

Number	Staff/ Public Comment Received	Staff Recommendation/Comment	City Council Decision
1	Part 1		
2	1005.B missing period on end of sentence	typo	Typo- Add period to end of sentence in section 1005.B.
3	1101.A(4) provision should be in .B because they should be exempt from review everywhere except in the Design Control where we may look at locations of satellite dishes.	Zoning Adminsitrator was concerned this exemption was being applied broader than the Council and Commission expected. She believes it is more appropriate in .B where it would still be regulated in the design review district.	
4	1103.A should be the Public Utilities Commission	Name change last year	Correction- change "Public Service Board" to "Public Utilities Commission" in section 1103.A
5	1201.A(1) strike "need to"	grammer fix	Grammer fix-strike "need to" in section 1201.A(1)
6	1201.B(1) strike "need to"	grammer fix	Grammer fix-strike "need to" in section 1201.B(1)
7	1203.E reword to read "A nonconforming structure may be enlarged or expanded without a waiver or variance provided:"	reword to better reflect intent	Reword to read "A nonconforming structure may be enlarged or expanded without a waiver or variance provided:" in section 1203.E
8	1204.A(1) strike "nonconforming" from second sentence.	Abandonment clause applies to all uses, not just non-conforming uses.	Strike "nonconforming" from second sentence in section 1204.A(1)
9	1206.A(1) change "shall" to "will"	grammer fix	Grammer fix- change "shall" to "will" in section 1206.A(1)
10			
11			

12	Part 2		
13	2101.C, 2102.C, 2103.C, 2104.C, 2105.C, 2106.C, 2107.C, 2108.C, 2109.C, 2110.C, 2111.C, 2112.C, 2113.C, 2114.C In each section there is at least one reference to Figure 2-14 (in some cases there are two). This should be changed to Figure 2-15.	Correcting wrong citation	Fix citation to read "Figure 2-15" rather than "Figure 2-14" in all the places listed.
14	Figure 2-01; Figure 2-02; Figure 2-04; Figure 2-07; Figure 2-08; Figure 2-09 strike entire max setback portion of requirement	Although the new hotel application is being reviewed under the old (current) zoning, it did let staff look at the proposed zoning and look at it in light of the new rules as well. It was noted that we did not have enough information to administer the maximum setback provisions. While it is a good planning principle, the zoning needs more work and should be struck until the planning commission can spend time with a fix (rather than rushing a change). The issue is that the bylaws do not address two principle buildings on a site (like a hotel behind the Capital Plaza). That new hotel application would be denied because it is more than the maximum setback allowed in that district. There also are no exemptions for accessory structures so a garage in the residential 1500 or 3000 would not be allowed behind the principle building. We don't think that was the intent but there isn't an exemption for it in the bylaws as written. Even if a quick fix was made to accessory buildings, an application to add an accessory unit would change the compliant structure to non-compliant which would result in an application getting denied. I think this is a provision that is currently half a good idea (as Bill is known to say).	
15	Figure 2-03 regarding front setbacks, "max" should be "min"	typo	Typo- the setback listed (15 feet) was intended to be the minimum setback not the maximum setback. Change "Max" to "Min" in figure 2-03.
16	Figure 2-03 regarding residential densities. Planning Commission recommendation to remove maximum residential density limit of 1 dwelling unit per 3,000 square feet.	See Planning Commission memo	Council agreed. Delete residential density limit in UC-3.
17	2110.B(3) strike second sentence which discusses undeveloped land associated with the college.	That land is no longer in this neighborhood.	Strike second sentence in 2110.B(3)
18	2112.B add a new (1) and change the current (1) to (2). The new (1) should read "College Pasture. This three acre undeveloped parcel is owned by the college and is located behind properties on Sabin Street. The land abuts other undeveloped land owned by the college to the north (zoned Mixed Use Residential) and south (zoned Riverfront). The open space also connects to Sabin Pasture to the east. This land is close to downtown and could support some housing development or have those units transferred to other undeveloped land abutting the parcel."	This is a new neighborhood that needs a description for this section.	
19	Figure 2-15 Add "neighborhood market" as a conditional use to riverfront, eastern gateway, western gateway, and mixed use residential. This will be removed from residential 3000, residential 6000, residential 9000, and residential 24,000.	This will be discussed further in section 3117 but the districts were changed since the development of the neighborhood market rules so the areas where markets were allowed no longer coincided with the zoning districts where it was allowed. This is the recommended fix.	

