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The form-based movement is strong…. 

March 2010: 
– 294 FBC’s adopted or under development in US and Canada 
– 40 states and 3 provinces
Get to Know the Neighborhood Types

The New Code is about balancing form and function all set within the context of surrounding areas. Learn about the 6 Neighborhood Types in the New Zoning Code.

Some factors include pedestrian activity.

Differing types of land use and transportation.

Neighborhood contexts are based on block pattern.

Have a voice. Attend a meeting.

It's the best way to weigh in on the New Code. Search by time.

Questions from the Community

Learn about Denver's new approach to Form Based Zoning.

Zoning Blogs

Learn about Denver's new approach to Form Based Zoning.
# Denver Neighborhood Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Suburban Neighborhood Image 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Suburban Neighborhood Image 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Suburban Neighborhood Image 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Edge Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="urban_1.png" alt="Urban Edge Neighborhood Image 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="urban_2.png" alt="Urban Edge Neighborhood Image 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="urban_3.png" alt="Urban Edge Neighborhood Image 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="urban_1.png" alt="Urban Neighborhood Image 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="urban_2.png" alt="Urban Neighborhood Image 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="urban_3.png" alt="Urban Neighborhood Image 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Apartment

**HEIGHT**
- Stories (min/max): 2/3, 2/5, 2/8, 2/8
- Feet, Pitched Roof (max): 40', 65', 100', 100'
- Feet, Flat Roof (max): 35', 60', 94', 94'
- Wall Plate Height (max): 11', 53', 86', 86'
- Finished Ground Floor Height (min/max): 1' 4", 1' 4", 1' 4", 1' 4"

**ZONE LOT AND BLOCK**
- Zone Lot Size (min/max): 
- Zone Lot Width (min): 
- Zone Lot Block Size (max): 
- Primary Structures per Zone Lot (min/max): 1/1, 1/1, 1/1, 1/1

**USE**
- Dwelling Units per Primary Structure (min/max): 3/no max, 3/no max, 3/no max, 3/no max

**STREET SETBACKS**
- Primary Street (min/max): 0' 10", 0' 10", 0' 10", 0' 10"
- Side Street (min/max): 0' 10", 0' 10", 0' 10", 0' 10"

**REQUIRED STREET FRONTAGE**
- Primary Street (min): 50%, 50%, 50%, 50%
- Side Street (min): 30%, 30%, 30%, 30%

**INTERIOR SETBACKS**
- Primary Street Setback (min): 0', 0', 0', 0'
- Side Street Setback (min): 10', 10', 10', 10'
- Setback Abutting Res. Zone District (min): 5', 5', 5', 5'

**CONFIGURATION**
- Overall Structure Width, Primary Street (max): 150', 150', 150', 150'
- Overall Structure Length, Side Street (max): 150', 150', 150', 150'
- Vertical Articulation Required (see Sec. 7.3.2): No
- Vertical Articulation Required (see Sec. 7.3.2): No

**TRANSPARENCY**
- Ground Story, Primary Street (min): 30%, 30%, 30%, 30%
- Ground Story, Side Street (min): 25%, 25%, 25%, 25%

**COURTYARD CONFIGURATION**
- % of Required Open Space to be Provided in Courtyard (min): 

**ENTRY FEATURES**
- Required Entry Features, Primary Street (see Sec. 3.3): (1) Front Porch; (2) Stoop; or (3) Canopy
Is it a Form-Based Code?
Form-Based Codes Institute

– Is the code's focus primarily on regulating urban form and less on land use?
– Does the code emphasize standards and parameters for form with predictable physical outcomes (build-to lines, frontage type requirements, etc.) rather than relying on numerical parameters (FAR, density, etc.) whose outcomes are impossible to predict?
– Does the code require private buildings to shape public space through the use of building form standards with specific requirements for building placement?
"True" Form-Based Codes

Form-Based Building Types
6.2 Live/Work Building (Type II)

Live/Work Building is a dwelling unit that contains a limited extent, a retail or office component. A live/work building is generally a fee-simple unit on its own lot with the retail or office component limited to the first floor.

