many others.
Fred Gunther	None Referenced	During this process, we were pleased to find out that our property was not included in the Urban Core CRA overlay area. I hope you can understand the frustration we felt when the map changed today (After all of the charrettes and input sessions are over and on the very last day comments are due to the CRA), suddenly including us in the overlay. As a result, new aesthetic, landscaping and setback requirements affecting us are being fast-tracked for implementation. These requirements have nothing to do with the building code and they are both arbitrary and subjective. In addition, no exception has been made for those who have already proceeded with developing a property based upon the existing land development code. Allow me to give you several examples:	The boundary maps were revised to correct boundaries which were incorrectly referenced due to a geographical conversion error. Since the project's inception, the CRA has confirmed that the overlay boundaries would be limited to the City's three community redevelopment areas which include the Urban Core, Westside and Eastside, excluding the City's existing Special Review Districts (SRD). The Port of Pensacola was added to the excluded area during the map revision, as it was established that the Port's activities were inappropriate for inclusion within the Overlay. No additional changes were made. We sincerely apologize for any inconvenience this has caused, and extended the public comment period accordingly. The extended schedule included two additional public input sessions in which the correct map was distributed.
Fred Gunther	Table 5.3.2, Form Standards	1.) There are currently no setbacks required on our site. As a result of input from our Architect, as well as our Civil Engineer, we created a 3' side setback on each lot so there will be a distance of approximately 6' between each of the homes. This allows the homes to have windows on the side but still maintain the high density you would expect along the downtown Palafox Street corridor. These parcels have been surveyed and are ready to be transferred. The new requirements state the side setback needs to be either 0', or a minimum of 5'.	None.
Fred Gunther	6.1.1.a	2.) We have designed the Palafox residences to be pushed to the street, as you would expect in an urban environment. Our Architect has designed a home which uses a 2.5' front setback. The new requirements state you must plant a tree in your front yard and the tree must be at least 3' from the right-of-way. DPZ has agreed on two separate occasions that this requirement is not appropriate for a residence in the downtown core and yet the requirement is still contained in the draft.	The reference to distance from right-of-way for trees on private property has been removed. Property located within the Dense Business Area will adhere to the front setback and lot coverage defined in Section 12-2-8, Table 12-2.7, as it relates to the Dense Business Area.
Fred Gunther	Table 5.5.1: Façade Types	3.) Because our site is built up several feet already, we would likely violate the maximum entry grade height of 48' even if we only slightly elevate the slab. If addition, the slab at the front entry will need to be built up by several feet because there is a significant slope to the lot.	Elevations will be measured based on the average grade, measured from the front property line. This will address sloping issues. This language has been clarified within the text.
Fred Gunther	Section 2, Applicability	As you can see, all of our plans meet the current land development code, but the proposed overlay will result in additional expense and problems if these changes are implemented. We have already created a set of design guidelines for our development, with the intent of holding residents to high standards, as well as maintaining some consistency in the development of these parcels. If we obtain building permits for several homes now with a 2.5' front setback on Palafox before the design standards are implemented, we could end up with some homes 2.5' from the sidewalk, with others, permitted later, approximately 6' away to allow room for a tree in the front yard. A person should have the right to know what they are able to build on a property without worrying about the government arbitrarily changing the entitlements associated with the property in the middle of the development process. As a result, I respectfully request the following amendment to your draft: "Section 2.9 - These standards shall not apply to any property where the property owner has had a pre-development meeting with City Staff, prior to implementation of the CRA Overlay District, which met the requirements of the City of Pensacola land development code at that time."	In accordance with the City's standard practices, the new standards will not apply to any proposed development which has received a development order or a building permit as of the effective date. Pre-development meetings serve as informal informational sessions rather than an approval procedure, and therefore cannot be considered due to their nature. To accomodate transitions, a forty-five (45) day grace period will be provided . This is a forty (40) day extension beyond the City's standard practice. Upon the conclusion of the grace period, the standards will become effective and implementation will begin.
Nina Goodrich	None Referenced	I would like to share a concern of citizens on the edge of downtown. Gregory Street, Chase Street, and L Streets flood now when a small rain comes through. With all the new buildings this flooding problem could become much worse. I would hate to see Pensacola become the next New Orleans, or Houston---people dying during hurricanes due to preventable flooding. The problem began when sidewalks were created---Throughout the Maxent Track, now West Garden District. This is a stable area of the city. People look out for one another. Thank you for all you do.	Ms. Goodrich, thank you for providing these comments. Flooding and stormwater issues are a concern for many downtown areas. The proposed requirement to elevate homes has the potential to reduce flooding of new construction homes, however, the overlay in and of itself cannot directly address stormwater and flooding overall. Instead, these standards are intended to ensure that development is contextual with the City's goals and vision for its redevelopment areas by preserving the traditional urban neighborhood characteristics of these areas.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Fred Gunther	None Referenced	What Board will review and approve variance requests to the proposed changes?	The Zoning Board of Adjustments (ZBA) will review and approve variance requests in accordance with Section 12-12-2 of the Land Development Code.
Fred Gunther	None Referenced	What fee will the City charge in order to apply for said variance?	No fee changes are proposed. Fees will be assessed in accordance with the City's adopted fee schedule.
Fred Gunther	None Referenced	Will the fee be charged regardless of whether or not the applicant demonstrates a hardship and is granted the variance?	Fees will be assessed and reimbursed in accordance with the City's current policies.
Scott Sallis	3.1	Recommend adding "development orders, plat approvals, or other projects discussed with City staff prior to ????? date"	To accommodate transitions, a forty-five (45) day grace period will be provided. This is a forty (40) day extension beyond the City's standard practice. Upon the conclusion of the grace period, the standards will become effective and implementation will begin. Project discussions with City staff do not serve as an approval process and therefore cannot be included due to their nature.
Scott Sallis	5.1.5	recommend "should" have minimum. (It's too restrictive to demand roof pitch requirements)	The intent for adopting urban design standards is to preserve traditional neighborhood character. Roof pitch is a key component of the character which exists within the community redevelopment area neighborhoods. It must be preserved in order to ensure that new development dovetails into and complements the existing neighborhood environment.
Scott Sallis	5.5.3.b	recommend removing this text. (The LDC must consider extruded aluminum for commercial storefronts as a viable option)	This language has been revised to allow extruded aluminum storefronts with decorative trim.
Scott Sallis	5.5.3.d.	recommend changing to "shall consist of.." (demanding materials here will easily be seen as restrictive)	The language contained within this section will ensure quality development which maintains its integrity over time and complements the existing neighborhoods.
Scott Sallis	5.9	WINDOWS & GLAZING (recommend striking this entire section) It is full of too many unnecessary restrictions)	The window proportions, design and glazing proposed are key elements which preserve neighborhood character and integrity, and provide welcoming, and walkable public spaces by preventing blank walls. These proposed standards are essential and necessary factors in meeting the goals and objectives of the overlay.
Scott Sallis	Table 12-2.7	C-2A, (if zero is allowed, it doesn't make sense to demand 5' as next option. We have a development within the CRA that needs 6' between buildings and thus we have 3' side setbacks) See example below. As written this development would not comply....	Properties within the Dense Business Area will be exempt from the 5' setback requirement.
			

