

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Integration of Chapters 12A, 23, 24, 25 - are they being changed as well?	29-4.3, 29-4.6, 29-4.10, 29-5	Revision have been made and are footnoted. No substainatial changes to Chap. 12A except for Tree Preservation. No changes to Chap. 23	Y	
Has the UDO been prepared in a "compare" format?	N/A	Footnotes and margin notes used in place of "comparson" document	Y	
Are the tree preservation requirements those prepared by the City Arborist?	29-4.5	Revision from Arborist and Tree Task Force are noted	Y	
Legal lot status - is platting the only option in the future?	29-1.13	Platting is only option. Request submitted to permit recorded "surveyor or plats" prior to Oct. 1, 1964 to be allowed	N	Permitting recorded surveys or plats does not resolve the issue of development occuring across property lines or on part of previously recorded lots. The proposed requirement is consistent with new provisions not permitting construction across propoerty lines and will "contemporize" the platted lot inventory throughout the City.
Protections to not push "by-right" zoning requests to PD?	N/A	The code proposes new standards intended to mitigate potential impacts (i.e. design standards, neighborhood protections, revised landscaping and screening)	N	Providing assurances for not requiring a PD zone is not within the purview of the UDO. Rezoning actions are a political function and as such other forces may be at work which lead to requiring a PD. The UDO attempt to eliminate this need by expanding uses within fewer districts and providing new methods for limiting impacts.
Will PD requests be handled like they are today?	29-2.2, 29-5.4	PD zones will be possible I n all locations except M-DT. Uses permitted will be chosen from the Permitted Use Table. Modficiations to the other Development and Form Standards will need to be stated in PD application and SOI. A develpoment plan will be required at the time of application.	N	It appears as though objection exists with the requirment that a PD plan be submitted at time of application. This requirement was created to address what is generally the current practice for sucessful PD requests and consistent with national trends. Furthermore, such a requirement reduces the potential for speculative request to PD zoning that are not needed given the revised land use mixtures within the new zoning district structure. Property only with unique characterists or a proposed development pattern unable to be accomodated should be zoned PD under the UDO.
Design Standards - where are they located?	29-4.8	Design Standards and Guideline for all developepment are located in Section 29-4.8	Y	

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Sufficiency of resources test - is it being included in the UDO?	29-5	Providing proof of sufficient infrastructure to support a "known" request (i.e. zoning or subdivision) will be a responsibility of the applicant through coordination with local utility providers. City is working to establish a "base" of infrastructure availability/capacities for which such testing can be compared.	N	This issue is mentioned in the UDO in a generalized manner and is not typically spelled-out specifically within a development code. Analysis of infrastructure availability and capacity is a fluid activity and to create potentially rigid criteria for assessing it may limit effectiveness.
What would be an example of proof that sufficiency of resources existed?	NA	The UDO does not provide examples. This would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	N	The City utilizes the development review process to determine what impacts a proposed development will create on its utility system based on project specific and existing capacity and future expansion plans.
15% open space in the M-DT - is that based on footprint of building or total square footage?	29-4.2, 29-4.5	Open space is based upon the buildable lot area.	Y	
Would sufficiency of resources be applied to all projects or select ones?	29-5	It would apply to all projects requesting to increase the intensity of development (i.e. rezoning, PD, subdivision)	Y	
Would the "scorecard" for sufficiency of resources be incorporated into the UDO or would the UDO language replace it?	29-5	The "scorecard" would likely be a part of the evaluation matrix for determining sufficiency of services. The UDO's general language would not be superseded. It is advisory in nature. The "scorecard" would be a tangible element of assessing sufficiency and provide an objective way of stating if there were or were not adequate resources available.	Y	
Description of differences between new UDO standards and actual development in R-MF during code test on Circus	NA	Provided during the presentation of code testing	Y	
What design standards exist for building articulation and 4-sided architecture?	29-4.8	Section 29-4.8 provides design standards for all development that is not 1 or 2 family residential.	Y	
Neighborhood protection - Is it possible to have R-MF next to R-MF and one parcel's ability to build-out restricted?	29-4.9	Yes. Depending on when an application to construct a structure is submitted and when an application to possibly rezone a vacant R-MF lot to a R-1 or R-2. To effectively block the full build-out the rezoning request would need to be approved by Council.	N	The timing of an application to construct and to rezone is not fully defined within the UDO. Construction plans may be submitted and delayed while a rezoning action may not encounter the same issues. Additional provisions may need to be added to address this scenario.