2017 Council Hearing comments and changes (December 13 and 20)

20	Chapter 220. Show "Capitol Complex exclusion area" on zoning map	Considering the design review provisions do not apply to the Capitol complex and we already show exclusion areas on the map for Cliffside, staff felt it would be good to show the CC exclusion area as well.	Show Capitol Complex as excluded from design review on zoning map.
21			

2017 Council Hearing comments and changes (December 13 and 20)

22	Part 3		
23	Figure 3-01 reference to section 3203 is still wrong. Should read "3002.F"	This was noted in the last matrix but the image is not changeable. We will note that it is wrong here and see if we can get consultant to make a new image.	If possible, fix image in figure 3-01 to read 3002.F
24	3002.E(3) change the first "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	Grammar fix "shall" to "will" in section 3002.E(3)
25	3002.F(1) change "shall" to "must"	grammar fix	Grammar fix "shall" to "must" in section 3002.F(1)
26	3002.G(5) replace (5) with "Setbacks for buildings and similar structures shall be measured to the closest point of the structure." and strike all of (a).	The Zoning Administrator thinks it is clearer to measure to the closest point on the structure than to measure to the foundation of the structure.	
27	Figure 3-06. Strike Front (minimum) and its associated waiver language. Add (under Building) Footprint (maximum) with a max waiver provision reading "No maximum limit to waiver request."	The first part is because the language in the minimum setback is already allowed administratively in 3002.G(4) so a waiver hearing is unnecessary. The second regarding footprints reflects the decision that was made in the previous draft but was not accurately reflected in the current draft.	Strike Front (minimum) and its associated waiver language. Add (under Building) Footprint (maximum) with a max waiver provision reading "No maximum limit to waiver request." in Figure 3-06.
28	3004.B Strike all	Section 2201, referred to in this section, was later moved to this section (3004.E) so this provision in .B is now wrong and unnecessary.	Strike all of section 3004.B
29	3004.E(1)(a) change "landscaped and screened" to "landscaped or screened"	grammar fix	Grammar fix to change "landscaped and screened" to "landscaped or screened" in section 3004.E(1)(a)
30	3004.E(2) change "...Vermont Historic Sites and Structures and the National Register..." to "...Vermont Historic Sites and Structure or the National Register..."	grammar fix - listing on one or the other is protected from demolition.	Grammar fix to change "...Vermont Historic Sites and Structures and the National Register..." to "...Vermont Historic Sites and Structure or the National Register..." in section 3004.E(2)
31	3004.E(4)(b) change "...reasonable use of the property" to "... reasonable use of the property".	typo	Typo - change "us" to "use" on last line of 3004.E(4)(b)
32	3005.B and water setback requirements in figures 2-01, 2-02, 2-03, and 2-04. Planning Commission has recommendations to change riparian setbacks and buffers back to the original language proposed by the planning commission	See Planning Commission memo.	Council requests language exempting channelized portion of the downtown.
33	3005.G change to read "...the Development Review Board shall find that either subsection (1) or (2) is met."; also strike "Either" from (1) and "Or" from (2).	grammar change for clarity	Change section 3005.G to read "...the Development Review Board shall find that either subsection (1) or (2) is met."; also strike "Either" from (1) and "Or" from (2).
34	3007.E strike duplicate "a required" in the first sentence and add " in accordance with the process for conditional use review outlined in Chapter 450" to the end of the first sentence. Also change the word "guidelines" to "standards" in last sentence.	First change is a typo ("require a required hearing"); second is to clarify what type of hearing will be conducted; Third you cannot have guidelines without standards. It is believed that the guidelines in .H are actually standards so we will recommend making that change as well (see below).	In section 3007.E strike the duplicate "a required" in the first sentence and add " in accordance with the process for conditional use review outlined in Chapter 450" to the end of the first sentence. Also change the word "guidelines" to "standards" in last sentence.
35	3007.H Change the word "guidelines" to "standards" in title.	To be consistent with decision above.	Change "guidelines" to "standards" in title of 3007.G
36	3008.B change "shall" to "will" in the last sentence.	grammar fix	Grammar fix to change "shall" to "will" in the last sentence.
37	3011.B(1) need to add Urban Center 3 to the list and change the first "shall" to "will"	Technical and grammar changes	Add Urban Center 3 to the list and change the first "shall" to "will" in section 3011.B(1)
38	3011.C(3) under (a) change "shall" to "will" and after (d) change "and" to "or"	Grammar and technical changes	In 3011.C(3) under (a) change "shall" to "will" and after (d) change "and" to "or"
39	3011.E change "and" to "or"	grammar fix	In 3011.E, change "and" to "or"
40	3011.E(3) change second "shall" (after "revised agreement") to "will"	Grammar fix	In 3011.E(3), change "shall" to "will"
41	3011.F second "shall" should be a "will"	grammar fix	In 3011.F change "shall" to "will"