Allowed Transect Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T4 Corner Lots</th>
<th>T3 by exception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Allowed Uses by Floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>No Applicable Standard</td>
<td>building area available for retail use is limited to the first story of block corner locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>No Applicable Standard</td>
<td>building area available for office use is limited to the first story of block corner locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>maximum of one accessory unit per main structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All uses</td>
<td>use limited by the parking standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intensity of Use

Landscape Plantings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frontage Type</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storefront</td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcade</td>
<td>Dooryard</td>
<td>6 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace/Light Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*landscape plantings shall be located between the frontage line and the building facade

Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>All use:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>No Minimum</td>
<td>1 space / dwelling unit min.</td>
<td>off-street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office or Retail</td>
<td>No Minimum</td>
<td>??? 2 spaces / 1000 s.f. min.</td>
<td>on-street, off-street, or a combination of on-street and off-street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>CS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>Street-Facing</td>
<td>0' max.</td>
<td>0' max.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>Non Street-Facing</td>
<td>0' max.</td>
<td>10' max.</td>
<td>5' min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>with Rear Alley</td>
<td>5' max.</td>
<td>5' max. or 16' min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Lots</td>
<td>with Rear Alley</td>
<td>10' max.</td>
<td>5' min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without Rear Alley</td>
<td>5' max. or 16' min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery or Arcade Setback</td>
<td>3' max. from curb to column/cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicable Notes:
1. At least 80% of the building facade shall be located at the front setback line.
2. For buildings located on corner lots, at least the first 30' of the building facade, as measured from the front building corner, shall be located at the setback line.

Building Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>CS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building Height (stories)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height (stories)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

180° DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.
MESQUITE, TEXAS
August 3, 2009
C. Building Placement
Setback (Distance from ROW / Property Line)

Front
- Minimum 1
- Maximum 2
- Front facade zone
- Side Street
- Side
- Rear

1 In developments on lots over 20,000 sf, the first building definition setback for block in new construction.
2 No maximum setback for carriage houses.
3 No side setback required between Townhouse and/or Live/Work building types.

D. Building Form
Lot Size
See Part 5 (Building Types).

Building Height
Lot depth ≤ 100': Within 75' of street property line or
Lot depth > 100': Within 90' of street property line
Stories 2½ stories max
To Eave or Parapet 24' max
Overall 35' max

Other lot area
Stories 1½ stories max
To Eave or Parapet 15' max
Overall 24' max

Ground Floor Finish Level
18" min. above sidewalk

Ground Floor Ceiling 9' min. clear

Upper Floor Ceiling 8' min. clear

1 Does not apply to accessory structures. See 4.02.030 (Accessory Structures).

E. Allowed Use Types
Ground Floor 1 Residential
Upper Floor 1 Residential
1 See 3.02.080.04 (THN Use Table) for specific use

F. Frontage Types and Encroachments
Encroachments into Setback
Front Side Street or Civic Space
Side 0' max
Rear
- Property Line
- Rear Lane

1 Encroachments are not allowed within a street ROW. See 4.02.020.08 (Encroachments) for complete list of allowed encroachments.

Required Frontage Types
Porch Forecourt
Stoop
1 See 4.03 (Frontage Standards) for descriptions and regulations.

G. Required Parking
Spaces
Residential Uses
Studio or 1 Bedroom
2+ Bedrooms
1 space/unit min.
2 spaces/unit min.

Location (Setback from Property Line)
Front
Covered or Attached Match front facade + width of garage
Uncovered Match front facade

Side Street
5' min

Side 0' min
Rear 0' min

Miscellaneous
Linear feet of front or side facade that may be garage 35% max.
Tandem parking is allowed for off-street parking only if both spaces are behind the required setback and are for the same residential unit.
See Chapter 4.04 (Parking Standards) for additional general parking requirements.

Livermore Development Code
Hybrid Code Approaches

MASSING AND FORM: HISTORIC CROSSROADS VILLAGE

1. Existing single-family homes

2. Infill duplex

3. Traditional building forms

1. Major addition is incorporated at the rear of and perpendicular to primary building module and appears subordinate in terms of its height and mass.

3. Traditional building forms in the Historic Crossroads Village District include simple, rectangular massing; sloped roof forms; and covered front porches and stoops.