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Steve Dana	6.1	Thank you for this effort to improve our standards in the CRA district. As a landscape architect I understand what a great impact well designed landscape and exterior space has on a community. Our current landscape standards require impervious surface requirements, and tree island in off-street parking, however, the codes do not require landscape plantings or even trees in these areas. Section 12-6-3 Landscape Requirements sets up interior planting areas but does not require trees to be planted in interior islands or areas and states that the remaining areas can be landscaped with "other landscape materials." In many cases "other landscape materials" results in pine straw. I hope that you can clean this up so that the code actually requires canopy trees in the interior landscape areas and requires some percentage of shrubs, turf, mulch in the remaining areas. The City of Fort Walton Beach and Panama City Beach have decent language that describes such percentages. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these comments. Thank you again.	Mr. Dana, thank you for your comments.
Wayne O'Hara	None Referenced	Please find attached the summary of my verbal comments from the public input session of last Thursday, April 5, 2018. Thanks again for the opportunity to provide this input and please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information. 1. Thanks for opportunity to provide input on this proposed set of standards and guidelines. 2. Commend DPZ on thorough and comprehensive proposal. 3. I began investing in real estate in the CRA area in 2002-16 years ago. Have purchased 6 separate pieces of property since that time. 4. I have a vested interest in area and currently maintain my construction office on Intendencia Street. 5. Enjoy the neighborhood and want to continue to promote and support future good development in the area. 6. I am Concerned about extra layer of rules and regulations that will be mandated by this new set of CRA Urban Design Standards. I have both "General" and "Specific" areas of concern a. Generally-Additional set of hurdles for developers/real estate investors to clear. May discourage development. b. Specifically-Reference paragraphs in Proposal:	Mr. O'Hara, thank you for your comments. It is the intent of the CRA to preserve the traditional urban neighborhood environment by establishing urban design standards which adhere to a form-based methodology and result in a predictable development. We believe that adoption of these standards will, in fact, prove to protect the investments of developers and the investments of their buyers who chose to live here. Research proves that communities which adopt urban design standards expodentially outperfrom those who do not. The benefits of implementation include enhanced resident and visitor attraction, community health and economic viability, amongst many others.
Wayne O'Hara	1.1.1	1.1.1 States "Encouraging new construction" -I tend to disagree, since this presents another set of rules and regulations, above and beyond what already exists, that complicates the development process.	As described above, research shows that design standards do not curtail development. While additional requirements are enforced, the standards lend themselves to a better built environment which improves value and attraction. Additionally, the proposed standards will not require the additional time or cost of a special review board. Rather, projects will be reviewed administratively through the City's existing processes.
Wayne O'Hara	2.1.1/3.2	2.1.1 States "Apply to all new construction, additions and renovations" Vs. 3.2- refers to "Substantial Modification" -which one is it? Please clarify.	The standards will apply to all new construction and substantial modifications as defined by the existing Building Code Standards. This clarification has been made within the text.
Wayne O'Hara	2.2	2.2 "In addition" to applicable regulations-Already many regulations in place, ie., Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use, Zoning, Land Development Code, Architectural Review Committee, Florida Building Code. Don't think we need more rules.	Existing regulations do not sufficiently address building form or character. Rather, development is unpredictable yielding both good and bad results. The design standards are proposed to ensure predictable results which preserve the traditional urban neighborhood character of some of the City's most treasured and valuable areas.
Wayne O'Hara	5.1	5.1 Measure in stories vs. table 5.3.2 sets building height@ 45 feet. Conflicting rules, please clarify.	Measurement in stories relates to nonresidential and multifamily. Measurement in feet relates to single family detached, attached and two-family attached (duplex).
Wayne O'Hara	5.1.5	5.1.5 Roof pitch min. 6:12--many commercial metal buildings have a 2:12 roof pitch or less. Will hamper commercial development.	The traditional roof pitch within these neighborhoods contain a 6:12 or greater roof pitch. While there may be some outlyers, the majority of development adheres to this standard. The intent of the proposed standards is to preserve the traditional neighborhood form. The roof pitch proposed ensures that development dovetails into the existing framework.
Wayne O'Hara	5.3.4.b	5.3.4b Dictates what fence material can be used. Due to costs of materials itemized, will force all fences to be wood.	Thank you for your comments.
Wayne O'Hara	5.4	5.4 Frontage types. "Existing neighborhoods with a well-established character" Who decides what the "well-established character" is? Do other Standards and Guidelines still apply? This paragraph seems to add subjectivity and vagueness.	The language contained within this section is guiding language intended to establish intent, it is not regulatory. Standards which are regulatory and mandatory are activated by the word "shall", guidelines which are recommended and encouraged, but not mandatory are activated by "should". The standards and guidelines contained within the overlay apply in accordance with these definitions.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Wayne O'Hara		Some examples of eliminating driveways and parking of vehicles in the front yard area were shown. While this concept sounds and appears attractive, I'm concerned over where the vehicles would then park. If forced to park in the street, with the width of many of the neighborhood streets in this area, it will cause a traffic hazard with parked vehicles obstructing traffic flow.	Most Pensacola streets are considered yield streets capable of accomodating on-street parking on both sides, and a travel lane in between. These streets are common in cities all over the world, and are utilized in a manner in which maximizes on-street parking and density, improves walkability on the sidewalks and enhances pedestrian safety. Enforcement is required to ensure that parking is orderly, however, this design is a tried and true method which provides many benefits in urbanized settings. All parking will be subject to maintaining visibility triangles, and no parking will be allowed in "no parking" zones.
Wayne O'Hara		To summarize--Many codes, regulations, rules, etc. already in place - construction and development {good development) is vibrant in downtown area and CRA District - I express my concern and encourage you to be cautious in moving forward with an additional set of standards that have the potential for negative effects on development and cause developers/investors to consider other areas.	As stated above, existing regulations yield unpredictable results - some good and some bad. Due to the magnitude and extent of development and redevelopment within the City's CRA neighborhoods, it is critical that standards be adopted which inform neighborhood character and layout. The proposed standards are the minimum necessary to protect the value and integrety of the redevelopment areas, and are not intended to be overly burdensome or regulatory.
Thomas Douthat	Appendix A, Sec. 12-2-82 €	I am writing in full support of the Proposed Chapter 12-2. Zoning Districts Article VIII: CRA Overlay District. The only specific comment I have would be with Sec. 12-2-82. - (e) regarding sidewalks. I support the mandatory rule, but it should be specified with the 6 foot width and setback traditional to Pensacola, not based on the personal judgment of the City Engineer. This is not leading to a strong and well designed sidewalk network in other areas of the city. The standard as proposed is too vague.	Mr. Douthat, thank you for your comments. A component of the proposed urban design standards is adoption of the the Florida Greenbrook, Chapter 19, Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) to guide street design, including sidewalks, within the overlay boundaries. This chapter rely's on strong integration of land use and transportation, and is intended to support improved walkability and complete street design within the overlay. Unfortunately, specific sidewalk widths cannot be adopted for all areas of the redevelopment districts as each thoroughfare is unique and faces different challenges and needs.
Thomas Douthat	None Referenced	Beyond this, what I think needs to be improved is what is "missing." Specifically, I would also like the city to allow "of right" missing middle housing in the area, including duplexes, triples, and multifamily-units consistent with the neighborhood character. The great strength of a form based code is that it can allow more housing diversity and mixing of uses, while still preserving character. Changing the design standards alone are insufficient to obtain the CRA's objective of a vibrant diverse area. Our family sizes are smaller than when the area was built in the 1900s-1950s, and we need greater numbers of units to build back population density in the urban core. The goal of a vibrant and diverse area, also necessitates an equity housing plan for strategic multi-site public housing and tax credit projects. Moreover, a large part of the problem in terms of design comes from the management of roads. These also need to be accompanied by changes to the street design and management standards to support "Complete Streets" and a Vision Zero approach to pedestrian and cycling injuries. Beyond this, I would like these standards applied in all parts of Pensacola, and at a minimum on the contiguous grid. Thank you for your efforts on this important topic for the future of the city. I hope you receive full support from City Council.	While the CRA recognizes the need for "missing middle housing" in the redevelopment areas, the development of urban design standards is limited to an overlay of the underlying land development regulations, it does not alter the underlying allowable land use types. Modifications to allowable use types would require rezoning areas currently zoned for low or medium density development to a higher zoning category.
John David Ellis, Jr.	None Referenced	I just wanted to send a quick note in support of the CRA Overlay. I think it is a critical step in promoting the unique character of the neighborhoods located in the CRA, and it will help streamline the building & development process in these areas. Thank you for your help facilitating this process.	Thank you for your comments.
Charles Holland	None Referenced	As a practicing architect w/ offices here since 1993, I really appreciate good design and hate projects where there is an absence of any originality or design thought. I also hate laws trying to regulate every choice. So I encourage a small fee to be added to those projects that do not provide a design idea and w/specific ways, directions, a project is original or builds on other good design. Which could be used to help increase property values. Also provide Guidelines to owners w/proposed project's that identify: concept intent, identifying visual contribution to community include offering community awards for excellence or original design.	Mr. Holland, thank you for your comments. We will consider this.
Zachary Lane	None Referenced	I live at 420 E Brainerd St in the East Side Neighborhood. The East Side Neighborhood is one of the neighborhoods that is a focus of the Urban Design Standards Overlay that was completed by DPZ. I would like to express my support for the plan. The East Side Neighborhood, I feel, would greatly benefit from the implementation of the plan.	Mr. Lane, thank you for your comments.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Jordan Yee	None Referenced	<p>I spoke briefly at the April 6 input session and would like to submit the following recap of my comments for your records: I would like to thank and applaud the City and the CRA for making such a strong effort to preserve and strengthen the character of our historic communities. DPZ is widely recognized as one of the top urban design and planning firms and I feel confident that Pensacola has chosen an experienced partner to help guide us through this process. I was three when my family moved to Pensacola in 1983. My father is a local dentist and my mother manages the practice. Both have been active in many local community organizations. I am now 38 years old and live in East Hill with my wife and two young children, but less than 10 years ago, I nearly left Pensacola for a larger urban area in search of more culture and better, more interesting career opportunities. Timing is everything and despite an exciting job offer and a built-in community of friends in another city, I chose to stay in Pensacola to start a family with my now wife. It was a difficult decision and I felt like I was leaving a lot on the table by not moving away. Fortunately, my initial reluctance and loss has turned into hope as I have witnessed the transformation of Pensacola over the last ten years. As a licensed architect, I closely watch where and how development occurs and there is so much to be excited about right now. That being said, I recently "quit" architecture because I know we deserve and can produce better development. Rather than wait for projects to be brought to me, I wanted to take a more active role in the development of our community. I am now working for a local general contractor and intend to use the construction experience as a springboard to developing my own small projects. During Ed McMahon's recent CivicCon presentation, I was particularly struck by one of his many pithy challenges, "Do you want the character of your community to shape development or do you want development to shape the character of your community?" I believe the answer to his challenge is clear. While the downtown development boom can be attributed to the efforts of many people and groups that believe Pensacola can and must be better, at its core, the boom is a testament to one idea—Downtown Pensacola is a special place worth preserving and strengthening. Downtown is where we host our most treasured local events—the Arts, Music, and Seafood Festivals, and most recently Cicovia to name a few. And it is where we host our most treasured personal events like weddings. And it is where young couples take wedding announcement photos because the most intimate, human scaled places in our community only exist downtown. The local ballet, opera, arts, and symphony communities all call downtown a few points regarding concerns from the local development, construction, and real estate communities that the new CRA overlay guidelines and standards will make development and construction in the new districts more difficult and expensive: 1) The areas in question are in highest demand and deliver the greatest returns precisely because of their historic character; 2) The best way to protect their business interests in these areas is by establishing standards that preserve and strengthen the character of those areas; 3) The idea that "regulations" make development more difficult is shortsighted when viewed in the context with the long term profitability of their real estate investments. Property owners should expect development to be deliberate and contextually appropriate or risk the decline of property values over time as the original character of the place is lost; 4) Countless case studies have shown form-based codes and the associated checklists make development easier because the review process is more objective and not subject to panel or board review. 5) The notion that added costs required by overlay standards make new development unfeasible ignores the fact that those costs directly translate to value added AND increased resale value. Residential properties values in downtown can top \$300/sf, which far exceeds \$225/sf in East Hill, which is continues to be one of the hottest neighborhoods in the area. 6) Guidelines are well-intentioned, but have no teeth and standards are a much stronger tool to ensure that local historic character (and</p>	
Jordan Yee	None Referenced	<p>Rather than close with a line by line confirmation of the wisdom captured in the proposal, I would like to close instead with a few personal notes and a challenge to our City. My 32-year old sister creates custom jewelry and her husband is an online trader. They recently left San Francisco and returned to Pensacola to care for a sick family member. While Pensacola is dramatically different than it was when she left over a decade ago, being home is a daily reminder of the amazing quality of life they gave up when they left San Francisco. I will be disappointed, but I won't be surprised if they leave Pensacola for an urban area that offers more...everything. My 29-year old brother is a dentist and officer in the Air Force. His wife is also a dentist. They currently live in Charleston, SC, one of the best preserved and most walkable small cities in our country. They are considering where to move when my brother's time commitment is fulfilled next year. Pensacola is in the running for a number of reasons—proximity to family and friends, a turnkey business opportunity, our beautiful natural resources, etc.—but they remain on the fence because they have both spent the last ten years of their lives living in urban areas that offer more...everything. Pensacola will never be San Francisco or Charleston, but as citizens we are responsible for creating the best version of Pensacola we can. I can tell my sister and brother that good things are happening in Pensacola all I want, but they have to feel the energy for themselves when they walk down the street. I spent this Easter weekend visiting family in Memphis. On the drive home, we stopped in West Point, MS to grab a bite to eat. Rather than stop at a chain on the bypass, which looks like every other bypass in small town America, we chose to drive an extra half-mile off the bypass to West Point's historic downtown. Thanks to my smartphone I was able to find Magnolia's at the Ritz, a new local restaurant attached to West Point's historic theater, the Ritz. The food was delicious and a huge improvement from the chain on the bypass, but the real treat was the old main street, the dining room, and the people. The old storefront was attached to the restored historic theater and it was located directly across the street from a still operating local hardware store. The 20-foot tall ceilings in the dining room featured original wood posts and details that are too expensive to recreate. And the pride of the business owner and the local community was obvious, especially with everyone decked out in Easter attire. We left Magnolia's with happy bellies and made our way back onto the bypass. Unfortunately, the consequences of choosing cars over people and bad development over good had never been so clear to me. I was pleased to later discover that West Point had joined countless small towns across the country and partnered with Main Street America to help strengthen the historic resources of their community. The community made a deliberate choice to preserve its historic character and the local business community responded by restoring the Ritz and opening Magnolia's. It goes without saying that neither the theater nor the restaurant could exist along the bypass. My challenge to the</p>	Mr. Yee, thank you for your comments.
Jordan Yee	None Referenced		Mr. Yee, thank you for your comments.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Jordan Yee	None Referenced	I did forget to add one important comment--I had hoped the overlays would take full advantage of the efficiencies of form-based codes and allow for more diverse land uses. If I understand correctly, none of the uses changes under the draft proposal and I feel like it's a missed opportunity if the CRA can't be developed more like areas in the historic commercial districts that successfully integrate a variety of uses.	Mr. Yee, you are correct. As mentioned in a previous response, the proposed urban design standards would be adopted as an overlay to the underlying land development regulations, they would not alter allowable land uses. Rezoning would be required to upzone lower density areas to allow for higher densities and mixed uses.
Charles Washington	5.1	I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on the Proposed CRA Overlay District Urban Design Standards and Guidelines. My specific comments and observation are listed below. Overall Report. The overall report is a commendable effort to present both technical and nontechnical information in a manner the average citizen can follow and be informed. However, because this is draft, the report could benefit from careful final editing before the final copy is published. Specifically, attention needs to be given to: 1. The way in which reference is made to information in a table or tables rather than to a table or table number. For example: rather than saying, "Building heights are as assigned by the Table 5.3.1 - 5.3.5 Form Standards," why not consider this instead: "Building heights are as assigned by the Form Standards in Tables 5.3.1 - 5.3.5." (See pages 5, 8, 9, 16, 20, 27, 29, and 30.)	Agreed. We will clarify.
Charles Washington	Tables 5.3.1-5.3.5	The inconsistency found in what is shown in a table illustration and its letter notations and how or if the letter notations are defined in the table legend. For example: in Table 5.3.1 that is to replace Table 12-2.2 the graphic illustration includes notations a, b, c, and d, but the notations in the legend includes letters f, g, and h. Letters f, g, and h are assigned substantive meaning or data, but neither of these notations appears in the illustration in the table. (Typically, drawings and illustrations are referred to as Figures, and tables refer to matrices of data and information.)	Agreed, we will clarify.
Charles Washington	Table 5.3.3	The lack of clarity in the meaning of some of the legend notations beneath tables. For example: it is unclear whether using the convention of the forward slash to separate two numbers is meant to convey a minimum on one side and a maximum on the other side as in the legends under the tables on pages 12 and 14. For example, what does 5 max./15 max., referring to principal building setback, mean on page 12 or 5 max./ 15 max. mean on page 14?	Agreed, we will clarify.
Charles Washington	Table 5.4.1 and Figures 5.6.2 and 5.6.3	Missing Tables or Figures. The draft has several missing (not included) tables or figures. Tables are missing on pages 17 and 18. Figures are missing on page 24.	Thank you for your comments.
Charles Washington	Tables 5.3.1-5.3.5 and Figure 5.6.1	Properly labeling or identifying the contents of a table or tables. See, for example, the table on pages 12, 14, 15, and 23.	Thank you for your comments. We will clarify.
Charles Washington	None Referenced	Substantive Content. 1. Deteriorating and Abandoned Housing. I was very surprised and disappointed that there is not one mention (that I could find) of keeping the CRA area free of deteriorating and abandoned buildings--private residence, commercial building or churches. The absence of such mention is to suggest that the intent is to preserve the area with its historic blight of abandoned and/or deteriorating buildings. This deserves at least a mention if not a policy statement or guideline to prevent such or to eliminate such buildings,	One of the CRA's main purposes is to remove and eradicate blight within the redevelopment areas. We will add a statement to the Intent section of the Overlay establishing that one of the goals of the design standards is to support the removal of blight within the redevelopment areas. The overlay, in and of itself, however cannot remove deteriorating and abandoned housing, but it can support redevelopment of such within its boundaries.
Charles Washington	Section 2, Applicability	Superiority of Standards in Article VIII over any other conflicting Standard or Guideline. While I think I know what is meant by Article VIII, 2.4 under Applicability, there is lack of certainty given the way the provision is stated. Here is what needs clarification. The written statement, not including the Italic text, is "The Design Standards and Guidelines in Section 12-2-82 shall apply. [unless preempted by these standards in Article VIII: CRA Overlay District]. Where a conflict exists between the standards in this Article {VIII: CRA Overlay District, 2.4} and the standards of Chapter 12-6, the standards in this Article [VIII: CRA Overlay District] shall prevail." The insertion of the bracketed article text will eliminate the ambiguity and implicit conflict in the original language.	We will clarify this language.
Charles Washington	Appendix A, Table 12-2-2	The report provides no justification or rationale for the proposed changes medium density in residential land use district regulations (Table 12-2.2). In the absence of a rationale or justification there is no need to make the proposed changes in Minimum Lot Area, Minimum Lot Width, and Front, Side, and Rear Setback Standards. This comment also applies to proposed changes in Standards in tables that are not titled or labeled following Table 12-2.2.	The proposed edits to Table 12-2.2 within Appendix A support the Form Standards contained within Tables 5.3.1-5.3.5, and will be incorporated into these tables, as appropriate.
Charles Washington	Section 8 and 5.1.3	(See: 8, 5.1.3) The criterion for determining or defining a two-story building is ambiguous and can be made clearer by stating how much of a distance above the single-story height requirement is. If the standard were to state by how much the building must exceed the maximum height standard that defines a one-story building, the ambiguity is removed.	We will clarify this language.