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Two lots adjacent to each other and one is R-MF and the other is a different zone and vacant - do the Neighborhood Protection Standards apply?	29-4.9	Height restrictions would apply and there would be landscaping and screening as defined in 29-4.5.	N	Height restrictions may need to be clarified so they only apply to development adjacent to 1 and 2 family use or R-1 or R-2 lots. It appears as though the standard as written applies at all types of development on lots other than R-1 or R-2 abutting R-1 or R-2 .
When Neighborhood Protection Standards are required does it matter if the adjacent property owner to the pending development objects or doesn't object to the standards?	29-4.9	No. The UDO does not contemplate creating this exception	N	No change is recommended. Creating waivers based upon ownership at time of construction is no guarantee that ownership will remain the same throughout the life of the development.
Will a "fake" door be permitted in the M-DT to meet the requirements?	29-4.2	At least one functioning entry door shall be provided along each Ground Story Façade. No Ground Story Façade may include a section of greater than seventy-five (75) feet without a functioning entry door	N	The standard has been created to activate the street frontage. The requirement does not apply to side or rear elevations without street frontage. If a non-functioning door is to be proposed along a street front it would need to be approved in accordance to the variance procedures of Section 29-5
What constitutes a second story versus a "fake" second story?				
Revision to the Regulating Plan - will the revision recommended in Clarion Memo be made?	29-4.2	Yes. The map plan is currently being worked on.	Y	
Will the UDO regulations facilitate redevelopment of historic buildings and metal warehouses easier or create obstacles?				
Is the M-DT boundary line currently the CID boundary?	29-4.2	No. The boundary is slightly larger. It includes more property to the north and west of Providence Road	Y	
What is the process for amending the M-DT boundary?	29-4.2, 29-5	Amendments to the boundary of the M-DT are processed like any other rezoning request.	Y	
How is solid waste collection in the M-DT being addressed?	29-4.2	There is no specific provision in the M-DT that deals with trash collection. Alleys are to be used for services.	N	The City evaluates trash collection on a building by building basis. The lack of standards for trash collection on an individual site basis may require additional consideration and new regulatory language. Consultation with the Solid Waste Division is necessary.

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Can the designations of the M-DT regulating plan be changed to reflect existing conditions (i.e. commercial on Hitt between Broadway and Cherry)?	29-4.2, 29-5	At this time the boundaries and frontage designations are still modifiable. Staff will review the existing conditions to determine if changes are warranted. Modification of frontage types after adoption will follow a typical rezoning public hearing process.	Y	
How are existing PD's going to be handled?	29-1.11(f)	Existing PD will be identified on the zoning map by ordinance number and governed by those existing provisions. No changes are proposed to be made to existing PD zoned property.	Y	
Will there be opportunity to have PDs changed to a conventional zoning district?	29-5	An application can be filed to change a "legacy" PD to a new UDO PD or a different conventional zone through the standard rezoning process.	Y	
If two similarly sized R-MF parcels are vacant and one property owner desires to downzone to R-1 after the other submits building plans is the owner of the parcel seeking to "fully" develop his site just out of luck? How will the owner of the parcel to be developed be affected?	29-4.9, 29-5	Compliance with neighborhood protection standards and landscaping/screening apply at the time of building permitting. A change in adjacent property zoning is not effective until approved by Council. If applications are submitted simultaneously an administrative review would be required to determine which application was submitted first to determine priority. If rezoning is approved prior to building permitting being completed, the new construction would be required to comply with regulations based on adjacent zoning which may reduce maximum build-out.	N	The potential for such a scenario is not addressed within the UDO. It may be necessary to provide clarification on what type of procedure would be utilized to determine "priority" of applications.