2. Massing and form of attached single-family (duplex) are organized to give the appearance of being a large single-family home.
Is it a Form-Based Code?
Form-Based Codes Institute

– Is the code's focus primarily on regulating urban form and less on land use?
– Does the code emphasize standards and parameters for form with predictable physical outcomes (build-to lines, frontage type requirements, etc.) rather than relying on numerical parameters (FAR, density, etc.) whose outcomes are impossible to predict?
– Does the code require private buildings to shape public space through the use of building form standards with specific requirements for building placement?
– Does the code promote and/or conserve an interconnected street network and pedestrian-scaled blocks?
“True” Form-Based Codes

SMARTCODE MODULE

TABLE 4C THOROUGHFARE ASSEMBLIES

Municipality

KEY

ST-57-20-8L
Thoroughfare Type
Right-of-Way Width
Pavement Width
Transportation

THOROUGHFARE TYPES

Highway: HW
Boulevard: BV
Avenue: AV
Commercial Street: CS
Drive: DR
Street: ST
Road: RD
Rear Alley: RA
Rear Lane: RL
Bicycle Trail: BT
Bicycle Lane: BL
Bicycle Route: BK
Fizh: FT
Fromage: FS
Transit Route: TR

BV-135-33

Thoroughfare Type
Boulevard
135 feet
30 feet - 35 feet - 30 feet
Free Movement
35 kph
8.5 seconds - 9.4 seconds - 8.5 seconds
3 lanes, one turning lane & two one-way slip roads
8 feet
10 feet
6 feet Sidewalk
7 feet continuous Planter
Curb

BV-135-53

Thoroughfare Type
Boulevard
135 feet
30 feet - 35 feet - 30 feet
Free Movement
35 kph
5.7 seconds - 15.1 seconds - 5.7 seconds
6 Lanes, one turning lane & two one-way slip roads
8 feet
10 feet
6 feet Sidewalk
7 feet continuous Planter
Curb

See Bicycle Module
Hybrid Code Approaches
Is it a Form-Based Code?
Form-Based Codes Institute

– Is the code's focus primarily on regulating urban form and less on land use?
– Does the code emphasize standards and parameters for form with predictable physical outcomes (build-to lines, frontage type requirements, etc.) rather than relying on numerical parameters (FAR, density, etc.) whose outcomes are impossible to predict?
– Does the code require private buildings to shape public space through the use of building form standards with specific requirements for building placement?
– Does the code promote and/or conserve an interconnected street network and pedestrian-scaled blocks?
– **Are regulations and standards keyed to specific locations on a regulating plan?**
“True” Form-Based Codes
Hybrid Code Approaches
Is it a Form-Based Code?
Form-Based Codes Institute

- Is the code's focus primarily on regulating urban form and less on land use?
- Does the code emphasize standards and parameters for form with predictable physical outcomes (build-to lines, frontage type requirements, etc.) rather than relying on numerical parameters (FAR, density, etc.) whose outcomes are impossible to predict?
- Does the code require private buildings to shape public space through the use of building form standards with specific requirements for building placement?
- Does the code promote and/or conserve an interconnected street network and pedestrian-scaled blocks?
- Are regulations and standards keyed to specific locations on a regulating plan?
- Is the code regulatory rather than advisory?
- Are the diagrams in the code unambiguous, clearly labeled, and accurate in their presentation of spatial configurations?
Hybrid Code Approaches
Is it a Form-Based Code?
Form-Based Codes Institute

- Is the code's focus primarily on regulating urban form and less on land use?
- Does the code emphasize standards and parameters for form with predictable physical outcomes (build-to lines, frontage type requirements, etc.) rather than relying on numerical parameters (FAR, density, etc.) whose outcomes are impossible to predict?
- Does the code require private buildings to shape public space through the use of building form standards with specific requirements for building placement?
- Does the code promote and/or conserve an interconnected street network and pedestrian-scaled blocks?
- Are regulations and standards keyed to specific locations on a regulating plan?
- Is the code regulatory rather than advisory?
- Are the diagrams in the code unambiguous, clearly labeled, and accurate in their presentation of spatial configurations?
Kaizer Rangwala

April/May 2009

Hybrid codes versus form-based codes

A form-based code is being used more often. Hybrid codes involve the meshing of conventional zoning codes with graphic urban design standards that typically address setbacks, parking placement, building bulk, materials, and architectural features. Such a hybrid is not a form-based code (FBC) and likely will not produce the physical outcome desired. While urban design standards within a conventional zoning framework are beneficial, they are not enough, and are not a viable alternative to FBCs.