CRA Urban Design Overlay District- City Staff and Community Comments

Charles Washington	5.4.3(a)	The use of the term "elements" in Standard 5.4.3 (a) adds ambiguity unclear because "elements" is not defined and can have many meanings. It is also not defined by its usage here. It needs to be defined or a synonym used.	This term has been removed.
Charles Washington	5.5.1€	Standard 5.5.1(e) proposes a First-Floor elevation of a minimum of nine (9) feet above sea level. Is this a typo? Does this standard apply throughout the CRA area? Nine feet high is quite high.	This standard has been removed.
Charles Washington	5.7	In all instances where on-street parking is required or discussed, there is no caveat that the street must be of a minimum width for this to occur. This is a serious oversight. Many neighborhood streets will not easily accommodate a car parked on the street if owners on both sides of the street utilize on-street parking and enough space remains to allow cars to use the street for normal travel.	Thank you for your comments. On-street parking is encouraged but not required. Standards contained within the Florida Greenbook Chapter 19 address these concerns. The Florida Greenbook Chapter 19 standards are proposed to be adopted as a component of the overlay.
Charles Washington	5.7.3	The notion of a shared parking space for residents living side by side is a good idea if the space is large enough for two cars. If not, how will this work, and why is it a "good" idea?	Minimum driveway width standards have been incorporated for joint driveways.
Charles Washington	6.1.1	I would urge a careful review of the Landscape on Private Property Standards, especially 6.1.1, to make sure what is stated is the intended standard.	Thank you for your comments.
Charles Washington	6.3.5(a)	Standard 6.3.5(a) should be reviewed carefully to make sure that what was intended to be proposed is what is really proposed. I have made many more comments on the reviewed draft, but these are the ones I offer for consideration.	Thank you for your comments.
Jimmie Jarrett	Section 6	Some thoughts for consideration for long term tree viability in the Urban Design Standards for the street trees in the public Right of Way: 1) Is there an alternative to using metal tree grates? Tree grates must be maintained and cut away from the trunk of a tree. The grate needs to be periodically cut to allow for trunk expansion otherwise the grate will strangle and eventually kill the tree.	Yes, there are alternatives to using metal tree grates. The proposed standards allow for planting in tree grates or tree pits which would not required to be cut away with trunk expansion.
Jimmie Jarrett	Section 6	The amount and type of soil used in planting trees will directly affect the tree size and health. Consider option for structural soil or spec the percentage of porous material and organic matter for tree pits.	Thank you for your comments. We will consider.
Jimmie Jarrett	Section 6	To reduce sidewalk and root conflicts, in guidelines mention or suggest using one of several systems that that will limit root and sidewalk conflict. Low cost systems can be as easy as a root deflection system or using 57 stone to create air space under the side walk.	Requirements to install a root barrier system have been included.
Jimmie Jarrett	Section 6	Consider adding an option for cluster planting trees in one large soil area. Tree roots are able to spread out and share soil space. Trees will perform better and grow larger with a bigger shared space rather than being confined to small planting pits.	Language for clustering tree plantings has been included.

PROPOSED

Chapter 12-2. Zoning Districts

Article VIII: CRA Overlay District

[actual location in code to be confirmed]

Urban Design Standards and Guidelines

[draft date: 3/15/18]

Page Intentionally Blank

Table of Contents

1.Intent	4
2.Applicability	5
3.Pre-existing Conditions	6
4.Zoning Changes	7
5.Additional Urban Standards & Guidelines	8
5.1. Building Height	8
5.2. Building Orientation	9
5.3. Building Massing	9
5.4. Frontage Types	16
5.5. Building Elements	20
5.6. Building Encroachments	23
5.7. Parking Access, Design & Reductions	26
5.8. Fences and Walls	28
5.9. Windows & Glazing	28
6.Additional Landscape Standards	30
6.1. Landscape on private property	30
6.2. Buffer Yards	30
6.3. Street trees in the public right-of-way	32
7.Additional Thoroughfare Standards	34
7.1. Local Street Design	34
7.2. State Street Design	34
8.Additional Definitions	35

Notes:

*Text in **Blue** relates to specific references within Chapter 12 Land Development Code and Chapter 11 Traffic and Vehicles, of Pensacola's City Code of Ordinances*

*Text in **Red** are internal references (only noted as red for this draft)*

*Text in **Grey** relates to the intent specific to sub-sections*

1. INTENT

- 1.1. The requirements set forth in this Article are intended to:
 - 1.1.1. Preserve and maintain the urban pattern and architectural history of Pensacola's CRA areas, while encouraging new construction that is compatible with that heritage, but also reflective of its time.
 - 1.1.2. Improve the physical appearance of the CRA areas with urban design standards that provide more predictable results in terms of the form and character of buildings.
 - 1.1.3. Support the future growth of Pensacola, to ensure compatible and cohesive land uses, to remain resilient long-term, and to support the goals, objectives and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan and CRA area master plans.
 - 1.1.4. Coordinate the placement, orientation, and design of buildings to ensure a coherent and walkable streetscape and traditional urban character by creating well-defined street edges with continuous building walls, articulated facades, and architectural features that create visual interest and an attractive pedestrian environment.
 - 1.1.5. Capitalize on opportunities to attract and grow a variety of residential building types, retail, service, and cultural establishments to serve local needs, create regional attractions and a robust economic base.
 - 1.1.6. Enable and encourage mixed-use development within the CRA areas in support of viable and diverse locally-oriented businesses and cultural institutions.

2. APPLICABILITY

- 2.1. These standards shall apply to all new construction, including building additions and renovations within the following three CRA areas:
 - 2.1.1. The Urban Core, excluding all plots within the Special Review Districts;
 - 2.1.2. The Eastside; and
 - 2.1.3. The Westside.
- 2.2. These standards are proposed as an overlay, in addition to all applicable regulations pertaining to the underlying zoning districts. Where a conflict exists between the standards in this Article and the standards of the underlying zoning districts, the standards in this Article shall prevail.
- 2.3. The Design Standards and Guidelines in [Section 12-2-82](#) shall apply. Where a conflict exists between the standards in this Article and the standards of [Section 12-2-82](#), the standards in this Article shall prevail.
- 2.4. Trees/Landscape Regulations in [Chapter 12-6](#) shall apply. Where a conflict exists between the standards in this Article and the standards of [Chapter 12-6](#), the standards in this Article shall prevail.
- 2.5. Modifications to the dimensional requirements of the existing zoning districts are included in [Section 5.3 and Tables 5.3.1-5.3.5 Form Standards](#).
- 2.6. References to sections in this Chapter refer to the Pensacola Code of Ordinances, Land Development Code.
- 2.7. Standards, defined by “shall” are regulatory and new development is required to comply with these standards. Deviations from these standards shall only be permitted by a variance.
- 2.8. Guidelines, defined by “should” are advisory, and new development is encouraged to incorporate them as appropriate in order to enhance and complement the built and natural environment. The intent is to create the highest level of design quality while providing the needed flexibility for creative site design.

3. PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS

- 3.1. Existing buildings and structures that do not meet the requirements of this Overlay may be occupied, operated, repaired and renovated in the existing non-conforming state.
- 3.2. Existing buildings and structures that do not conform to the requirements of this Overlay may continue in use as they are until a substantial modification is requested, according to Building Code Standards.
- 3.3. The restoration or rehabilitation of an existing building does not require the provision of parking in addition to the existing, if less than six (6) new spaces are required.

4. ZONING CHANGES

- 4.1. Refer to [Appendix A](#) for proposed edits to the Pensacola Code of Ordinances, Land Development Code.
-

5. ADDITIONAL URBAN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

5.1. BUILDING HEIGHT

Intent: *Measuring height in stories rather than feet has numerous benefits which include: a) to provide greater creativity for a natural variety of roof forms; b) to recognize the need of different users, as commercial floor plates are different than residential floor plates; c) to remove the incentive to create short floorplates, and instead encourage more gracious floor-to-ceiling heights for environmental health, without penalizing property owners; and d) to protect the historical proportions of Pensacola's CRA areas.*

5.1.1. Building heights are as assigned by the [Tables 5.3.1-5.3.5 Form Standards](#).

5.1.2. Building height is measured as follows:

- a. Building height shall be measured in stories, with the exception of single-family residential, which shall be measured in feet.
- b. Where maximum height is specified, the measurement shall be taken from the average grade of sidewalk adjacent to the site.
- c. Above ground stories are measured from finished floor to finished floor.
- d. Single-family and duplex residential height is restricted to 35 feet, measured as follows:
 - i. To the bottom of the eave for pitched roof buildings; and
 - ii. To the top of the parapet for flat roof buildings.
- e. Height by story for residential buildings, excluding single-family and duplex residential buildings, is limited as follow:
 - i. In R-1AA, R-1A, R-1B, R-2A, and R-NC, R-NCB: above ground story height shall be a maximum 14 feet.
 - ii. Ground floor height shall be a minimum 12 feet.
- f. Height by story for non-residential and mixed-use buildings is limited as follows:
 - i. In R-NC, R-NCB, and R-2: ground floor story height shall be a maximum of 20 feet.
 - ii. In C-1, C-2 and C-3, ground floor story height shall be a maximum of 24 feet.
 - iii. Above ground story height shall be a maximum 14 feet.
 - iv. Ground floor height shall be a minimum 14 feet.
- g. Building height that exceeds the maximum permitted height shall count as two (2) stories.

5.1.3. Parking garages shall not exceed the height of the principal building on the site. Parking garages shall not be constrained by floor to floor height requirements, but stand-alone parking garages shall appear from the street to conform to the number of stories permitted in the zoning district in which it is located.