Consider eliminating zero-lot line housing to protect neighborhood character	29-3.2, 29-3.3(b), 29-5.4(b)(2)	Attached single-family dwellings are permitted in R-2 and R-MF districts only subject to "use-specific" standards that regulate the maximum number of attached units on a single lot. Building over a property line without re-platting will no longer be permitted under the UDO.	N	The UDO does not directly address the concern expressed; however, restricts endless "attached" dwellings on a single lot. The UDO would permit multiple adjacent lots to be developed with attached dwellings; however, would require separation between each building group and would require compliance with all other regulatory standards. Elimination of the opportunity to construct "attached" dwellings is not recommended. UC-O districts can be modified to further restrict this use's perceived impacts.

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Small lot redevelopment along the Business Loop 70 in the MC district	29-4.1(a), 29-5.5	There are no minimum lot area standards associated with MC development. Redevelopment subject to compliance with UDO standards. The variance procedure can be employed to seek relief from provisions that restrict development. Non-conforming standards (29-5.5) provide options for reuse or expansion within non-conforming building of existing buildings.	N	Additional consideration may need to be given to if sufficient relief exists for buildings along the Bus. Loop. A better approach to dealing with the unique characteristics for this corridor may be to work with the Loop CID on a "corridor plan" that tailors standards specific to their location.
Setback, landscaping, parking modifications for small lot development/redevelopment	29-4.4(a)(2), 29-4.4(d), 29-5.4 (d)	The UDO already exempts parking requirements on lots and for buildings less than 10,000 sq.ft. For lots or buildings over this threshold, off-site parking options are permitted. Landscaping/screening waivers would require variance approval.	N	No change is believed necessary. Proposed UDO provisions afford affected parties with adequate methods for appeal and relief.
Limits on when relief would apply - not applicable to lot combinations?	NA	The UDO does include provisions that state compliance with the parking requirements is to be obtained on lots over 10,000 sq.ft. The UDO already expects lots to comply with all other dimensional requirements.	Y	
HP designation process - revise petition standard to include a minmum # of lots along with % criteria	29-2.3(c)	No changes to the current procedures is proposed. A public hearing before the Commission and Council is required prior to adoption of a district. Such procedure permits public engagement for those opposed to inclusion in a district.	N	The HPC has indicated that it desires to have opportunity to proposes revisions to the designation process. Recommended revision will be forwarded to them for consideration.
Historic District boundaries - standards for establishment?	29-2.3(5)(v)	No change from current standards.	Y	Staff will provide link to the US Dept. of Interior bulletin
Land use changes - will property owners be notified?		Specfic property owner notification will be provided to lands within the M-DT district. General notification through the Tribune and press releases will be used for all other areas.	N	Notification will be conducted in accordance with direction given by the Law Department. A final zoning map will be made available prior to the Planning Commission's public hearing. Section 29-1.11(g) specifies procedures to follow if a change in status of a land use occurs. This section however does not address if the use becomes non-conforming.

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Setback impacts on small lots and limits to redevelopment	29-4.1(a), 29-5.5	There are no minimum lot area standards associated with MC development. Redevelopment subject to compliance with UDO standards. The variance procedure can be employed to seek relief from provisions that restrict development. Non-conforming standards (29-5.5) provide options for reuse or expansion within non-conforming building of existing buildings.	N	Additional consideration may need to be given to if sufficient relief exists for buildings along the Bus. Loop. A better approach to dealing with the unique characteristics for this corridor may be to work with the Loop CID on a "corridor plan" that tailors standards specific to their location.
Shared parking options, exemptions, or relief?	29-4.4(a)(2), 29-4.4(d), 29-5.4 (d)	The UDO already exempts parking requirements on lots and for buildings less than 10,000 sq.ft. For lots or buildings over this threshold, off-site parking options are permitted. Landscaping/screening waivers would require variance approval.	N	No change is believed necessary. Proposed UDO provisions afford affected parties with adequate methods for appeal and relief.