2017 Council Hearing comments and changes (December 13 and 20)

42	3011.I(1)(b) change "shall" to "will"	grammer fix	In 3011.I(1)(b) change "shall" to "will"
43	3011.I(6) change first "shall" to "will"	grammer fix	In 3011.I(6) change first "shall" to "will"
44	3012.C(11) delete	typo header with nothing after it	Delete 3012.C(11)
45	3012.G(3) change 12 to 6	12 square feet is a big as the wall and ground mounted signs. We believe the intent was for smaller pedestrian oriented signs to guide people to the business.	
46	3012.G(4) (f) change first "shall" to "will"	grammer fix	In 3012.G(4)(f) change first "shall" to "will"
47	3012.G(7)(f) change second "shall" to "will"	grammer fix	In 3012.G(7)(f) change second "shall" to "will"
48	Figure 3-16 In column with EG, add Crossroads neighborhood and add a footnote to RIV that has Note 1: excluding Crossroads neighborhood. Also under Urban Center add 12 square feet for ground mounted sign area and 8 feet for ground mounted sign height	Two items were noted in our final review. The signs that exist in the crossroads neighborhood are more consistent with those required in EG. Also, with the addition of UC1 and UC2 there are now properties that can have ground signs but we don't have standards for them. These additions fix those items that had been overlooked.	
49	Add 3102.D that reads "Temporary permits may be issued by the Adminsitrative Officer for a period not exceeding 120 days provided such permits are conditioned upon removal of the structure or use upon expiration of the permit. Such permits may be renewed for additional periods not exceeding 90 days, if the Adminsitrative Officer finds that the construction requires it."	The Zoning Adminsitrator requested that the language from the existing zoning be added to the proposed regarding how long temporary permits are good for.	
50	3104.A strike "owner occupied" and strike (4)	This was one of the outstanding issues from the previous matrix that we had requested an opinion from the city attorney. He confirmed that we can remove the owner occupied limitation on accessory apartments.	
51	3106.B and 3106.C both refer to figure 2-14 which should be 2-15	wrong citation	change figures 2-14 to 2-15 in 3106.B and 3106.C
52	3107.A change both "shall"s to "will"s	grammer fix	In 3107.A change both "shall"s to "will"s
53	3107.D add "as listed on Figure 2-15" to the end of the sentence.	Small statement was needed to clarify where that provision was located.	In 3107.D add "as listed on Figure 2-15" to the end of the sentence.
54	3110.A(5) change "and" to "or"	technical fix	In 3110.A(5) change "and" to "or"
55	3110.B(1) In second sentence change "and" to "or"	technical fix	In 3110.B(1) In second sentence change "and" to "or"
56	3117.C strike all	It was noted that many of the places listed for these markets were no longer in the zoning districts that allowed them. Adjustmenets were made earlier to figure 2-15 to remove markets from the residential neighborhoods and allow them in the mixed use neighborhoods (where this description targetted them).	
57	3118.B change second "shall" to "will"; In (2) change "shall be" to "is"	grammer fixes	In 3118.B change second "shall" to "will"; In (2) change "shall be" to "is"
58	3120.D add words "of abandonment" to the end of the sentence.	Clarifies when the clock starts.	In 3120.D add words "of abandonment" to the end of the sentence.
59	3122.C change he/she to "the Adminsitrative Officer"	clarification	In 3122.C change he/she to "the Adminsitrative Officer"
60	3124.G change "shall" to "will"	grammer fix	In 3124.G change "shall" to "will"
61	3124.I change to read "... the proposed extraction activity meets the conditional use criteria and that the development shall"	fixes a few things for clarity	In 3124.I change to read "... the proposed extraction activity meets the conditional use criteria and that the development shall"

