

# Open Space Zoning Districts

## Pros and Cons

---

### Pros

- Can be used to designate and zone land for park or open space uses
- Can be combined with other institutional or civic uses, such as schools, fire stations, hospitals, libraries, churches, private utility uses, etc.
- Can adopt standards for the zone that vary from that of surrounding uses (e.g. impervious surface coverage, building height, signs)
- Can adopt standards for the zone that are more specific than what may be needed for adjacent area (e.g. lighting (sports fields or trails), hours of use, access and parking, bicycle and pedestrian access, concessions, noise, sponsored activities/tournaments, outdoor storage)
- Most uses can be reviewed for land use approval administratively, rather than by Conditional Use Permit

### Cons

- Would require a rezone when the City acquires land for parks/open space
- Would require a rezone to sell land if it were likely to be used for a different purpose (or selling the property would be more limited)
- May impact property values in the area (this could be pro or con)
- Prescriptive standards may prevent or discourage private parks (unless parks are still allowed in other zoning districts)
- Impact to staff in Parks and CP&D to process rezones. There is a cost impact of staff time and the need to reprioritize other work items.

### Note

There has not been a problem for parks and open space lands with the way our code is currently written. There is not a specific problem that needs to be solved at this time.

### Examples:

Lacey, WA ([LMC Chapter 16.48](#))

Tumwater, WA ([TMC Chapter 18.31](#))

Yelm, WA ([YMC Chapter 18.40](#))

Edgewood, WA ([EMC Section 18.80.110](#))

Port Townsend, WA [Public, Park and Open Space Zoning Districts](#) Chapter 17.24

Poulsbo, WA [Park Zoning District](#) Chapter 18.100

Portland, OR [Open Space Zone](#)

Oakland, CA [Open Space Zoning Regulations](#)