"The conception of public realm in this form of hybrid codes is missing," says Geoffrey Ferrell, chair of the Form-Based Code Institute. FBCs carefully pull together the individual elements of the public realm — the buildings, streets, and open space — into a cohesive and memorable place. FBCs also integrate the full spectrum of land-use regulations such as planning, zoning, subdivision, public works, and safety standards to produce benefits in union, rather than allowing these systems to clash with one another. Because the form standards are not fully developed in such hybrid codes, primary control of uses continues. Changes in market cycles require constant legislative changes to the zoning regulations. The lack of precise standards diminishes the predictability of the outcome. Discretionary review continues. The uncertainty is played out at individual project levels in contentious and protracted public hearings.

Communities often drift toward a hybrid code either because the sheer scale of replacing the conventional zoning seems daunting — or because a hybrid code is proposed by an architect who does not fully understand how to integrate a FBC into the existing system, especially when it applies citywide.

A better way to deal with this problem is to adapt a complete and comprehensive FBC for a specific planning area such as a neighborhood or district. The FBC would reside within the structural and legal framework of a conventional code.

Plenty of FBCs have been adopted. Their built results provide numerous examples of how FBCs have been implemented, without the need to "hybridize." Recently completed codes and code updates that are in progress in Miami, Denver, Livermore, California, and Flagstaff, Arizona, show the right way to approach form-based codes citywide.

In a citywide code there are auto-dependent or conventional zones nesting next to complete FBC regulations. The StreetCode, for example, allows the establishment of special districts and Transit zones in which a degree of automobile-oriented and public transit-oriented development is permitted. A pure FBC, therefore, legitimacy includes a degree of "hybridization" — or conventional components — in the citywide scale. Integrating form-based coding into a citywide code is no more work and no more complex than a conventional code update. In addition, communities often are excited about getting a much-needed fix for their "broken" zoning codes, which have promoted development that is completely auto-dependent.

Infill and greenfield areas susceptible to change are typically coded first. Their FBCs include a regulating plan that defines the placement of buildings, structures, and open spaces within form standards that define height (or stories), bulk, and function of the building, standards for different types of streets and open spaces, and a streamlined development review process. Any code that lacks these basic components will compromise the consistency of the place and the streamlined review process — by shifting the protracted discretionary review from the larger plan and code level to the individual project level.

FBCs can be adopted for specific areas — as a freestanding unified development code that contains all the standards and procedures, with little or no reference to the conventional zoning ordinance. For example, "Specific Plans" in California combine policies, codes, and implementation strategies into one freestanding document. Alternatively, these FBCs can be housed in the existing conventional zoning ordinance with necessary adjustments to the conventional subdivision and site planning processes. This kind of code delivers all the benefits of a FBC — on a conventional zoning platform. It combines zoning, urban design, public works, and safety standards with subdivision and streamlining review processes.

Lessons Learned

How does one determine if a code is form-based and well-crafted? The Form-Based Codes Institute (FBCI) has developed a checklist for identifying and evaluating FBCs based on their ability to shape pedestrian scale, mixed-use, fine-grained urbanism, enforceability, and ease of use. The checklist is available at www.formbasedcodes.org.

Production and administration of FBCs require an interdisciplinary sensitivity to planning, urban design, architecture, landscape design, transportation, and civil engineering, legal issues, environmental science, and market demand. Generally, planners do not have all of these critical skills — no one person does. Therefore, hiring consultants, while expensive, is necessary. Cash-strapped communities should explore creative.

Flower Mound, Texas, form-based zones
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Hybrid codes versus form-based codes

KAI RANGWALA

A form-based coding continues to increase in popularity, and the term “hybrid code” is being used more often. Hybrid codes involve the meshing of conventional zoning codes with graphic urban design standards that typically address setbacks, parking placement, building bulk, materials, and architectural features. Such a hybrid is not a form-based code (FBC) and likely will not produce the physical outcome desired. While urban design standards within a conventional zoning framework are beneficial, they are not enough, and are not a viable alternative to FBCs.

“The conception of public realm in this form of hybrid codes is missing,” says Geoffrey Fussell, chairman of the Form-Based Code Institute. FBCs carefully pull together the individual elements of the public realm — the buildings, streets, and open space — into a cohesive and memorable place. FBCs also integrate the full spectrum of land-use regulations such as planning, zoning, subdivsion, public works, and safety standards to produce benefits in union, rather than allowing these systems to clash with one another.

Because the form standards are not fully developed in such hybrid codes, hyper-control of uses continues. Changes in market cycle require constant legislative changes to the zoning regulations. The lack of precise standards diminishes the unpredictability of the outcome. Discretionary review continues. The uncertainty is played out in individual project levels in contentious and protracted public hearings.

