

HISTORIC DISTRICT ORDINANCE REVISIONS COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE COMMENTS
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2008

Comments to be addressed at October 13, 2008 committee meeting indicated in bold italics.

1. Some members of the committee feel that since the procedural changes were requested by the City to be removed during this round of changes then some of their LSD changes must have been rejected also. ***All of the items that City Council requested the committee to address are in the draft ordinance.***
2. These members also felt that they had put in a lot of time with the proposed procedural changes and questioned whether or not this work would be forwarded to the Technical Advisory Committee to the Unified Zoning Ordinance effort. They wanted to know what assurances staff could give them that those changes would move forward. ***The proposed procedural changes initially came from the Technical Advisory Committee to the Unified Zoning Ordinance and will be forwarded as part of the UZO update.***
3. It was stated that the development community has not had the opportunity to review the proposed changes yet and that needs to happen – did not feel that the committee had reached a consensus on these issues. ***The draft ordinance and major concept changes need to be released to the larger public for more input. Finalize the initial committee process in order to move forward with public comment and meet with stakeholders.***
4. The City Manager requests that the issues be grouped into two tiers. Tier I would be the priority issues that Council asked the committee to address – height and height map, lot coverage and large scale development. The second tier would consist of procedural matters. He does not object to a later decision package being put together consisting of the procedural issues. ***Completed.***
5. The City Manager said the following question needs to be addressed. With the new rules how is design stronger in the 75% zone with regard to large scale construction. ***See Tier I/Tier II Chart in above comment. Addressed through materials and fenestration.***
6. The City Manager and others object to the use of the word compatibility; however, it was noted that the word compatibility is defined in the ordinance – suggested changing table name to height relationship table and replace the word compatibility with proportional relationships. ***Completed change for Height Relationship Table.***
7. When maximum heights on the height map are permitted for properties less than 9,000 square feet or less than five stories, the Visual Compatibility Factors should also apply. As written they now do not. ***Completed.***
8. Reword # 3 within the Height Allowance section – multiple ground floor uses as defined by the Preservation Officer and/or define what the uses are (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant, etc...) ***Completed.***

9. Is it burdensome to state that variances from the height map are not permitted? There should be specific objective criteria to allow the Review Board the ability to vary height. Don't use the word variance. **Completed.**
10. The City Manager wants a half dozen examples showing what the buildings could look like applying the new rules (specifically in regard to the Height Compatibility Table and step-downs to historic buildings) in various locations such as the Liberty Plumbing site, Smiths Texaco site, Liberty and Whitaker Streets. He wants visuals. **Completed by meeting.**
11. Affordable Housing needs quantifiers such as percentage of number of units of a development or percentage of square footage of a development. The duration of such a requirement also needs to be established. The City Manager suggests a periodic adoption of what constitutes affordable. He thinks there are different levels such as work force housing. **To be developed by Bureau of Public Development.**
12. Developers should not be able to address the 25% open space requirement on the rear lot line off the lane. **Obtain feedback from Committee.**
13. If small scale development can build to the maximum height, how do you prevent boxes particularly when the development is at the upper end of the scale for less than large scale? **Obtain feedback from Committee.**