2017 Council Hearing comments and changes (December 13 and 20)

62	3202.B reword to state that "A sidewalk shall be provided along the street frontage of the subject property if a sidewalk currently terminates at a property abutting the subject property in accordance with the following:"	The previous wording could be read that the developer would need to build a quarter mile of sidewalk to connect their project to the existing sidewalk network. I don't believe that was the intent.	
63	3203.H change "and" to "or" and change second "shall" to "will"; Also (5) change "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 3203.H change "and" to "or" and change second "shall" to "will"; Also (5) change "shall" to "will"
64	3204.D change to read "when changes to existing outdoor lighting is proposed"	Technically as written previously, any zoning permit would trigger a loss of grandfather status. Replace the front door in the historic district and you need to upgrade all the outdoor lighting. Again, I don't think that was the intent.	
65	3204.F(6) change first "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 3204.F(6) change first "shall" to "will"
66	3204.G(c) change first "and" to "or"	technical fix	In 3204.G(c) change first "and" to "or"
67	3204.H(2) change "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 3204.H(2) change "shall" to "will"
68	3205.B(2) add Urban Center 3 to the list; in (3) change second "shall" to "will"	Technical and grammar changes	In 3205.B(2) add Urban Center 3 to the list; in (3) change second "shall" to "will"
69	3206 strike "energy conservation" from title; .B Add Urban Center 3 to the list; .D change title to Nonconforming shading.	Energy conservation is no longer here; UC-3 was missed; discussion in .D is about non-conforming and how to handle them (not waivers).	In 3206 strike "energy conservation" from title; .B Add Urban Center 3 to the list; .D change title to Nonconforming shading.
70	3207.A change "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 3207.A change "shall" to "will"
71	3303.A(2) Planning Commission has recommended changes to this section	See Planning Commission memo	Amend section 3303.A(2) to read "That the traffic generated by the proposed development shall not unreasonably and disproportionately contribute to a degradation of capacity and relative "stop delay'." and strike (a) and (b) and replace with (a) that reads "Any change in an intersection stop delay of less than 20 seconds will not be considered unreasonable."
72	3303.A(3) change "and" to "or"	technical fix	In 3303.A(3) change "and" to "or"
73	3304.C add "undue" to "shall not have an undue adverse effect"	technical fix	In 3304.C add "undue" to "shall not have an undue adverse effect"
74	3401.A(3) change "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 3401.A(3) change "shall" to "will"
75	3401.F(1) and (2) change "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 3401.F(1) and (2) change "shall" to "will"
76	3402.K(1) reword to say "Vehicle access shall not be required to, and on-site parking shall not be required on, each lot or cottage."	reworded for clarity	In 3402.K(1) reword to say "Vehicle access shall not be required to, and on-site parking shall not be required on, each lot or cottage."
77	3404.B(2) heard comments that "unless part of another PUD" is a problem.		
78	3404.E (2)(a) requirement that development must include at least 20% single family detached units is going to be a problem.	Nearly every development proposal for housing has been for apartment units. Detached single family dwellings would need to be very expensive to cover infrastructure costs. Requiring detached single family dwellings would likely kill many proposals.	
79	3404.J David Rugh provided comments on open space. He recommends a range of 30% to 50% rather than the fixed 40% figure.		
80			
81	3405.E strike "and live-work units"	term not defined. Residential units would still be eligible for home businesses and industries like any other.	Strike "and live work units" from Section 3405.E
82	3405.F(2) move "and" from the end of (e) to the end of (d)	typo	In 3405.F(2) move "and" from the end of (e) to the end of (d)