Community members could demand a lack of scale criteria because the sheer scale of replacing the conventional zoning seems daunting. Often, a hybrid code is proposed by a consultant who does not fully understand how to integrate a FBC into the existing system, especially when it applies citywide.

A better way to deal with this problem is to adopt a complete and comprehensive FBC for a specific planning area such as a neighborhood or district. The FBC would reside within the structural and legal framework of a conventional code.

Many FBCs have been adopted. Their built results provide numerous examples of how FBCs have been implemented, without the need to “hybridize.” Recently completed codes and code updates that are in progress in Miami, Denver, Livermore, California, and Flagstaff, Arizona, show the right way to approach form-based codes citywide.

In a citywide code there are auto-dependent or conventional zones existing next to complete FBC regulations. The Smart-Code, for example, allows the establishment of special districts and Transect zones in which a degree of automobile-oriented and/or lower-density development is permitted. A pure FBC, therefore, legitimately includes a degree of “hybridization” — or conventional components — at the citywide scale.

Integrating form-based coding into a citywide code is no more work and no more complex than a conventional code update. In addition, communities often are excited about getting a much-needed fix for their “broken” zoning codes, which have promoted development that is completely auto-dependent. Infill and greenfield areas susceptible to change are typically coded first. Their FBCs include a regulating plan that designates the placement of buildings, streets, and open spaces, building form standards that define height (or stories), bulk, and function of the building; standards for different types of streets and open spaces; and a streamlined development review process. Any code that lacks these basic components will compromise the consistency of the plan and the streamlined review process — by shifting the protracted discretionary review from the larger plan and code level to the individual project level.

FBCs can be adapted for specific areas — as freestanding unified development codes that contain all the standards and procedures, with little or no reference to the conventional zoning ordinance. For example, “Specific Plans” in California combine policies, codes, and implementation strategies into one freestanding document. Alternatively, these FBCs can be housed in the existing conventional zoning ordinance with necessary adjustments to the conventional subdivision and site planning processes. This kind of code delivers all of the benefits of a FBC — on a familiar conventional zoning platform. It combines zoning, urban design, public works, and safety standards with subdivisions and streamlined review processes.

Lessons Learned

How does one determine if a code is form-based — and well-crafted? The Form-Based Codes Institute (FBCI) has developed a checklist for identifying and evaluating FBCs based on their ability to shape pedestrian scale, mixed-use, fine-grained urbanism, enforceability, and ease of use. The checklist is available at www.formbasedcodes.org.

Production and administration of FBCs require an interdisciplinary sensitivity to planning, urban design, architecture, landscape design, transportation and civil engineering, legal issues, environmental science, and market demand. Generally, planners do not have all of these skill sets — no one person does. Therefore, hiring consultants, while expensive, is necessary. Cash-strapped communities should explore creative...
“While urban design standards within a conventional zoning framework are beneficial, they are not enough, and are not a viable alternative to FBCs.”
“Communities often drift toward a hybrid code either because the sheer scale of replacing the conventional zoning seems daunting---or because a hybrid code is proposed by a consultant who does not fully understand how to integrate a FBC into the existing system, especially when it applies citywide.”
– “Anything less than a FBC will produce inferior outcomes and may further disillusion the public.”

– “A hybrid code in any format is not a long-term solution.”
In Defense of Hybrid Codes….
In reality, a spectrum....

Euclidean Zoning with Design Standards

Use-Based
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The Range of Form Controls

- Euclidean Districts with Form Standards
- Linking Building Types and Permitted Uses
- Optional Form-Based Districts
- Mandatory Form-Based Districts for Specific Areas
- Mandatory Citywide Form-Based Code

With or without Regulating Plan
Austin, Texas
Euclidean Districts with Form-Based Standards
### 1-POINT OPTIONS

- Achieve City of Austin Green Building Program 1-star rating.
- Provide for liner stores in building façade.
- Provide façade articulation meeting specified standards.
- Provide primary entrance design meeting specified standards.
- Provide roof design meeting specified standards.
- Provide building materials meeting specified standards.
- Improve existing storefronts to meet new glazing requirements.
- 100% of glazing on ground-floor facades facing street or parking lot with visual transmittance (VT) of 0.6 or higher.
- Comply with neighborhood design guidelines (if applicable).