5.1.4. Exceptions to maximum height:

- a. Towers and loggias may exceed the maximum height, provided their footprint is less than 400 square feet.

5.1.5. Roof pitch:

- a. Gable or hipped roofs shall have a minimum pitch of 6:12 and a maximum pitch of 12:12.
- b. Shed roofs shall have a minimum pitch of 4:12.

5.2. BUILDING ORIENTATION

Intent: *Buildings should have their principal pedestrian entrance along a street, pedestrian way or open space, with the exception of entrances off a courtyard, visible from public right-of-ways.*


- 5.2.1. Building frontage occupation shall be regulated by the underlying zoning district according to [Tables 5.3.1 to 5.3.5 Form Standards](#).
- 5.2.2. Buildings shall be oriented so that the principal façade is parallel, or nearly parallel to the street it faces for the minimum building frontage requirement specified in the zoning district.
- 5.2.3. Forecourts, courtyards and other such defined open spaces shall count towards minimum frontage requirements.
- 5.2.4. Ground floor units in multi-family residential buildings shall provide landscaping, walls, fences, stoops or similar elements to provide an attractive and private frontage to the building.

5.3. BUILDING MASSING

Intent: *Buildings should be designed in proportions that reflect human-scaled pedestrian movement, and to encourage interest at the street level.*

- 5.3.1. Where provided, multi-family building courtyards shall maintain a minimum width:height ratio of 1:3 in at least one dimension, in order to avoid light well conditions. Courtyards should be wider where possible.
- 5.3.2. The design and façade treatment of mixed-use buildings shall differentiate commercial from residential uses with distinguishing expression lines (such as cornices, projections, banding, awnings, terraces, etc.), changes in fenestration, façade articulation and/or material changes.
- 5.3.3. Townhouses shall distinguish each unit entry with changes in plane, color, materials, front porches, front stoops or railings.
- 5.3.4. All service and loading areas shall be entirely screened from public right-of-ways as follows.
 - a. Equipment shall be screened in such a manner as to be compatible with the character of the building or to minimize its visibility.
 - b. If outdoor storage area is separate from the building it serves, the fence materials are limited to masonry, concrete, stucco, wood, PVC and metal, excluding chain-link.

- 5.3.5. HVAC and mechanical equipment are restricted as follows:
 - a. They are prohibited in frontage yards.
 - b. They shall be integrated into the overall building design and not be visible from adjoining streets and or open spaces.
 - c. Through-wall units or vents are prohibited along street frontages and open spaces, unless recessed within a balcony.
- 5.3.6. Mechanical equipment on a roof shall be visually screened from the street with parapets or other types of visual screens of the minimum height necessary to conceal the same.
- 5.3.7. Roof top parking shall be visually screened with articulated parapet walls or other architectural treatment.

Table 5.3.1: Detached Single-Family & Duplexes (R-1AA, R-1A)*Replaces Table 12-2.2***Setbacks - Principal Building (feet)**

a	Front	20 min.
b	Front, Side	5 min.
c	Side (Interior)	5 min.
d	Rear	30 min.

Frontage & Lot Occupation (min.)

Primary	45%
Secondary	40%

Lot Occupation

i	Lot Width	30 ft. min.
	Lot Coverage	50% max.

Building Height (max.)

Principal Building	35 ft. ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾
Accessory Building	24 ft. ⁽¹⁾

Parking (min.)

Off-street	1/unit
------------	--------

Density (max.)

12 du/acre

Setbacks - Accessory Building (feet)

e	Front	50 min.
f	Front, Side	5 min.
g	Side (Interior)	1 min.
h	Rear	5 min.

Frontage Yard Types

Standard	Permitted
Shallow	Not Permitted
Urban	Not Permitted
Pedestrian Forecourt	Not Permitted
Vehicular Forecourt	Not Permitted

Facade Types


Porch	Permitted
Stoop	Permitted
Common Entry	Not Permitted
Gallery	Not Permitted
Storefront	Not Permitted

Notes:

- (1) Measured according to [Section 5.1.2](#)
 (2) First floor elevation shall be according to [Section 5.6.1](#)

Table 5.3.2: Attached Single-Family (Townhouses) (R-1A, R-1B, R-2A)

Replaces Table 12-2.2 & 12-2.3

**Setbacks - Principal Building (feet)**

a	Front	8 min.
b	Front, Side	5 min.
c	Side (Interior)	0 or 5 min.
d	Rear	30 min.

Frontage & Lot Occupation (min.)

Primary	60%
Secondary	40%

Lot Occupation

i	Lot Width	16 ft. min. 60 ft. max.
	Lot Coverage	75% max.

Building Height (max.)

Principal Building	45 feet ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾
Accessory Building	24 feet ⁽¹⁾

Parking (min.)

Off-street	1/unit
------------	--------

Density (max.)

18 du/acre

Setbacks - Accessory Building (feet)

e	Front	50 min.
f	Front, Side	5 min.
g	Side (Interior)	1 min.
h	Rear	5 min.

Frontage Yard Types

Standard	Not Permitted
Shallow	Permitted
Urban	Not Permitted
Pedestrian Forecourt	Not Permitted
Vehicular Forecourt	Not Permitted

Facade Types


Porch	Permitted
Stoop	Permitted
Common Entry	Not Permitted
Gallery	Not Permitted
Storefront	Not Permitted

Notes:

- (1) Measured according to [Section 5.1.2](#)
 (2) First floor elevation shall be according to [Section 5.5.1.e](#)

Table 5.3.3: Neighborhood Commercial & MF Res. (R-NC, R-NCB, R2, C-1)

Replaces Table 12-2.6 & 12-2.7

**Setbacks - Principal Building (feet)**

a	Front (Com./MF)	5 max. / 15 max.
b	Front, Side (Com./MF)	5 max. / 15 max.
c	Side (Interior)	0 or 5 min.
d	Rear	none

Frontage & Lot Occupation (min.)

Primary	80%
Secondary	50%

Lot Occupation

i	Lot Width	16 ft. min.
	Lot Coverage	75% max.

Building Height (max.)

Principal Building	4 stories ⁽¹⁾
Accessory Building	N/A

Off-street Parking (min.)

Residential	1/unit
Commercial	Per Section 5.7.1

Density (max.) 24 du/acre**Setbacks - Accessory Building (feet)**

e	Front	N/A
f	Front, Side	N/A
g	Side (Interior)	N/A
h	Rear	N/A

Frontage Yard Types

Standard	Not Permitted
Shallow	Permitted
Urban	Permitted
Pedestrian Forecourt	Permitted
Vehicular Forecourt	Permitted

Facade Types


Porch	Not Permitted
Stoop	Permitted
Common Entry	Permitted
Gallery	Permitted
Storefront	Permitted

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ First floor elevation shall be according to [Section 5.5.1.e](#)

Table 5.3.4: Core Commercial & Multi-Family Residential (C-2, *C-3)

Replaces Table 12-2.7

**Setbacks - Principal Building (feet)**

a	Front (Com./MF)	5 max. / 15 max.
b	Front, Side (Com./MF)	5 max. / 15 max.
c	Side (Interior)	0 or 5 min.
d	Rear	none

Frontage & Lot Occupation (min.)

Primary	80%
Secondary	60%

Lot Occupation

i	Lot Width	16 ft. min.
	Lot Coverage	100% max.

Building Height (max.)

Principal Building	10 stories ⁽¹⁾
Accessory Building	N/A

Off-street Parking (min.)

Residential	1/unit
Commercial	Per Section 5.7.1

Density (max.) 135 du/acre**Setbacks - Accessory Building (feet)**

e	Front	N/A
f	Front, Side	N/A
g	Side (Interior)	N/A
h	Rear	N/A

Frontage Yard Types

Standard	Not Permitted
Shallow	Permitted
Urban	Permitted
Pedestrian Forecourt	Permitted
Vehicular Forecourt	Permitted

Facade Types


Porch	Not Permitted
Stoop	Not Permitted
Common Entry	Permitted
Gallery	Permitted
Storefront	Permitted

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ First floor elevation shall be according to [Section 5.5.1.e](#)

Table 5.3.5: Hybrid Commercial (C-3 along C3C FDOT Context Zone)

Replaces Table 12-2.7

**Setbacks - Principal Building (feet)**

a	Front	60 max.
b	Front, Side	40 max
c	Side (Interior)	0 or 5 min.
d	Rear	none

Frontage & Lot Occupation (min.)

Primary	60%
Secondary	40%

Lot Occupation

i	Lot Width	16 ft. min.
	Lot Coverage	100% max.

Building Height (max.)

Principal Building	10 stories ⁽¹⁾
Accessory Building	N/A

Off-street Parking (min.)

Residential	1/unit
Commercial	Per Section 5.7.1

Density (max.) 135 du/acre**Setbacks - Accessory Building (feet)**

e	Front	N/A
f	Front, Side	N/A
g	Side (Interior)	N/A
h	Rear	N/A

Frontage Yard Types

Standard	Not Permitted
Shallow	Permitted
Urban	Permitted
Pedestrian Forecourt	Permitted
Vehicular Forecourt	Permitted

Facade Types

Porch	Not Permitted
Stoop	Not Permitted
Common Entry	Permitted
Gallery	Permitted
Storefront	Permitted

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ First floor elevation shall be according to [Section 5.5.1.e](#)


5.4. FRONTAGE TYPES

Intent: *New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-established character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.*

Maintaining a consistent street-wall is a fundamental component for a vibrant pedestrian life and a well-defined public realm. Retail buildings closely aligned to the street edge with consistent setbacks, provide a clear sense of enclosure of streets, enabling them to function as pedestrian-scaled outdoor rooms. The placement of buildings along the edge of the sidewalk should be given particular attention as it is that portion of the buildings that is the primary contributor to pedestrian activity.

- 5.4.1. Site and building development is subject to the frontage types and to the urban design guidelines in this Section.
- 5.4.2. Setbacks shall be as follows:
 - a. Buildings shall be set back from site boundaries according to [Tables 5.3.1 to 5.3.5 Form Standards](#).
 - b. Where a maximum setback is specified, it pertains only to the amount of building facade required to meet the minimum frontage occupation requirements of the zoning district.
- 5.4.3. Frontage Yard Types shall be as follows:
 - a. Frontage yards shall be wholly open to the sky and unobstructed, except for roof projections, elements and permitted encroachments attached to principal buildings, accessory buildings, and trees.
 - b. Applicants shall select and specify frontage yard types along frontages from [Table 5.4.1 Frontage Yard Types](#).
 - c. Impervious surfaces and walkways in frontage yards are subject to the requirements of [Table 5.4.1 Frontage Yard Types](#) and the following:
 - i. Where townhouses occupy a common site, each townhouse with an entrance towards a frontage shall have a walkway connecting the sidewalk to the townhouse entrance.
 - ii. At cluster courts, the shared court shall have have a walkway connecting the sidewalk at the primary frontage with building entries.
- 5.4.4. In R-NC, R-NCB, R-2, C-1, C-2, and C-3, any portion of a frontage not occupied by buildings, driveways, or walkways shall be lined with a streetscreen as follows:
 - a. Streetscreens shall meet the fencing and wall standards for the frontage yard type.
 - b. Streetscreens shall be coplanar with the primary building facade or located further into the lot than the facade.
- 5.4.5. Street trees and landscaping in frontage yards shall comply with the requirements of [Section 6](#).

Table 5.4.1: Frontage Yard Types**A. Standard Yard (Fenced or not)**

Illustration	
Surface	50% minimum shall be pervious material. A minimum of one (1) tree is required per Section 6.1. Paving is limited to walkways, and driveways.
Walkways	One (1) per frontage providing access to building entries
Fencing	Permitted along frontage lines, and according to Section 5.8

B. Cluster Court



Illustration	
Surface	A minimum 50% of the court shall be landscaped with ground cover, trees, or understory trees. Paving is limited to walkways, and driveways.
Walkways	Court shall be a minimum 20 feet wide and a min. 1,000 sq.ft. in size, and shall have a walkway connecting the sidewalk at the primary frontage with building entries.
Fencing	Permitted at or beyond the building setback line, and street frontages not along frontage lines, according to Section 5.8


Table 5.4.1: Frontage Yard Types**C. Shallow Yard**

Illustration	
Surface	Maximum setback of eight (8) feet. 50% minimum shall be landscaped in R-1A, and R-1B and up to 100% may be paved in R-NC and R-NCB.
Walkways	1 per frontage providing access to building entries.
Fencing	Permitted interior to the building setback line at primary street frontages. Permitted at or interior to secondary street frontage lines according to Section 5.8 .