2017 Council Hearing comments and changes (December 13 and 20)

83	3405.I strike everything after "Conservation Commission" and replace with "in accordance with section 4302"	4302 is where the rules that govern the conservation commision process are housed. The process pieces should not be repeated here.	In 3405.I strike everything after "Conservation Commission" and replace with "in accordance with section 4302"
84	3504 should match whatever is decided in 3303 conditional use- traffic.		Match 3504 to 3303.
85	3506.D(1) and (2) change first "shall" to "will" in each	Grammer fix	In 3506.D(1) and (2) change first "shall" to "will" in each
86	3506.K(2) and (3) change both "and"s to "or"s	technical fix	In 3506.K(2) and (3) change both "and"s to "or"s
87	3509.A(2) change to "Natural Resources Inventory Map"	typo	In 3509.A(2) change to "Natural resources Inventory Map"
88			
89			
90			
91			
92			
93			
94			
95			
96			
97			
98			
99			

2017 Council Hearing comments and changes (December 13 and 20)

100	Part 4		
101	4003.A Change to Design Review Control District	missed one in the previous correction	In 4003.A Change to Design Review Control District
102	4103.A strike "Administrative Officer or"	technically the administrative officer does not have the power to condition approvals. It could be required as a part of the regulations but not as condition of approval.	In 4103.A strike "Administrative Officer or"
103	4201.B change second "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 4201.B change second "shall" to "will"
104	4202.A(1) change first "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 4202.A(1) change first "shall" to "will"
105	4203.A(1) change second "Administrative Officer" to "applicant"	technical fix. The previous his/her was updated to the wrong party.	In 4203.A(1) change second "Administrative Officer" to "applicant"
106	4204.B change to read "...Development Review Board approvals expire..."	grammar fix	In 4204.B change to read "...Development Review Board approvals expire..."
107	4301.C new section to be added to say that "The meeting shall be noticed in accordance with Open Meeting laws.	technical addition to reflect state law. It was mentioned in 4302 but not here.	In 4301.C new section to be added to say that "The meeting shall be noticed in accordance with Open Meeting laws.
108	4301.E new section to be added that says "Where and applicant does not agree with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee the applicant shall, within 15 days, appeal the recommendation to the Development Review Board. Additional fees may apply based on the fee schedule.	While the process is clear for applications where the applicant agrees it was not for cases that they wanted to appeal. This adds the process that was agreed to at the Council meetings.	4301.E new section to be added that says "Where and applicant does not agree with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee the applicant shall, within 15 days, appeal the recommendation to the Development Review Board. Additional fees may apply based on the fee schedule.
109	4302.B, 4302.C and 4302.E (two places) change "hearing" to "meeting"	Conservation commission technically holds meetings, not hearings.	In 4302.B, 4302.C and 4302.E (two places) change "hearing" to "meeting"
110	4302.C replace "Subsection 4501.B" with Open Meeting Law.	technical fix	In 4302.C replace "Subsection 4501.B" with Open Meeting Law.
111	4502.B change "shall" to "will"	grammar fix	In 4502.B change "shall" to "will"
112			
113			
114			
115			
116			
117			
118			

119	PART 5		
120	5101.B(3) change second "shall" to "will"	grammer fix	In 5101.B(3) change second "shall" to "will"
121	5101.I(5) change all "shall"s to "will"s	state law says "will"	In 5101.I(5) change all "shall"s to "will"s
122	5101.N(3) change to "structure, use, or lot"	nonconformities come in three flavors	In 5101.N(3) change to "structure, use, or lot"
123			
124			
125			
126			
127			
128			
129			
130			
131			
132			
133			