Shared parking not allowed in M-C	29-4.4(d)	UDO includes several options for parking reductions and sharing of parking.	Y	
Sidewalk requirements along Business Loop	29-4.3(d)	Sidewalks are required for any lot located along the Bus. Loop as part of receiving a building permit unless a sidewalk waiver is approved.	N	No change is recommended. Connectivity is of paramount concern. Alternatives to standard sidewalk placement may need to be considered.
Definition of "Four-sided" architecture - may need to be "multi-sided" and clarify "visible" criteria	29-1.13, 29-3.3(d)	Undefined term. Issue of defining visible will need to be reviewed.	N	Changing "four-sided" to "multi-sided" is not believed necessary. The use-specific standard makes reference to "all sides" which seems straight-forward. A definition and clarification of the "visible" criteria is necessary.
Definition of "story"	29-1.13	UDO include a defintion of "story" which is directly from International Building Code (IBC). To count as a story the following must be present: "the useable floor area of any vertical level within a building must consist of at least fifty-one (51) percent of a building's ground footprint".	Y	

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
UDO purpose statement and its guidance appears misplaced.	29-1.2	The purpose statement is broad and inclusive. The reference to implementing Columbia Imagined's vision and recommendations provides a document to which decision-makers may obtain guidance on community values that were captured within the Plan or during its updates as they be relevant to specific proposals. Columbia Imagined is a guidance document - not regulatory. The UDO is the regulatory document that is intended to effectuate the vision and recommendations contained within Columbia Imagined. Decision-makers may choose to abide by or discount the contents of Columbia Imagined in rendering land use and development decisions.	Y	No change is seen as necessary. The inclusion of reference to Columbia Imagined (the City's general plan) is not uncommon and provides guidance on community values to decision-makers when rendering decision on land use and development matters.
Funeral home standards and its "fully-enclosed" provisions - prevents carports/canopied entries	29-3.3(k)	Item (1) will be clarified to permit canopies or port cohere as a permissible outside entry for moving the deceased from inside a funeral home to an awaiting herst.	Y	
Permitted use table use changes from allowed to conditional or not permitted at all	29-1.11			
How will industrial property in downtown be addressed? Possibly C-2?	29-1.4, 29-4.2			
Yard definition may be to restrictive - may not permit trees	29-1.13			
Can we have an "official zoning map" at the hearing	29-1.4			
How can I get a printed version that is relevant throughout all hearings?	N/A			
Diagram on page 10 showing block comers has a symbol "A" in middle of lowest street which appears should be a symbol "B" at mid-block	29-1.13			
Why is a "certificate of appropriateness" (page 12) needed, as issued by Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) for a structure within a historic district, if such property is not considered a "landmark" property?	29-1.13, 29-2.3(c)			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
<p>Why are "civic buildings" (page 12) not subject to the building form standards prescriptions of M-DT? This may exempt a substantial amount of downtown structures.</p>	29-1.13, 29-4.2			
<p>Does a "historic district" require that at least one property within such "historic district" have the designation of "landmark"? (page 27). Is there a minimum land area for historic district? Shouldn't the threshold be higher than 60%, or two out of three properties, to create a historic district.</p>	29-2.3(c), Clarion response			
<p>Can the historic preservation commission nominate or recognize a "most notable property" without a property owner's permission? Are properties designed as "most notable property" subject to certificate of appropriateness. We suggest that this should require property owner consent to become designated as "most notable property".</p>	29-2.3(c), Clarion response			
<p>Under the term light vehicle sales and rental, should there be a definition for "short term use" (page 30). Define what is meant by short term use, i.e. less than 31 days?</p>	29-1.13, 29-3.2(Table 29-3.1)			