### 2-POINT OPTIONS

- Achieve City of Austin Green Building Program 2-star rating.
- 75% of façade facing principal street consists of storefronts with at least 2 separate entrances facing principal street.
- Provide sustainable roof meeting specified standards.
- Integrate solar power generation into building design.

### 3-POINT OPTIONS

- Achieve City of Austin Green Building Program 3-star rating.
- Develop VMU building.
# Mooresville, North Carolina
## Linking Building Types and Permitted Uses

### A blended form/use table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Category</th>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-5</th>
<th>RMX-MH</th>
<th>IND-C</th>
<th>NMX</th>
<th>CMX</th>
<th>HB</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>GI</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>FC-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P = PERMITTED BY RIGHT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C = CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CU = CONDITIONAL ZONING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DH = DETACHED HOUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MA = MANSION APARTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AR = ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA = NOT APPLICABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CV = VOC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SF = SF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WP = WORKPLACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR = COMMERCIAL/RETAIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LR = LARGE RETAIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1.4: Table of Allowed Uses**

- **Restaurant with Drive-Through Service**
  - **P**
  - **CMX**
  - **SF**
  - **WP**
  - **OR**

- **Crematory**
  - **P**
  - **SV**
  - **WP**
  - **CA**

- **Retail Sales and Services**
  - **Type I Retail Use**
    - **P**
    - **SF**
    - **WP**
  - **Type II Retail Use**
    - **P**
    - **SF**
    - **WP**

- **Type II Retail Use (Up to 15,000 sq ft OFA)**
  - **P**
  - **SF**
  - **WP**

- **Type II Retail Use (15,001 to 30,000 sq ft OFA)**
  - **P**
  - **SF**
  - **WP**
Denver’s Main Street Zones

- Denver, Colorado
Mandatory Form-Based Districts in Specific Areas
Existing conditions
Mixed-use buildings on one block
Public street improvements: street trees, street lamps, decorative traffic signals, bulbouts
Additional mixed-use development, remodeling of existing buildings
Miami, Florida
Mandatory Citywide Form-Based Code
(with regulating plan)
Miami, Florida
Mandatory Citywide Form-Based Code

MIAMI 21
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ARTICLE 5. SPECIFIC TO ZONES
ILLUSTRATION 5.4 GENERAL URBAN TRANSECT ZONES (T4)

BUILDING DISPOSITION
LOT OCCUPATION
a. Lot Area
   - With rear vehicular access
     5,200 sq ft min.; 16,000 sq ft max.
   - With no rear vehicular access
     1,400 sq ft min.; 10,000 sq ft max.
b. Lot Width
   - With rear vehicular access
     50 ft min.
   - With no rear vehicular access
     16 ft min.
c. Lot Coverage
   80% max.
d. Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
   1.5

e. Frontage off front setback
   90% min.
f. Open Space Requirements
   15% of lot area min.
g. Density
   35 sf/area max.

BUILDING SETBACK
a. Principal Front
   10 ft min.
b. Secondary Front
   10 ft min.
c. Side
   5 ft or 5 ft min. Abutting a setback
d. Rear
   20 ft min.

OUTBUILDING SETBACK
a. Principal Front
   30 ft min.
b. Secondary Front
   10 ft min.
c. Side
   5 ft or 5 ft min. Abutting a setback
d. Rear
   5 ft min.

BUILDING CONFIGURATION
FRONTAGE
a. Common Lawn
   permitted
b. Porch & Fence
   permitted
c. Tennis or L.G.
   permitted
d. Park/enclosure
   permitted
e. Slope
   permitted
f. Shopfront
   permitted (14.11.4.0 only)
g. Gallery
   prohibited
h. Arcade
   prohibited

BUILDING HEIGHT
a. Principal Building
   3 Stories max.
b. Outbuilding
   2 Stories max.
Integrating Form Controls

Where You Are Today

Where You’ll Probably Wind Up

The Smart Code Ideal
Evaluating a Code’s Effectiveness
Form-Based Codes Institute

– *Is the code enforceable?*
– *Is the code easy to use?*
– *Will the code produce functional and vital urbanism?*
Case Studies

- Why was a hybrid approach necessary?
- How was the form-based piece balanced with other code elements?
- What’s unique about the code and/or code development process?
- Politics of the hybrid code adoption
- What would you do differently?
Case Studies

– John Miki, Opticos Design
  – Flagstaff, Arizona
  – Livermore, California

– Craig Richardson, Clarion Associates
  – Beaufort County, South Carolina