134	ADDENDUM ITEMS		
135	S.H. Comment fences- 3101.D regarding front yard fences. How to determine when front yard fences can be 4.5 feet and when to be 3 feet.		Staff needs to develop language
136	S.S. Wants Council to revisit maximum footprint limits. Comment that numbers are too high		
137	D.R. Fix legend on Natural Resources Inventory Map to clearly label the "resources"		
138	A.G. Continued concerns about vernal pools.		
139	?? Comment about uses allowed in the MUR district-specifically Personal and Professional services.		
140	S. McShane comment that 3001.G.5.b - requirement to remove non-conforming parking in the most developed districts sounds good in principle but the reality is that this will cause a very big financial cost to owners of properties like Sarduccis, Shaws, and others on River Street. Strike it until a broader conversation and analysis can be performed.		
141	S. McShane comment that 4201.E should be removed. It is not the responsibility of the ZA to educate or ensure that the applicants are meeting federal or state laws.		
142	S. McShane comment on 4207. It is unclear what happens in cases of old Certificates of compliance. It is recommended that a new section be added 4207.K that reads " Unless a Certificate of Compliance was required as a condition of approval by the Development Review Board, Certificates of Compliance for permits issued under previous bylaws will no longer be required to be applied for or approved."		
143	P.D. section 3404.B(2) change to read "Required for any development of either 40 lots or dwelling units or more in a 10-year period that is 10 acres or larger and that is not located in the Urban 1 district or entirely in the Rural district.		Was this already approved?
144	P.D. section 3405.B(3) add a second sentence reading"However if the lots or are counted as a part of another type of Planned Unit Development and the number of lots would otherwise require a conservation Subdivision, the other type of planned unit development shall meet the requirements of Section 3405.F (Conservation Areas) for any portion of the development in the Rural district.		Was this already approved?
145	A.F. Figure 2-05 -Revise the per building footprint requirement in the eastern gateway district from 10,000 sf max. to 40,000 sf max.		
146	A.F. Section 2105.E We suggest eliminating the architectural standards for this zoning district until new rules appropriate to the area and district uses can be developed and vetted by the public.		

147	A.F. Natural resources Inventory Map- Remove the below grade portion of the "stream" that is shown on the Natural Resources Inventory Map that crosses the property parcel #051-006000.		
148	R.K. Table of contents 4-23 reference error needs to be deleted	typo	delete 4-23 shall error
149	R.K. section 2110.B(2) typo- should be "lots of varying size"	typo	2110.B(2) add 's' to "lot"
150	R.K. fix underline in section 1101.A(9)(a) the addition of the parket exemption was mistakenly underlined.		Remove underline from section 1101.A(9)(a)
151	R.K. 2104.F(1) - "no riparian buffer is required" - Elsewhere we decided to require the riparian buffer everywhere (unless we act on the planning commission comments)	(Excellent catch. That one should also read "Shall meet the requirements of section 3005.")	Section 2104.F(1) should read "shall meet the requirements of section 3005"
152	R.K. 3002.C(1) - This tells how to calculate max residential density in UC1, 2 and 3, but we don't have a max residential density in UC1, and UC2 (and depending on how we decide on the PC recommendation, maybe not in UC3 either). I think we need to strike UC 1 & 2 from this.	(You are correct again. We can strike UC1 and UC2.)	3002.C(1) strike UC-1, UC-2 and UC-3.
153	R.K. Figure 3-02 - need to make sure this is consistent with riparian buffer as defined elsewhere - not sure it is (doesn't mention 15 ft riparian buffer in UC1,2&3 and riverfront) - also, should probably reword so it's clear that "natural woody vegetation is the same thing as the "riparian buffer" referenced later.	(Good point. Those three districts do not follow protocol. Amending these figures have proven difficult. Technically where the written rules conflict with the graphic the texts rule but it would be best to fix the graphic if we can.)	
154	R.K. 3002.H(6) - Stories! Do we need to convert this to height, since we dropped our definition of story?	I wonder if 6 is needed at all. We don't specify how they meet the 24 foot minimum height so a tall single story meets the intent as much as 2 story. That's basically what #6 was saying. I would vote to delete it as unnecessary.	
155	R.K. Figure 3-07 - The limit on max 2 and max 3 per lot for garages and sheds caught me up again, even though I'd heard your explanation already, so I think we need to clarify that this is only a maximum when the structure is within the setbacks. I suggest clarifying this by both changing the name of the figure to "Accessory Structures and Uses within Setbacks" and also re-writing the parenthetical maxes on each of these lines to say "(A maximum of 2 of these structures per lot may be located within the setback unless...)"	Agreed with one caveat ... "Accessory structures and uses within the setback for principle buildings." Otherwise people may be confused about the new 5 or 10 foot setback.	
156	A.L. recommended changes to sign provisions (attached separately)	Staff had requested a legal review of the sign provisions because it is a complex legal area. Ms. Lafferty provided the attached proposed edits.	
157			
158	R.K. 3108.A - Delete "not" in "not more than 7 days" - we meant that camping for longer than 7 days was a camp ground, this says camping for less than 7 days is a camp ground.	Correct.	Delete "not" from 3108.A
159	R.K. 3123.C(1) - revise to say "...have the sale or use of locally produced farm or forest products..." and strike (a), since "locally produced" is defined in the definitions and (a) is now in conflict with that definition and also not particularly well worded.	Correct.	Replace word "local" with "locally produced"