D. Urban Yard

Illustration	
Surface	Shall be paved at sidewalk grade, trees in grates or in tree pit.
Walkways	Shall be paved at sidewalk grade. Vegetation is permitted in raised containers.
Fencing	Not permitted

Table 5.4.1: Frontage Yard Types**E. Pedestrian Forecourt**

Illustration	
Surface	Minimum 80% paving-at-sidewalk-grade.
Fencing	Permitted at or interior to building setback lines and according to Section 5.8
Area	Forecourt: A minimum 20 ft. wide up to 30% of the allowable frontage, and a maximum 50 ft. deep.
Activation	Shall be lined with habitable space on 3-sides, or on 2-sides at corner sites.

F. Vehicular Forecourt

Illustration	
Surface	Driveway shall be paved at sidewalk grade. The remainder of frontage setback may be paved or landscaped.
Fencing	Low wall, maximum 24 inches high, of either brick, or stone is permitted.
Area	Forecourt: 4,200 sq.ft. maximum
Activation	Shall be lined with habitable space on 3-sides, or on 2-sides at corner sites.

5.5. BUILDING ELEMENTS

Intent: *Buildings should be designed in proportions that reflect human-scaled pedestrian movement, and to encourage interest at the street level.*


5.5.1. Building entries shall be as follows:

- a. Building entrances shall be clearly visible from the street.
- b. One (1) building entry shall be provided every 80 feet of facade leading to a habitable space.
- c. Building entries for mixed-use buildings shall differentiate entrances for residential and commercial uses.
- d. Entries for multifamily buildings shall provide protection from the elements with canopies, marquees, recesses or roof overhangs.
- e. Residential building entries at grade are restricted as follows:
 - i. Single-Family residential buildings shall be raised above average sidewalk grade according to [Table 5.5.1 Facade Types](#). Exceptions include:
 - (1) First floor elevation shall be a minimum nine (9) feet above sea level.
 - ii. Multi-family residential buildings shall be raised above average sidewalk grade according to [Table 5.5.1 Facade Types](#). In no instance shall the entry be raised less than 18 inches.
 - iii. Mixed-use and non-residential building entries shall be at sidewalk grade.


5.5.2. Facade Types shall be as follows:

- a. Facades shall be assigned along frontages and are limited by type according to [Table 5.5.1 Facade Types](#).
- b. Projections into setbacks are permitted as follows, but not beyond the property line:
 - i. Roof overhangs, cornices, window and door surrounds and other facade decoration may project up to two (2) feet.
 - ii. Where permitted, shading devices may project into the front setback up to the property line with a minimum eight (8) foot clearance.
 - iii. Balconies may project up to three (3) feet.
 - iv. Bay windows may project up to three (3) feet.
 - v. Porches and stoops may project according to [Table 5.5.1 Facade Types](#).

Table 5.5.1: Facade Types**A: Porch**

Entry Grade	Minimum 18 inches above grade	
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required at the primary building entrance. Porches shall be a minimum 6 feet in depth. Porches and related structures may project into frontage setbacks a maximum 10 feet. Porch openings shall be vertical in proportion. Porches shall be a maximum 10 feet in height. Columns should have a diameter between 1/9th and 1/14th their height. 	

B: Stoop

Entry Grade	Minimum 36 inches and a maximum 48 inches above grade	
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A stoop is required at building entrances, projecting from the facade. Wood is prohibited for stoop railings. Stoops and related structures may project into frontage setbacks up to 100%. 	

C: Common Entry





Entry Grade	Minimum 18 inches and a maximum 24 inches above grade	
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single collective entry to a multi-family lobby is required at the primary building entrance. Canopies and awnings are permitted to project into frontage setbacks up to 100% of their depth. 	

Table 5.5.1: Facade Types

D: Gallery		
Entry Grade	At sidewalk grade	
Requirements (see section 5.5.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where a gallery occurs, it is required along a minimum of 80% of the frontage. Encroachments are permitted according to Section 5.6. Awnings are not permitted in galleries. 	
E: Arcade & Colonnade		
Entry Grade	At sidewalk grade	
Requirements (see section 5.5.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where an Arcade or Colonnade occurs, it is required along a minimum of 80% of the frontage. Encroachments are permitted according to Section 5.6. Awnings are not permitted in arcades and colonnades. 	
F: Storefront		
Entry Grade	At sidewalk grade	
Requirements (see section 5.5.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A storefront is required at the primary entrance of the tenant space. A minimum 70% of the ground floor of a storefront shall be glazing 	

5.5.3. Storefronts

Intent: Retail storefronts should be architecturally articulated through the varied use of high-quality durable materials, display windows, entrances, awnings and buildings signs. Their signage, glazing and doors should be conceived as a unified design.


- a. Retail shops shall provide a minimum of 70% glazing (void to solid ratio of surface area along principal facades at the ground level).
- b. Storefronts shall not be constructed of extruded aluminum frames or panels.
- c. Opaque, smoked, and reflective glass on storefront windows shall be prohibited unless used as accent materials.
- d. High-quality, durable materials are especially important at street level within reach of pedestrians. The materials for the retail storefronts shall consist of stone, brick, concrete, stucco, metal, glass, cementitious siding and/or wood. Construction detail and finish shall adhere to craftsman standards.
- e. Outdoor dining areas on sidewalk and public right-of-ways shall be allowed subject to the following standards:
 - i. Outdoor dining areas shall be separated from public walkways and streets using railings, wrought-iron fences, planters, landscaping and other suitable materials; and
 - ii. A minimum unobstructed pedestrian path of at least six (6) feet wide shall be provided along public right-of-ways.

5.6. BUILDING ENCROACHMENTS



5.6.1. When encroachments are within public right-of-ways, they shall meet Public Works clearance standards.

5.6.2. Awnings and canopies are restricted as to as illustrated in [Figure 5.6.1](#) and as follows:

- a. May project into the public right-of-way, up to two (2) feet of the curb.
- b. Awnings and canopies shall be a minimum of six (6) feet in depth and have a minimum of eight (8) feet of vertical clearance.



- 5.6.3. Arcades and Colonnades are restricted according to [Figure 5.6.2](#) and as follows:
- a. Shall be a minimum of eight (8) feet in depth and a minimum of 12 feet in height, maintaining a 1.5:1 to a 2:1 height-to-width ratio, as illustrated in [Figure 5.6.2](#).
 - b. Columns or piers should have a diameter between 1/8th and 1/12th the height, measured from the base to the bottom of the arched opening or the bottom of the entablature, as illustrated in [Figure 5.6.2](#).
 - c. Arcades and Colonnades should encroach into building setbacks.
 - d. Where Arcades and Colonnades encroach over sidewalks, they shall not extend beyond two (2) feet of the curb.
 - e. They should not change height or width along a facade.
 - f. They should align along the length of the block.
- 5.6.4. Galleries are restricted according to [Figure 5.6.3](#) and as follows:
- a. Shall be a minimum of 8 feet in depth and a minimum of 12 feet in height, maintaining a 1.2:1 to a 2:1 height to width ratio, as illustrated in [Figure 5.6.3](#).
 - b. Gallery columns should have a diameter between 1/9th and 1/20th their height, measured from the base to the bottom of the entablature, as illustrated in [Figure 5.6.3](#).
 - c. Galleries should encroach into building setbacks.
 - d. Galleries should encroach over sidewalks.
 - e. Where galleries encroach over sidewalks, they shall not extend beyond two (2) feet of the curb.
 - f. Galleries shall not change height or width along a building facade.

Figure 5.6.2: Encroachment for Arcades & Colonnades Illustrated**Figure 5.6.3: Encroachment for Galleries Illustrated**

5.7. PARKING ACCESS, DESIGN & REDUCTIONS

Intent: *The intent of these standards is to guide the placement and design of parking, when it is provided.*

Vehicular parking spaces should be carefully integrated to avoid the negative impacts of large surface parking areas on the pedestrian environment. In general, parking supply should be shared by multiple users and property owners to facilitate the ability to “park once and walk”. On-street parallel parking is encouraged on both sides of the street to provide a supply of convenient shared parking, and as a means to provide a protective buffer for pedestrians on the sidewalk. Where surface parking is permitted, it should be hidden or screened from the pedestrian realm by use of garden walls and narrow landscape edges.

Parking garages, where provided, should be lined. They are encouraged to be designed for possible future conversion to other non-parking functions, including office, residential and/or commercial uses.

5.7.1. Minimum parking requirements are as follows:

- a. Parking requirements shall be in accordance with [12-3-1\(B\)](#).
- b. Shared parking shall be according to [12-3-1\(D\)](#).
- c. Parking reductions shall be calculated according to [Table 12.3-1](#).
- d. Lots less than 30 feet in width have no minimum parking requirement, except for:
 - i. Lots fronting streets where on-street parking is not permitted.
- e. Lots less than 42 feet wide shall be accessed from a rear lane, where possible. Where not possible, the following exceptions are permitted:
 - i. Parking in the rear of the lot, subject to accessory structure setbacks of their zoning district. Shared driveways are encouraged.
 - ii. A single-car garage, subject to meeting the minimum frontage requirements.

5.7.2. Bicycle parking is required as follows:

- a. Minimum bicycle parking requirements are as follows:
 - i. Bicycle parking is not required for single-family residential or multi-family residential with less than eight (8) units.
 - ii. Bicycle parking requirements shall be according to [Table 5.7.1](#).
 - iii. Bicycle parking locations within the public right-of-ways shall be coordinated with Public Works.

Table 5.7.1: Minimum Required Bicycle Parking

Use	Location	R-NC, R-NCB, R-2, C-1	C-2, C-3*
Multi-family Residential	Primary & Secondary Frontages	minimum 0.25 spaces per unit	minimum 0.5 spaces per unit
Non-residential	Primary & Secondary Frontages	minimum 0.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet	minimum 0.75 spaces per 1,000 square feet

* not adjacent to C3C

- b. Bicycle parking configuration is required as follows:
 - i. Bicycle racks shall not be located within:
 - (1) Five (5) feet of fire hydrants.
 - (2) Four (4) feet of loading zones and bus stop markers.
 - (3) Three (3) feet of driveways and manholes.
 - (4) Two (2) feet of utility meters and tree planters.
 - c. Bicycle parking located along private or public streets is subject to the following:
 - i. Bicycle racks installed parallel to curbs shall be set back from the curb a minimum of two (2) feet.
 - ii. Bicycle racks installed perpendicular to curbs shall allow for a minimum clearance of two feet at the curb and six (6) feet of pedestrian way with a 56cm bicycle properly locked to the rack.
 - iii. Bicycle racks should be spaced a minimum of 36 inches apart.
 - d. Bicycle racks shall allow bicycle frames to be locked at two points of contact with the rack.
- 5.7.3. Vehicular parking location is restricted as follows:
- a. Residential: single-family, duplex, and townhouse:
 - i. Off-street covered or garage parking for detached single-family and duplex buildings shall be set back a minimum 20 feet behind the principal building facade.
 - ii. Off-street parking for attached single-family residential shall only be permitted in the rear 50% of the lot.
 - iii. Residential off-street parking, where required, shall be provided within garages, carports or on driveways in residential zoning districts.
 - iv. The minimum distance between two driveways on the same lot shall be 20 feet.
 - v. Tandem parking is encouraged
 - vi. Shared driveways are encouraged
 - b. Multi-family residential and all other non-residential buildings:
 - i. Off-street parking shall not be permitted within the front setback area. Exceptions include:
 - (1) Properties which are adjacent to a thoroughfare identified as FDOT C3C Context Zone, shall conform to the Form Standards according to **Table 5.3.5 Hybrid Commercial**.
 - ii. Off-street parking shall be masked from frontages by liner buildings no less than 24 feet in depth.
 - iii. The ground floor of commercial buildings with a gross floor area less than 1,500 square feet is exempt from parking requirements.