<p>Page 31: Listed use "vehicle service and repairs" specifically does not include vehicle body work or painting or major engine repair. Why? Where are these uses specifically defined? For instance, they do not appear under the definition shown on page 26 Heavy Vehicle and Equipment Sales, Rentals and Servicing.</p>	29-1.13, 29-3.2(Table 29-3.1)			
<p>Doesn't the definition of "logging" seem light? Really, "logging" is considered the removal of more than 3 existing trees for commercial purposes on any tract of land larger than 1 acre? Almost any site will be candidate for "logging" under this definition. This seems rather light and classifies almost any site preparer as a "logging" operation.</p>	29-1.13, 29-4.6(c)			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Under the definition Mechanical and Construction contractors a portion of second sentence seems to add confusion "This use does not include establishments where the primary activity is retail sale of goods to general public," ... What is the rationale for this first part of the sentence shown in quotation here. Page 33	29-1.13			
Under definition of office can we add "construction contractors management offices" or "construction company administrative offices" to eliminate confusion that these are a defined permitted use in M-OF, as they are now permitted in O-1.	29-1.13, 29-3.2(Table 29-3.1)			
Page 35- Parking Lot, Commercial in MD-T. These are shown on Regulating Plan- can parking lot be allowed elsewhere in MD-T or limited to shown areas on the Regulating Plan?? Are private parking lots for commercial purpose (i.e. built to rent) permitted in district M-DT???	29-3.2(Table 29-3.1), 4.2(d)(6)	29-		
Describe procedure for detennining appropriate zoning for any specific business use that is not specifically described in this document?	29-3.1(h)			
Page 42- definition suggest "shared parking" to have its own paragraph- edit	29-1.13, 29-4.4(d)			
Page 56- please show "official zoning map"- where can I find it now posted electronically -is it really on web-site as now proposed or is that map a previous version.	29-1.4			
Page 56- Why is zoning district I-G industrial called out as a "special purpose" district? What makes it "special"? Aren't industrial districts normal in the new code proposal?	29-2.2(c)			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
<p>Page 68 under Purpose title (line 8 & 9) reads "without the need for re-zoning to a Planned Development district" -suggest adding this language to all other commercial and industrial districts, since a stated goal ofUDC is to minimize future use of all Planned Districts.</p>	29-2.2(b)			
<p>Page 68- rear yard setback does not distinguish between an abutting a commercial use or an abutting residential use and we suggest 25' is not necessary if abutting an office or commercial property use. Current code allows this distance to be reduced in circumstance of abutting commercial uses or like zoning.</p>	29.2.2(b)(Table 29-2.6)			
<p>Page 68- suggest that "M-OF district dimensional summary-should be compared to current 0-1 district. This side by side comparison was done for the other districts, such as MC/C-3 and M-N/C-1, but not for this district M-OF district. Why?</p>	29.2.2(b)(Table 29-2.6)			
<p>Page 71: How does M-N "Pedestrian" standard get tracked (inventoried) by Community Development Dept. -will a symbol "PED" be used on zoning map for instance?</p>	29-1.4, 29-5.4(l)			
<p>Page 74: seems that parking should not be reduced at arterial-arterial or arterial-collector. I know it states because of public transit is likely-but it also seems likely those intersections will attract the most personal auto traffic and therefore require parking. Also car parks may be necessary to pick-up travelers from a bus stop. Why allow parking to be reduced by 30% in high auto traffic areas? Seems counterintuitive.</p>	29-2.2 (b)(Other standards); 29-4.4			
<p>Page 77- multifamily and some commercial removed from MB-P. How will owners be notified that some uses now allowed under current zoning will be removed from their land under the new code that previously allowed such uses?</p>	29-3.2 (Table 29-3.1)			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
<p>Page 78- is screening required if two lots of similar zoning are adjacent or abutting. This under "a" would appear to be so. Does not seem to be needed. Under "b" are the stacking equipment or display equipment allowed to exceed 12' high in BM-P? i.e. can operating equipment exceed a fence or screen height?</p>	<p>29-2.2 (M-BP "other standards") , 29-4.5(e)</p>			
