### Planned Unit Developments – Real World Experiences

**Comparison of Case Studies**

| **City** (ord. date(s)) | **Purpose & Special Emphasis** | **Density and/or  Height Bonus?** | **Use Flexibility?** | **Street Design Flexibility?** | **Unique Provisions** | **Results?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Bellevue** (1986-2009) | Variety in type, design and arrangement of structures;  Special emphasis on protection of critical areas | 10% maximum;  Some height flexibility;  Large sites (5 acres+) = up to 30% density bonus for additional conservation design features | No | No – compliance with Transportation Department Design Guidelines | Ordinance was updated in 2006 together with Critical Areas Ordinance. The update added a special conservation design features matrix; Projects must have 40% of gross land area encompassing conservation design features. | Since Bellevue is largely built-out, there have only been six projects completed since the last PUD ordinance update in 2006; Most projects have been relatively small and all involve critical areas. While some projects have utilized density bonuses, the primary reason for doing a PUD is to get relief from strict lot size minimums in applicable zones. |
| **Whatcom County** (1989-2009) | Innovative & efficient land use and design; Flexibility in zoning requirements; Permanent open space; | Up to 35% increase based on use of incentive list items to choose from:   * 15% base increase * 10% for common open space improvements * 10% historic preservation * 10% energy efficiency * 10% renewable energy * 15% shoreline public access * 15% alley access   Up to 50% height bonus possible | Yes, some flexibility for commercial uses in residential zone and vice versa | Yes | Project must be within UGA and at least 2 acres in size; Extensive perimeter design criteria  Reduction in parking possible | Nearly all PUDs are in Birch Bay – an unincorporated UGA island – most are single family developments and none have used the density bonus provision;  All are impacted by critical areas – thus asking for reduced setbacks and changes to road standards;  County has been slow to enforce PUD conditions of approval |
| **Marysville** (2006) | Planned Residential Developments: Allow design flexibility and performance criteria; Emphasis on housing type choices, open space, environmental preservation, and compact development | Includes very prescriptive parameters to allow modifications to parking and dimensional standards;  Includes special residential density incentives chapter that applies to PRD’s. Big list of 10 bonus benefit items to choose from – each with distinct bonus calculation; Benefit topics range from affordable housing to energy conservation; No max % or number of density bonus increase – you can use all ten – max bonus is tied to each benefit element. | Flexibility in housing types with max #’s & type of multifamily housing | Includes special PRD access street standards, but allows flexibility provided design meets special criteria | One acre minimum size;  Includes both required criteria and optional criteria - PRD’s must include at least 2 optional criteria;  Includes prescriptive standards for small lot development (<5k lots); | Three PUD’s have gone through the system since its 2006 adoption, but only one development since 2008 (economic slowdown). The flexibility with housing types has been the biggest factor in their use; The subdivision ordinance allows considerable flexibility in design, so it often reduces the need or desire to do a PRD. |
| **Chelan:** Planned Development District(1994) | Permits flexibility in design, development and uses – consistent with the comp plan; But only if the type of development wouldn’t be allowed in another zoning district. | Yes – there is flexibility in the density level, but no parameters are included | Yes – no specific use parameters are included; Applicants must submit supporting market analysis and address service & utility impacts | Yes, but no specifics are provided | The ordinance encourages innovative development but there are two notable features that stand out:   * It only allows a type of development that wouldn’t be allowed in another zoning district (but interpretation of this has been a challenge) * There’s a notable lack of parameters and guidelines to assist applicants and staff in decision making on projects. | While the innovative provisions are good, the lack of parameters and design criteria make the ordinance difficult to administer;  Most applicants appear to use provision to circumvent code – but the City is not getting innovative development and desirable amenities in large part due to the lack of “teeth” in the code. |