5.8. FENCES AND WALLS


- 5.8.1. Where provided, fences and walls shall provide full enclosure.
- 5.8.2. Fences and walls are restricted according to [Table 5.4.1 Frontage Yard Types](#) and [Required Visibility Triangle Section 12-2-35](#).
- 5.8.3. Height of fences and walls shall comply with the following:
 - a. Height is limited to a minimum 30 inches and a maximum 42 inches within the front setback.
 - b. Height is limited to eight (8) feet beyond the building face at non-frontages.
- 5.8.4. Materials for fences and walls are limited as follows:
 - a. Approved materials include, but are not limited to wood, brick, stone, and wrought iron.
 - b. Vinyl is discouraged on all frontages.
 - c. Chain-link, exposed concrete block, barbed-wire and razor wire are prohibited.
 - d. Wood fences shall be a different 'picket' design to adjacent properties.
 - e. Wrought iron fences shall be painted if the principal building is painted. The use of wrought iron or brick fences shall be in conjunction with buildings which use masonry materials in their construction.
- 5.8.5. Where hedges are utilized along frontages, they shall be maintained at a minimum 30 inches and a maximum 42 inches in height.

5.9. WINDOWS & GLAZING

- 5.9.1. Windows shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. Windows shall be vertical in proportion
 - b. Windows shall have muntins, with the exception of commercial and office.
 - c. Window panes shall be vertical in proportion.
 - d. Single panes of glass shall not exceed 20 square feet, with the exception of commercial and office.
- 5.9.2. Glazing shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. Storefront glazing requirements, according to [Table 5.9.1](#).
 - b. For residential and mixed-use buildings, excluding commercial uses at grade, the percentage of glazed wall area shall be a minimum 20%.
 - c. Stained, reflective or tinted windows are prohibited, except as an accent window.


Table 5.9.1: Glazing Requirements**Residential**

At & Above Grade	Minimum 20% along frontages
-----------------------------	-----------------------------

**Multi-Family & Office**


Above Grade	Minimum 20% along frontages
--------------------	-----------------------------

At Grade	Minimum 35% along frontages
-----------------	-----------------------------

**Mixed-use**

Above Grade	Minimum 20% along frontages
--------------------	-----------------------------

At Grade	Minimum 70% along frontages
-----------------	-----------------------------



6. ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE STANDARDS

Refer to Appendix A for proposed edits to the Pensacola Code of Ordinances, Land Development Code Section 12-2-32. - Buffer yards, Section 12-6 Tree/Landscape Regulations, and Section 11-4-88 Placement of Trees and Poles.

Intent: Supplement the urban canopy, accommodate stormwater, increase access to open space and facilitate pedestrian movement throughout the existing block patterns to meet the urban design goals of the CRA.

A healthy tree canopy contributes to the health of citizens and the environment, and is fundamental to a vibrant pedestrian life and a well-defined public realm. Trees closely aligned to the street edge with consistent setbacks, provide a clear sense of enclosure of streets, enabling them to function as pedestrian-scaled outdoor rooms. The placement of trees along the edge of the sidewalk should be given particular attention as a major contributor to pedestrian activity. Trees and other native plants placed in drainage right-of-ways and parking islands contribute to the control of stormwater quantity and quality.

6.1. LANDSCAPE ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

6.1.1. Landscaping in frontage yards are subject to the requirements of [Table 5.4.1 Frontage Yard Types](#) and the following:

- a. For single-family and duplex lots, one tree for every lot or for every 50 feet of linear frontage along the right-of-way shall be preserved or planted. Trees planted to meet this requirement shall measure a minimum of three (3) inches DBH. If planted, the tree shall be a minimum of three (3) feet from the right-of-way.
- b. Ground vegetation or shrub plantings with spines, thorns, or needles that may present hazards to pedestrians, bicyclists, or vehicles must be maintained a minimum distance of two (2) feet from the edge of walkways.
- c. In single-family and duplex lots, trees shall be protected in accordance with [Section 12-2-10\(A\)\(5\)\(b\)](#).
- d. When off-street parking is located in front or side setbacks, a year-round landscaped hedge or wall along the street edge(s) of the parking lot shall be installed as a means of buffering, according to [Section 12-6-3\(B\)](#).
- e. Hedges planted along street right-of-ways shall be between three (3) and five (5) feet in height at maturity.

6.2. BUFFER YARDS

6.2.1. In addition to the buffer yard requirements of [Section 12-2-32](#) the following shall apply:

- a. Berms shall not be installed as part of a required buffer without review and approval by the City Engineering Department to ensure a proposed berm will not have a detrimental effect on adjacent properties by impeding or diverting stormwater flow.
- b. Berms shall be planted and stabilized to prevent erosion.
- c. Buffer yards may be used to create rain gardens or other stormwater facilities with the selection of appropriate plant material and approval of the City Engineering Department.

- d. Plants in these stormwater facilities shall be selected to meet any applicable buffer yard screening requirements, and they should be tolerant of periodic inundation and drought. It is recommended that native plants be selected from the *Florida Friendly Landscaping Guide to Plant Selection & Landscape Design*, Northern Region, and *Waterwise Landscapes* by the South Florida Water Management District, according to [Table 6.2.1 Bioretention & Rain Garden Plant List](#).

Table 6.2.1: Bioretention & Rain Garden Plant List	
Flowers	
Common Name	Scientific Name
Blue Flag Iris	Iris Hexagona
Cardinal Flower	Lobelia Cardinalis
Chipola Coreopsis	Coreopsis Integrifolia
Goldenrod	Solidago spp.
Swamp Sunflower	Helianthus Angustifolius
Spider Lily	Hymenocallis Latifolia
Swamp Lily	Crinum Americanum
Swamp Milkweed	Asclepias Perennis
Grasses	
Common Name	Scientific Name
Blue-Eyed Grass	Sisyrinchium Atlanticum Bicknell
Florida Gamma Grass	Tripsacum Floridanum
Muhly Grass	Muhlenbergia Capillaris
Path or Soft Rush	Juncus spp.
Rainlily	Zephyranthes spp.
River Oats	Chasmanthium Latifolium
Wiregrass	Aristida Stricta
Shrubs	
Common Name	Scientific Name
Beautyberry	Callicarpa Americana
Buttonbush	Cephalanthus Occidentalis
Virginia Willow	Itea Virginica
Wax Myrtle	Myrica Cerifera

Note: New suggested table to be inserted as Appendix C in Chapter 12-6

6.3. STREET TREES IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY

[to be administered by Public Works]

- 6.3.1. Street trees shall be provided as specified in [Section 12-6-3](#) except for single-family and duplex, and [Section 6.3.5](#) for all buildings.
- 6.3.2. ROW tree selections and placements shall be reviewed and approved by the city engineer prior to planting.
- 6.3.3. Greenway street tree plantings are required. When planted, they shall be in accordance with [Section 11-4-88](#) and [Section 12-6-3](#) except for single-family and duplex, and [Section 6.3.5](#) for all buildings.
- 6.3.4. Where required trees cannot be reasonably planted, payment in lieu of planting shall be made to a new and dedicated CRA tree planting fund, at the value established in [Section 12-6-6\(B\)\(5\)](#).
- 6.3.5. Street trees shall be planted as follows:
 - a. Trees planted three (3) feet or less from a public sidewalk shall have a minimum clearance of six feet and six inches (6'-6") between the public walking surface and the lowest branches at planting.
 - b. Mature trees shall be maintained at a minimum clearance of eight (8) feet above the public walking surface.
 - c. In greenways six (6) feet or more in width, trees shall be planted three (3) feet from the sidewalk, in those less than six (6) feet, trees shall be planted in the center.
 - d. One (1) tree shall be provided per 35 linear feet of public right-of-way frontage, where no underground utility conflicts exist.
 - e. Where overhead utilities occur, a tree with smaller size at maturity shall be selected.
 - f. Tree selections shall be from [Section 12-6 Appendix B](#). Palm trees are not acceptable for use as street trees.
 - g. Where the greenway is less than three (3) feet wide, between sidewalk and curb, street trees should be planted on the lot, where practical.

- 6.3.6. Commercial and mixed-use buildings shall comply with the following:
- a. Where galleries, arcades or colonnades are not provided, street trees shall be planted, unless in conflict with underground utilities. Where there are overhead utilities, appropriate species from [Section 12-6, Appendix B, Tree Replant List](#) shall be selected.
 - b. Where a gallery, arcade or colonnade is provided, and the greenway that occurs between the sidewalk and the back of curb is less than three (3) feet wide, no street trees are required.
 - c. Where a greenway at least three (3) feet wide occurs between the arcaded sidewalk and the back of curb, and no overhead or underground utilities prevent street tree installation, planting of a columnar variety street tree is required.
 - d. Where paved surface occurs between the arcade and curb, installation of street trees in individual tree pits with tree grates, or linear planters with pervious pavers between several trees, is required.
 - e. Where trees are planted in sidewalk planters, the minimum sidewalk planting pit dimensions shall be four feet by four feet (4' x 4').

7. ADDITIONAL THOROUGHFARE STANDARDS

7.1. LOCAL STREET DESIGN

- 7.1.1. Design of local streets should be guided by the Florida Greenbook, Chapter 19 Traditional Neighborhood Design.
- 7.1.2. Driveway aprons should not be permitted to interrupt sidewalks.

7.2. STATE STREET DESIGN

- 7.2.1. The Context Classification system, as developed by FDOT, should be adopted to identify place and guide streets and other transportation features, to allow transportation to support adjacent land uses.
- 7.2.2. Streets should be classified as one of the following:
 - a. Classification C4-Urban General
 - b. Classification C5-Urban Center
 - c. Classification C3C Suburban Commercial:
 - i. Should be limited to locations adjacent to Industrial areas and commercial areas that are not envisioned to be walkable.
- 7.2.3. The following table equates the Context Classifications with applicable zoning districts.

Table 7.2.1: Zoning to Context Classification Translation	
Context Classification (FDOT)	Zoning Districts
C4 - Urban General	R-1AA
	R-1A
	R-1B
C5 - Urban Center	R-NC
	R-NCB
	C-1
	C-2
	C-3
C3C - Suburban Commercial	C-3
	M-1
	M-2

8. ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS

Arcade means a series of arches, supported by columns, or piers. Arcades may cover sidewalks and may front retail storefronts.

Building height, *single-family residential*, means the vertical distance of a building measured from the average elevation of the finished grade to the bottom of the eave.

Building height, *multi-family and non-residential*, means the vertical distance of a building measured by stories. The restrictions to story height are according to [Section 5.1](#).

Cluster Court means a collection of buildings on a semi-public, privately owned open space.

Colonnade means a row of columns joined by an entablature. Colonnades may cover sidewalks and may front retail storefronts.

[FDOT] Distinct Context Classifications Zone means classifications, along with functional classification and design speed, determine the corresponding thoroughfare design standards within the Florida Design Manual. (<http://www.fdot.gov/roadway/CSI/files/FDOT-context-classification.pdf>)

Entablature means a horizontal, continuous building element supported by columns or a wall.

Facade, building, means the exterior wall of a building that is set along a frontage line.

Facade Type means the different configurations of building elements that make up a building facade, such as a storefront, porch, etc. [See Table 5.5.1](#)

Frontage line means a property line bordering a public frontage. Facades facing frontage lines define the public realm and are therefore more regulated than the elevations facing other property lines.

Frontage Occupation means the length of the frontage that is occupied by a building.

Frontage Yard Type means the configuration of the area between the facade of the building and the frontage line such as a standard, shallow, cluster court, etc. [See Table 5.4.1](#)

Gallery means a covered sidewalk in front of a retail storefront that supports either a roof or outdoor balcony above.

Habitable Space means building space which use involves human presence with direct view of the enfronting streets or public or private open space, excluding parking garages, self-service storage facilities, warehouses, and display windows separated from retail activity.

Parkway, Greenway, Verge means the planting strip between the edge of the road and sidewalk or right-of-way, which may be used for tree planting. [See Section 11-4-86 through 11-4-88.](#)

Streetscreen means a freestanding wall built along the frontage line, or aligned with the facade. It may mask a parking lot from the thoroughfare, provide privacy to a side yard, and/or strengthen the spatial definition of the public realm.

Chapter 12-2. Zoning District

Article VIII: CRA Overlay District

Appendix A: Code Revisions

We are recommending the following edits to your zoning code, for the CRA areas only, separate to the proposed Urban Design Standards and Guidelines.

Sec. 12-2-81. - Development plan requirements.