<p>Page 101 paragraph (i) second sentence reads "A petition to designate a historic district may be made only by the owners of at least 60 percent of the Boone County tax map parcels in the proposed historic district." There is no defined size of a historic district, and no defined number of owners. Being in a "historic district" could now or later subscribe a property owner to restrictive property rights or design criteria which he did not seek thru his or her own action.</p>	<p>29-3.3(c), Clarion response</p>			
<p>on page 100 section (vii), the Historic Preservation Commission seems to be granted the power to nominate: "notable properties", "landmarks" and "historic districts". This status should only be allowed by property owner written request or acknowledgement, not conferred by a committee that has no stake in the property ownership.</p>	<p>29-3.3(c)</p>			
<p>Page 102, (5) Landmark and Historic District Designation Procedures paragraph (iii) requires minimum of 60 day written notice and certified mail to affected property owners to create a Historic Preservation overlay (HPO) district. This is good. However if an individual property owner does not want to have his/her property placed in such district, then what remedy does the individual property owner have?</p>	<p>29-3.3(c)</p>			
<p>Page 103 paragraph (v): Reference is made to National Register of Historic Places when setting boundaries. Comment: request that criteria used by National Register of Historic Places be made available in the UDC document as an exhibit someplace.</p>	<p>29-3.3(c)</p>			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
<p>Page 103-104: There are only (4) listed properties under "Designated Historic Districts and Landmarks". Is this list comprehensive and complete? If so fine. If there are others, then they should be noted right now in this document. If there are any "designated historic districts" as opposed to these listed "landmarks" only, then those historic districts should be noted right now in this document. This will curtail future discussion about whether a property or area holds historic significance or not.</p>	29-3.3(c)			
<p>Page 104 paragraph 9 (ii): Comment: suggest changing the shown 40 days to 30 days or for "certificate of appropriateness" being granted thru inaction of Historic Preservation Commission.</p>	29-3.3(c)			
<p>Page 106 paragraph 11 section (iii): Language here obligates a "realtor" in addition to a property owner to advise of a property being within a HP-0 district. Comment: this should be limited to property owner, not also involve "realtor". Also the term Realtor should be changed to an authorized or designated agent of owner (which is not necessarily a "realtor"). For instance an authorized or designated agent would have the authority to execute documents for a property owner that a "Realtor" would not.</p>	29-3.3(c), Clarion response			
<p>Page 108 paragraph 15 review: Certain time limits are described for historic districts of 10 year and 5 year minimums. Comment: Please offer rational for these time periods, does there need to be any defined time limit?</p>	29-3.3 (c)			
<p>Page 121: One family and two family uses are no long permitted in M-C (formerly C-3) districts. Will this impact a project like Patriot Place on Business Loop 70 E? Or is this considered another use as defined on page 122?</p>	29-3.2 (Table 29-3.1), 29-3.3			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Page 126: Tree or landscaping service requires I-G zoning as shown. Cmmnt: suggest allowing it in M-BP as well, even if as a "conditional use"	29-3.2 (Table 29-3.1)			
Page 126: Light vehicle sales, service, rentals are not permitted in M-BT. Cmmnt: We suggest they be allowed or at least as "conditional" use. Car washes are a permitted use; truck terminal is permitted use.	29-1.13, 29-3.2 (Table 29-3.1)			
Page 128: Footnote 449 the word "pluming" is misspelled. Add letter "b". This is a spelling comment only.	29-3.2 (Footnote 449)			
Page 137: Family day care center paragraph E reads "no advertising sign or identification sign shall be placed on the premises" ... why? Seems a sign would be helpful to those trying to locate such a facility.	29-4.3(j)			
Page 161: Temporary Real Estate Sales/Leasing Office: description ends with word "board". Suggest that be expanded to read "Board of Adjustment" (if that is what in meant by term "board").	29-3.3(oo)			
Is 300 feet the minimum and 750 feet the maximum on cul-de-sacs?	29-4.3(c)			