2017 Council Hearing comments and changes (December 13 and 20)

160	R.K. 3401.C - should be "...achieve a Pre-Photovoltaic HERS (home energy rating system) index of 50 or less"	Agreed. (Thought we already made that change).	In 3401.C- it should read "...achieve a Pre-Photovoltaic HERS (home energy rating system) index of 50 or less"
161	R.K. 3403.B(9) - "A community building shall be compatible in scale, design and height to the homes" - this section takes the language from community buildings in other PUDs and applies it to manufactured home parks, which is generally good (I requested that change), however, we probably want to re-think whether a community building in a mobile home park needs to look similar to the mobile homes - maybe just strike this last line.	Agree we should strike last line.	
162	3404.C(5) should be "...achieve a Pre-Photovoltaic HERS (home energy rating system) index of 50 or less"	Agreed. (Thought we already made that change).	In 3404.C(5)- it should read "...achieve a Pre-Photovoltaic HERS (home energy rating system) index of 50 or less"
163	R.K. 3405.H - this description of community buildings in the Conservation PUD does not include the requirement that they be compatible with the homes that the other community buildings in PUDs sections have.		
164	R.K. 3406.E(1),(2),(4), 3406.L, 3406.M - insert "Campus" in front of "Master Plan" any time it is mentioned in this section - without specifying that this is the campus master plan, it may be confused with the city's master plan, which is also mentioned in the bylaws (I was confused!).	Agreed. That would clarify.	In 3406.E(1),(2),(4), 3406.L, 3406.M - insert "Campus" in front of "Master Plan" any time it is mentioned in this section.
165	3508.B(4) - insert apostrophe in "lots" (to make it possessive)	typo	In 3508.B(4) - insert apostrophe in "lots" (to make it possessive)
166	3206.E - this is one of several places that requirements for solar siting are mentioned. I am concerned that there are times when these requirements are going to conflict with some of our other requirements - for example, just a short while later in 3207.C(3)c, we say that projects requiring a major site plan should reduce the visual and shadow impact of upper stories by tucking the top story into a pitched roof, using pitched roofs with dormers, etc." - pitched roofs with dormers might be understood to "impede solar access" in 3206.E. I think it would be good to make it a little clearer to the applicant and to the DRB when solar siting takes priority, and when other things like architectural standards and street layout to reduce dead-ends (etc.) take priority.	How this is written, they would need to demonstrate 75 sq ft of solar access per dwelling unit before they could be approved for dormers. That's relatively small area of panels for a single family dwelling but for a larger number of dwelling units it could become more challenging.	
167	R.K. The land owned by the North Branch Nature Center appears to be in the municipal district. Since NBNC is a 501c3 and this isn't public land, I'm not sure that's the appropriate district.	You are correct about North Branch and could be changed.	
168	R.K. I'm confused by the area excluded from design review in cliff street (again!). It looks like this area is an island - I thought that the area was at the edge of the district. Is what's on the map the same area we've been talking about all along?	This is what was voted on for Cliffside (before you were elected). I noted that it would be a donut hole at that time and the Planning Commission really didn't like the donut hole approach but it was not changed. It was on the PC draft this way. We can talk about removing the entire neighborhood if you like (which was my suggestion if council was going to go this way).	
169			
170	F.C. On Figure 2-15 consider switching indoor and outdoor retail permit requirements in Eastern Gateway. Currently outdoor retail is permitted and indoor retail is conditional. Shouldn't it be the other way around?		