(B) *General conditions, procedures and standards.*

- (1) *Preapplication conference.* Prior to submitting a formal application for approval of a proposed new development plan or plan for an addition to an existing development, the owners(s) shall request a preapplication conference with the staff of the Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development, engineering department, the Inspection Services Department, the department of leisure services, the traffic engineer, the fire department, the architectural review board, the Escambia County Utilities Authority, and/or other appropriate staff to review:
 - (a) The relationship between the proposed development plan and the surrounding Context Classifications, land usage and the Comprehensive Plan of the city.
 - (b) The adequacy of the existing and proposed vehicular and pedestrian context, character and right-of-way, utilities and other public facilities and services, which will serve the proposed development.
 - (c) The character, design and applicability of the following factors:
 1. Traffic control;
 2. Walkability and Complete Street character;
 32. Noise reduction;
 43. Sign and light control;
 54. Preservation of open space and visual corridors;
 65. Police and fire protection;
 76. Storm drainage;
 87. Landscaping;
 98. Fencing and screening; and
 109. Other matters specifically relevant to the proposed development site necessary to foster desirable living and working conditions and compatibility with the existing environment;

At the time of the preapplication conference, the developer shall provide a sketch plan indicating the location of the proposed development and its contextual relationship to surrounding properties. The advisory meeting should provide insight to both the developer

and the city staff regarding potential development problems which might otherwise result in costly plan revisions or unnecessary delay in development. At this time a decision will be made as to whether the review process will require a separate preliminary and final plan or if they can be combined.

(C) *Contents of the preliminary development plan.*

(2) *Existing conditions, including:*

- (b) Zoning districts, Context Classifications, major shopping areas, residential areas, public buildings, rights-of-way, public utilities and other major facilities surrounding the proposed development for a radius of three hundred (300) feet;

(3) *Proposed development.* Preliminary layout showing as applicable:

- (b) General location of all existing and proposed off-street parking and loading areas and roadways, by type and complete street design, including expected travel modes and width of right-of-way and paved streets;

(D) *Contents of final development plan.* The final development plan may be on several sheets. However, in that event, an index shall be provided. For a large project, the final development plan may be submitted for approval progressively in contiguous sections satisfactory to the planning board.

(2) *Existing conditions.* The same information as required in paragraph (B)(2) shall be provided with the addition of the following detailed information:

- (a) Existing streets, both on and within three hundred (300) feet of the proposed development, shall be described including:

1. Street names;
2. Right-of-way width of each street;
3. Parking design, on-street and off-street;
4. Medians and median cuts locations.

(3) *Proposed development.* The same information as required in paragraph (B)(3) shall be provided with the addition of the following detailed information:

- (b) Location of existing and proposed land uses and exact locations of all existing and proposed improvements including:

1. Buildings and structures;
2. Curb cuts;
3. Driveways and interior drives;
4. On-street and ~~Off~~-street parking and loading;
5. Storage facilities;
6. Proposed roadways, by type and by Context Classification, including width of right-of-way and paved streets; and
7. Traffic control features and signage.

(g) Design for Walkability based on area's Context Classification;

Sec. 12-2-82. - Design standards and guidelines (for the CRA areas).

(A) *Purpose.* The requirements set forth in this subsection are intended to coordinate land development in accordance with orderly physical patterns; to implement goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan; to provide for adequate access to building sites for ingress and egress; to achieve context based Complete Streets; to improve the physical appearance of the city, and; to preserve the environmental character of the city.

(C) *Design standards.* Except where specific approval is granted by the city engineer and city planner due to unique and peculiar circumstances or needs resulting from the size, configuration or location of a site requiring a modification of the standards as set forth below, the minimum standards shall be as follows:

(1) *Streets and rights-of-way.* Whenever public or private streets, rights-of-way, pedestrian ways, bikeways or driveway approaches are to be constructed as part of any development after the effective date of this chapter, they shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of this paragraph. Whenever existing public or private streets, rights-of-way, pedestrian ways, bikeways or driveway approaches abutting a development do not meet the requirements of this paragraph, the city engineer may require that they be improved to conform to these requirements.

(a) Driveway approaches and curb cuts.

1. Width (residential except multifamily). In properties developed for residential use (except multifamily), curbcuts and driveway approach shall conform to the following requirements:

	Minimum Driveway	Maximum Driveway
Driveway	12 <u>10</u> feet	24 <u>20</u> feet
Joint-use driveway	20 <u>10</u> feet	24 <u>22</u> feet

2. Width (residential multifamily). Properties developed for residential multifamily use shall have curbcuts for driveways not ~~less~~ more than twenty-four (24) feet wide ~~and not more than forty (40) feet wide.~~
3. Width (nonresidential). Properties developed for commercial use shall have curbcuts for driveways not less than twelve (12) feet nor more than ~~forty~~ twenty-four (~~40~~24) feet wide.
5. Spacing. Where more than one (1) curbcut is to be located on any single property, the minimum distance between such curbcuts on local streets shall be forty-two (42) feet, and on all arterial and collector streets shall be in accordance with the requirements set forth in subsection (2) below. Exceptions shall be permitted for individual lots, less than forty-two (42) feet wide.

- (d) Street improvements. All streets and public ways shall be paved and curbed in accordance with standards established by the city engineer, including context based Complete Streets and the following requirements:
1. Additional improvements for existing thoroughfares. Where any existing arterial or collector lying within or abutting a proposed development requires construction of ~~additional~~ a different number of lanes or other improvements to meet the standards of the city engineer, the amount of construction required (or money escrowed) for such improvements shall be commensurate with the impact of the proposed development.
 2. Missing arterial or collector links. Where there are missing segments in the arterial or collector system or new arterials or collectors are to be constructed which are context based and designated in the Comprehensive Plan, such segments lying within or abutting the proposed development shall be improved (or money escrowed in an appropriate manner) by the developer along with other required improvements. Where such construction creates an undue hardship in a particular case, appeals are available in accordance with chapter 12-13.
 3. Traffic control devices. context based Intersection improvements and traffic control devices such as acceleration, deceleration, and turning lanes, signalization devices, and other traffic control devices required by the development shall be installed at the developer's expense in accordance with the State of Florida Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and the latest adopted Florida Greenbook.
 4. Improvements required to nearest acceptable paved public street. Each development shall abut, or have as its primary access, a street improved to the minimum context based requirements of the city engineer. Wherever the abutting street does not meet these requirements, the developer shall construct the street where it abuts the development and to the nearest structurally acceptable paved public street as determined by the city engineer.
- (e) Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be required on all street frontages in residential, nonresidential, commercial and industrial developments in accordance with context based standards established by the city engineer.
- (2) *Driveway and curbcut design along arterial and collector streets.* Recognizing that the traffic movement function of arterial and collector streets can be compromised by the provision of unlimited access to individual properties. Whenever any building site will require vehicular access from an arterial or collector street as designated on the city's adopted Future Traffic Circulation Map, the development shall be designed in accordance with the Context classification and the requirements of this paragraph.
- (a) Driveways and curbcuts. In addition to any applicable driveway approach and curbcut requirements of subsection (1) above, the following standards shall apply:

1. Curbscut spacing. The minimum distance between curbcuts on any one block face, shall be context based and whether or not such curbcuts are located on the same property, shall be based upon the posted speed of the thoroughfare, in accordance with the following schedule:

Posted Speed	Minimum Spacing
30 Mph	125 ft.
35 Mph	150 ft.
40 Mph	175 ft.
45 Mph	200 ft.
50+ Mph	250 ft.

Curbcuts in areas with Context Classifications C-4 or greater shall be designed for greatest walkability with posted speeds that may be 15, 20 or 25 mph.

2. Spacing reductions and joint-use driveways. Where the existing configuration of properties and curbcuts in the vicinity of the building site precludes spacing of a curbscut access in accordance with the schedule above, the city engineer shall be authorized to reduce the spacing requirement if he finds that all of the following conditions have been met: wherever feasible, the city engineer shall require the establishment of a joint-use driveway serving two (2) abutting building sites, with cross-access easements provided; the property owner shall agree to close and eliminate any pre-existing curbcuts on the building site after the construction of both sides of the joint-use driveway; and where feasible, the building site shall incorporate unified access and circulation in accordance with the requirements of subsection (2)(a)3. below.
 3. Unified access and circulation. The planning director, in coordination with the city engineer, shall be authorized to designate context based cross-access corridors on properties adjacent to arterial or collector streets. Such designation may be made in connection with the approval of any site plan within the affected area, or as part of an overall planning program. The planning director, in coordination with the city engineer, shall be authorized to modify the requirements of this subparagraph where he finds that abutting properties have been so developed that it is clearly impractical to create a unified access and circulation system within part or all of the affected area.
- (3) *Public facilities.* All developments shall be provided with sufficient, context based utility easements including potable water, sanitary sewer, electric power and light, telephone, natural gas, cable television, and any other franchised utilities, including access for maintenance. Sufficient easements shall be provided for stormwater management facilities, including access for maintenance. Based on the unique character of each Context Classification, Aall public and private street networks and parking lots shall be designed to allow easy access for solid waste disposal and emergency service vehicles. In addition to new development, any remodeling, enlargement, reconstruction or redesign of any existing building site for specific uses and within the Gateway Redevelopment District and the resource

protection overlay districts shall require submittal of a drainage plan to ensure that stormwater management requirements are met pursuant to chapter 12-9 of this title.

(7) *Parking.*

- (a) The city discourages construction of more than the minimum number of parking spaces required by this title, ~~in order so~~ that more natural vegetation may be preserved, greater walkability design might be achieved and ~~in order~~ to control stormwater runoff in a more natural manner. Parking in excess of more than ten (10) spaces or ten (10) percent (whichever is greater) above the parking total dictated by chapter 12-3 will require an administrative waiver as described in subsection 12-2-82(C) of this section.

Site design should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian, complete street environment, adjacent properties and pedestrian safety.

- (c) The following are some examples of techniques used to minimize the impacts of driveways and parking lots.

1. Locate surface parking at the rear or side of the zoning lot.
2. Break large parking lots into multiple smaller ones.
3. Minimize the number and width of driveways and curb cuts.
4. Share driveways with abutting zoning lots.
5. Locate parking in less visible areas of the site.
6. Locate driveways so they are visually less dominant.
7. Provide special pavers or other surface treatments to enhance and separate pedestrian areas from vehicle maneuvering and parking areas.
8. Off-street ~~P~~parking located along a commercial street front where pedestrian traffic is desirable lessens the attractiveness of the area to pedestrians and compromises the safety of pedestrians along the street. On-street parking enhances walkability for urban Context Classification areas (C4 to C6) and is strongly encouraged. On-site (off-street) surface parking on a commercial street front should be minimized and where possible should be located behind a building.

- (9) *Non-residential site lighting.* Non-residential and multiple-family developments, shall be designed to provide safe and efficient lighting for pedestrians and vehicles. Lighting shall be designed in a consistent and coordinated manner for the entire site (including outparcels). Lighting shall be designed so as to enhance the visual impact of the project and/or should be designed to blend into the surrounding landscape. Lighting design and installation shall ensure that lighting accomplishes on-site lighting needs without intrusion on adjacent properties and shall meet the following design requirements:

- (a) Fixture (luminaire). When feasible, the light source shall be completely concealed within an opaque housing and shall not be visible from any street right-of-way or adjacent properties.
- (b) Light source (lamp). Only florescent, LED, metal halide, or color corrected high-pressure sodium may be used. The same light source type must be used for the same or similar types of lighting on any one site throughout any development.

- (c) Mounting. Fixtures shall be mounted in such a manner that the maximum candela from each fixture is contained on-site and does not cross any property line of the site.

(d) Height. Pole mounted street lighting shall be pedestrian scale with a maximum of 16 feet within Context Classification areas C4, C5 and C6.

- (d) Limit lighting to periods of activity. The use of controls such as, but not limited to, photocells, occupancy sensors or timers to activate lighting during times when it will be needed may be required by the director of community development, or their designee, to conserve energy, provide safety, and promote compatibility between different land uses.