In situations that give the director authority to make decisions, is there an appeal process for those decisions?	29-4.4, 29-4.9, 29-5			
First floor transparency is a minimum of 20% (could be more) when it is office, food, or retail - is every level above that required to have 20%?	29-4.2(d)(2), 29-4.8(c)(2)			
Is the 20% transparency the aggregate of the total floors?	29-4.2(d)(2), 29-4.8(c)(2)			
Loading and delivery areas that are located in the rear of a building - how will car dealerships be handled?	29-4.8(c)			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Will maximum light pole height be 25 feet in any type of zoning?	29-4.7, 29-4.9			
Outer parameter light poles would restricted to a 20 foot height?	29-4.7, 29-4.9			
Restrictions on what can be placed in sideyard areas between dissimilar uses (i.e. parking lots, mechanical equipment, etc)	29-4.1(c), 29-4.9(e)			
Four-sided building designs to be neighborhood friendly on all four sides	29-3.3 (d), 29-4.8 (c)			
Sidewalk master plan and how money gets put aside to pay for the sidewalks on arterials and collectors	29-4.3(d)			
Is there anything in the UDC that allows for the development of tiny houses?	29-1.13, 29-3.3, 29-4.1			
The UDO includes provisions for rural cluster design - is there potential to create an area that might be termed "urban cluster design" that would be applicable, perhaps within a cottage or tiny house district?	29-4.1(b)(3)			
Stormwater mitigation for R-2 and R-3 redevelopments - are there provisions in the UDO for this?	29-4.3(g)(2), 29-4.6			
Climax tree and forest areas should attempt to lump as many of those 25 percent areas together so that they are contiguous across lots as well.	29.4.5(g), 29-4.6(b)			
Four-sided development/four-sided design - wall and roof articulation should be on all sides of large multi-family development not just on the street side.	29-3.3(d), 29-4.8(c)(1), 29-4.8(c)(3), 29-4.8(c)(4)			
Local examples of the dimensional and design standards would be helpful.	N/A			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Conditions for a single contiguous tract of climax forest - manageable on large tracts, but sometimes needs to be spread out around the tract.	29-4.6(b)			
Loading dock locations - consider possibly on the sides of buildings as means of reducing required turning radius and impervious surface areas.	29-4.8(c)(6)			
Screening and buffering (Section 29-4.9(e) - does this apply to lots that abut a zoned residential district or lots that abut a lot that has residential uses?	29-4.5(e), 29-4.9(e)			
Does the location of a residential use on a commercially zoned property change the applicability of the screening and buffering requirements of Sec. 29-4.9, item e?	29-4.5(e), 29-4.9(e)			
How are we going to incorporate the work of the parking task force into the UDO?	N/A			
Land analysis map and its relationship to the Comprehensive Plan - unclear and undefined standards. Reference to Comprehensive Plan should be removed and rely on specific language already provided to defined/available items.	29-4.3(b)			
Median front yard setback - continue to require it be calculated by using the entire block on the same side of the street as the way to determine the setback of a new development or a redevelopment.	29-4.1(b)(1)			
Land analysis map requires that two types of sensitive areas be shown - those areas on the Comprehensive Future Land Use map and all other areas known to be sensitive. How does one determine the "other sensitive" areas if they are not mapped?	29-4.3(b)			

Question/Issue	Related Code Section	Issue Answer	Issue Resolved	Issue Resolution Comment
Create a higher degree of predictability and certainty relating to the expectation of the Land analysis map so property owners can understand what they can do with their property. Current process uses vague, nebulous terms, it creates a lot of uncertainty.	29-4.3(b)			
The more ambiguous the language regarding subdivisions is within the UDO, the less the procedure functions as a ministerial action and it becomes more of a discretionary action	29-4.3(b)			
Tree preservation easement - will it allow any development; it is not a defined term.	29-1.13, 29-4.6(b)(2)			
The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the sensitive overlay area - is every square inch of that identified property a sensitive area?	29-4.3(b)(1)(ii(f))			
Is the 300 feet cul-de-sac length the default?	29-4.3c(3)(f)			
Tree clearing prior to annexation and the five year delay in permitting - is there a look-back period?	29-4.6(b)			