(D) *Design guidelines.* Most development in the city is located on infill or redevelopment sites; therefore, projects should take their surroundings and context into account. These recommended design guidelines are intended as suggested methods to improve the character and fit of new development and to encourage respect for how architecture, landscape features, and public improvements help establish context, and steadily improve the quality of the city's residential and commercial neighborhoods. These guidelines are intended for designers and developers to look closely at the context and area surrounding their specific project and create developments that enhance and complement the built and natural environment. The design guidelines are flexible in their application and maybe applied to specific projects during review by city staff and any applicable review board(s). The intent is to create the highest level of design quality while providing the needed flexibility for creative site design. Use of the following design guidelines is a means for addressing urban design, aesthetic and environmental concerns in the development process.

- (2) Building design and architectural elements. The placement of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as irregular-shaped lots, location on prominent intersections, views, or other natural features. On-site surface parking should be visually minimized and where possible should be located behind a building. Site characteristics to consider in building design include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (f) The placement and orientation of buildings ~~should~~ shall be context based, according to the adopted Context Classification areas and also acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the public right-of-way. For example, a multi-story mixed use building proposed for a C5 and C6 Classification, downtown corner zoning lot ~~shall~~ should reinforce the existing streetscape by utilizing the ground level for pedestrian oriented retail and restaurants and maintaining a consistent building edge abutting the sidewalk.

- (g) Building entrances should be clearly visible from the street. Using entries that are visible from the street makes a project more approachable and creates a sense of association with neighboring structures.

- (h) New development and redevelopment in Context Classifications C4, C5 and C6 ~~shall~~ should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street. To accomplish this end, entrances, porches, balconies, decks, seating and other elements can be designed to promote use of the street front and provide places for human interaction. For example, for commercial developments such elements can include shop front windows, outdoor seating/dining, rooftop decks, balconies, and canopies that protect pedestrians from the elements.

- (i) Development projects in that area adjacent to a less-intensive zoning district with differing development standards, may create substantial adverse impacts that result from inappropriate height, bulk and scale relative to their neighbors. Careful siting and design

treatments can help mitigate some height, bulk and scale impacts; in other cases, actual reduction in the height, bulk and scale of a project ~~are advisable to adequately can~~ mitigate adverse effects. In some instances, careful, context based siting and design treatment may be sufficient to achieve reasonable transition and mitigation of height, bulk and scale differences. Some techniques for achieving compatibility are:

3. Location of features in Context Classification C3, on-site to facilitate transition, such as locating required open space on the zone district edge so the building is located farther from the lesser intensity zone district. In Classifications C4 and higher, walkability between varying land uses should guide site design.
 4. In a mixed-use project, siting the more compatible use(s) near the zone district edge, while designing for high degrees of walkability.
- (k) Architectural context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.
2. In cases where an existing architectural context is either not well defined, or may be undesirable, a well-designed new project has the opportunity to establish a pattern or identity that future redevelopment can build on.
- (3) Human scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements and details that achieve a desirable human scale through the use of human-proportioned architectural features and site design elements clearly oriented to higher walkability and other human activity. Building elements that may be used to achieve human scale are as follows:
- a. In Context Classifications C4 and greater, pPedestrian-oriented storefront windows and doors shall directly ~~face~~ing the street or publicly accessible open space such as courtyards, gardens, patios, or other unified landscaped areas.

Sec. 12-2-4. - Medium density residential land use district regulations.

Table 12-2.2

Standards	R-1AAA	CRA R-1AA		
		SF	SFA Duplex	SFA TH
Maximum Residential Gross Density	4.8	8.7	11.6 14	11.6 18
Minimum Lot Area	9000-sf	5000-sf	7500-sf	3750-sf
Lot Width at Minimum Building Setback Line	75 ft	40 ft	60 ft	30 ft
Minimum Lot Width at Street ROW Line	50 ft	40 30 ft	50 30 ft	25 16 ft
Front Setback <u>(max.)</u>	30 ft	30 20 ft		30 8 ft
Side Setback <u>(min.)</u>	7.5 ft	5 6 ft		0 or 5 6 ft
Rear Setback <u>(min.)</u>	30 ft	5 30 ft		
Off-Street Parking (Space / unit) <u>(min.)</u>		1		1 2
Maximum Building Height	35 ft	45 35 ft		

Table 12-2.2

Standards	CRA R-1A		
	SF	SFA Duplex	SFA TH
Maximum Residential Gross Density	12.4	17.4	17.4 2418
Minimum Lot Area	3500-sf	5000-sf	2500-sf
Lot Width at Minimum Building Setback Line	30 ft	50 ft	25 ft
Minimum Lot Width at Street ROW Line	30 ft	50 30 ft	25 16 ft
Front Setback <u>(max.)</u>	20 ft		20 8 ft
Side Setback <u>(min.)</u>	5 ft		0 or 5 5 ft
Rear Setback <u>(min.)</u>	25 5 ft		
Off-Street Parking (Space / unit) <u>(min.)</u>	1		2 1
Max. Building Height	35 ft	35 45 ft	

Table 12-2.3

Standards	<u>CRA</u> R-1B		
	SF	SFA Duplex	SFA TH
Maximum Residential Gross Density	8.7	11.6 <u>17.4</u>	17.4 <u>24</u>
Front Setback (<u>max.</u>)	10 ft	10 <u>8</u> ft	
Side Setback (<u>min.</u>)	5 ft	5 <u>0 or 5</u> ft	
Rear Setback (<u>min.</u>)	10 ft	10 ft (<u>5</u>)	
Off-Street Parking (Space / unit) (<u>min.</u>)	1		1 <u>2</u>
Max. Building Height (<u>max.</u>)	45 ft.		
Lot Coverage Requirements (Res. SF, Duplex, TH)	50% max.	50 <u>75</u> % max.	
Lot Coverage Requirements (Other)	1-4 Stories 5-7 Stories 8-9 Stories	30% 25% 20%	

Sec. 12-2-7. - Residential/neighborhood commercial land use district.

Table 12-2.6

Standards	<u>CRA</u> R-NC	
	Within 100 ft of SF District	Over 100 ft of SF District
Max. Building Height	35 <u>ft 4</u> Stories	45 ft
Front Setback (<u>max.</u>)	<u>5</u> 15 ft	<u>15</u> 10 ft
Side Setback (<u>min.</u>)	<u>0 – 5</u> 5 ft	5 ft
Rear Setback (<u>min.</u>)	15 <u>ft</u> <u>None</u>	10 ft
Lot Coverage Requirements (Res. SF, Duplex, TH) (<u>max.</u>)	<u>75</u> 50 %	
Lot Coverage Requirements (Other)	1-4 Stories 5-7 Stories 8-9 Stories	30% 25% 20%
Max. Floor Area for Uses Under 12-2-7	4000 sf	

Sec. 12-2-8. - Commercial land use district.

Table 12-2.7

Standards	C-1	C-2A	<u>CRA</u> R-C, C-2, C-3
Setbacks	N/A / 20 ft near res	Max. 10 ft	N/A / 20 ft near res (15 max.)
<u>Lot Width (min.)</u>		<u>16 ft.</u>	
<u>Front Setback (max.)</u>		<u>5 / 15 ft.</u>	
<u>Side Setback (min.)</u>		<u>0 / 5 ft.</u>	
<u>Rear Setback</u>		<u>None</u>	
Max. Building Height	45 ft	100 ft <u>10 stories</u>	
Lot Coverage	70% up to 100 ft bldg height 65% over 100 ft bldg height	100% up to 100 ft bldg height 90% over 100 ft bldg height <u>100% max.</u>	100% up to 100 ft bldg height 90% over 100 ft bldg height Outside of dense business area: 75% put to 100 ft bldg height 65% over 100 ft bldg height
Max. MF Density	135 du/ac	135 du/ac	135 du/ac Outside dense business area: 35 du/ac

CHAPTER 12-6. TREE/LANDSCAPE REGULATIONS^[4]

Sec. 12-6-1. - Purpose.

The purpose of this chapter is to establish protective regulations for trees and landscaped areas within the city, and to provide for the planting of Street Trees and Lot/Shade Trees for new residential or non-residential development. Such areas preserve the ecological balance of the environment, control erosion, sedimentation and stormwater runoff, provide shade and reduce heat and glare, abate noise pollution, and buffer incompatible land uses. The intent of this chapter is to encourage the preservation of existing trees, and to increase the tree canopy to develop a more walkable community. It is critical that a balance be maintained between developed areas and natural/landscaped areas with appropriate existing and/or newly planted trees and other vegetation. The intent is also to provide for the future of our citizens through maintaining vital vegetative species that will reproduce for future generations.

Sec. 12-6-2. - Applicability.

- (C) *Exemptions.* All single-family and duplex uses are exempt from the provisions of this chapter, except as provided for in sections 11-4-86 through 11-4-88 (parkways), section XX (frontage yards), section 12-2-35 (visibility triangle), section 12-2-32 (buffer yards), subsection 12-6-2(D) (heritage trees) and subsection 12-6-6(D) (new subdivisions). The C-2A downtown retail commercial district is exempt from the provisions of this chapter, except as provided for in subsections 12-6-6(A), (E), (F), and (G). All healthcare related uses of property owned or controlled by an entity which is licensed as an acute care hospital under F.S. Ch. 395, owned or controlled by a parent company of an entity which is licensed as an acute care hospital under F.S. Ch. 395 are exempt from the provisions of this chapter, except as provided for in section 12-6-3 and subsections 12-6-6(A), (C), (E), (F), and (G). In conjunction with the development of any such healthcare related use, a payment of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) per acre of new developed impervious surface area shall be made to the tree planting trust fund. The designated clear zone areas around the Pensacola Regional Airport and any other area identified by the airport manager and approved by the city council as critical to aircraft operations shall be exempt from this chapter.
- (E) *DBH.* All tree measurements for existing trees shall be taken at Diameter Breast Height (DBH), which is the diameter of the tree at four and one-half (4½) feet (54 inches) above ground. If the tree has a bump or branch at four and one-half (4½) feet above ground then DBH shall be measured immediately below the bump or branch. If the tree is growing vertically on a slope, DBH shall be measured from the midpoint of the trunk along the slope. If the tree is leaning, DBH shall be measured from the midpoint of the lean. If the tree forks below or near DBH the tree shall be measured at the narrowest part of the main stem below the fork. If the tree splits into more than one (1) trunk close to ground level, DBH shall be determined by measuring each of the trunks separately

Sec. 12-6-3. - Landscaping requirements.

The following landscaping requirements apply to all types of land uses and zoning districts listed in section 12-6-2 of this chapter:

- (A) *Landscape area requirements.* The minimum percentage of the total developable site, which shall be devoted to landscaping, unless otherwise specified in this chapter, shall be as follows:

ZONING DISTRICT		PERCENT
R-ZL, R-2A, R-2B, R-2	25
R-NC, C-1, C-2 , R-C	25
C-1, C-2 , C-3, M-1, M-2	20-15
SSD, ATZ-1, ATZ-2	25

- (B) *Off-street parking and vehicle use areas.* Off-street parking regulations apply to all parking facilities of twenty (20) spaces or more. Off-street parking facilities and other vehicular use areas shall meet the following requirements:

- (1) *Perimeter requirements.* A ten-foot wide strip of privately owned land, located along the front and/or side property line(s) adjacent to a street right-of-way shall be landscaped. In no case shall this strip be less than ten (10) feet wide. Width of sidewalks shall not be included within the ten-foot wide perimeter landscape area. This perimeter landscape requirement shall be credited toward the percentage required for the total developable site in subsection 12-6-3(A), above. Exemptions from the ten-foot wide strip only shall be permitted for R-NC, R-NCB, C-1 and C-2 zones.

APPENDIX B TREE REPLANT LIST

<i>A. Small Trees:</i>	
7.	Glossy Privet (<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>) CAT 1 INVASIVE – REMOVE -www.fleppc.org

Sec. 12-2-32. - Buffer yards.

TABLE 12-2.11 RECOMMENDED VEGETATION LIST FOR BUFFER YARD VISUAL SCREEN

Thorny elaeagnus (<i>Elaeagnus pungens</i>) CAT II INVASIVE – REMOVE -www.fleppc.org
--

Sec. 11-4-88. - Placement of trees and poles.

In greenways of a width of six (6) feet or more, poles and trees shall be planted three (3) feet from the sidewalk, in those less than six (6) feet, trees must be planted in the center. [See section 12-6 \(D\) Greenway / Street tree planting requirements. \(6.4 Street trees in the public right-of-way\)](#)

DRAFT