

2018 Comprehensive Code Update to Land Development Code (LDC)

Keyed to First Column in Civic Presentation “No.”

2. NO effect on DCPC or Public
3. Will make any appeals; more difficult, Staff actions stronger
4. Reduces decision time to make appear by 2 days
5. Counts “usable” attics as part of Gross floor area
6. Makes HRB appeals consistent with other process 2 appeals
- 7. Bee Hives and other “urban” agriculture uses. Could be problematic in Downtown**
- 8. Visibility arcs for entrances and exits. No common sense, just arbitrary calculations to avoid evaluation, might result in loss of Hundreds of parking spaces in Downtown.**
- 9. Will require CPG/DCPC to really pay attention if they want to express opinion on any process two items. May require either special meetings or immediate appeal to have opinion heard.**
10. N/A unless supersedes Downtown Design Guidelines.
11. Same comment as Item 8 above.
12. Size of screen and sound or not, not discussed, should be part of signage not LDC?
13. Very limited in Downtown, Not many single house lots remain, question: would allowing CU delay/prevent redevelopment of those lots and are Historic houses included?
- 14. Continued and additional exemptions, waivers for Affordable Housing.**
15. N/A
- 16. Allow recycling centers with no CUP/NUP. Noise, odor, operating hours would no longer have any input by neighbors.**
- 17. Would allow industrial equipment on the Outer Edge of zones directly impacting adjacent non industrial zones.**
18. In absence of MAD, or lighting district how else to get streetlights?
19. How is retail cannabis outlet different from retail alcohol outlet? What are the sensitive receptors for a cannabis outlet?
20. Could a temporary use (in Downtown all parking lots are “temporary”) be used for display, auction? We did have auto dealers Downtown at one time.
21. Downtown not in CPIOZ.
22. Allows Hotel/Motel/Timeshare anywhere. Does DCP/PDO control?

23. Bayfront only ESL in Downtown
24. Does not appear applicable to Downtown
- 25.
26. Downtown Design Guidelines already allow.
27. NA for Downtown once Bus Yard is gone.
28. NA under current Community Plan and PDO
29. Should also include ADA paths from Street/Parking
30. Should include Above Mean Sea Level for Downtown?
- 31. For small structures should continue to expire in 2 years to encourage lot consolidation and redevelopment of small lots.**
32. To CEQA not LDC
33. FYI typical lot Downtown is only 5,000 sqft, we already exempt up to 10,000 sqft, Whole block is only about 60,000sqft average.
34. NA unless some large blocks broken up in the future.
35. NA
36. Could lead to more disputes like in Little Italy with gelato truck parked outside gelato shop.
37. NA to Downtown currently but areas under Airport Overlay could be affected by future changes.
38. NA to Downtown
- 39. Could lead to reestablishment of Liquor Only Stores.**
40. ADA
- 41. City Facilities should NOT be exempt from minimum standards for Street walls, and other design requirements, May be exempted from FAR, but WHY? Change to Substantial Conformance Review (SCR) means Developer did not properly research or present plan. Allow only if all SCR requires DCPC recommendation in all cases.**
- 42. If Active commercial uses not required than ground spaces will be row after row of closed blinds. If review necessary, need changes to DCP/PDO and design guidelines, not slipped into LDC. If spaces NOT built than will never be available for future use destroying the ability of neighborhood formation and forcing further travel.**
- 43. Waterfront marine, Convention Center are within DCPC provinance, are in fact City land administered by the Port District for however long it exists. Not Civic at the moment. Public facilities may or may not be relevant as build out happens, for right now probably not important until next DCP revision.**

- 44.** Requires some thought, ie. expansion of the quiet corner Church to a mega Rock Church type use in middle of residential area? Or small restaurant to mega nightclub? **This implies no limits at all if allowed use.**
45. As stated, should we push back on airport overlay zones?
46. Should be consistent throughout and easy to understand.
- 47. NO. Hours were meant to encourage street activity. Downtown should not roll up the sidewalks at 8 PM.**
- 48. Should discuss, small size arrived at by architects drafting DCP and meant to encourage family, not roommate sharing, or home office use. Try increase in bonus first.**
49. Access has been, is, the issue.
- 50. Quick way to lose control of signage in Downtown.**
- 51. No storage means decks become storage, original driver for requirement. Regulations were put in place to prevent landlords from continually subdividing space yet getting same rent per unit. Repeating bad history is not good planning.**
- 52. Continue to decide on case by case basis, Blanket change will result in the Urban Canyons DCP tried to avoid.**
- 53. Good idea, but until someone solves the escalating HOA assessment problem not very practical.**
54. Downtown not currently covered by a CPIOZ.
- 55, Why LDC? All are supposed to be “temporary”.
56. Why LDC?
57. Concur with part of item 13
- 58. Permitting is good, community event advertising is usually good. Beware allowing any commercial advertising opens the door thru litigation to unlimited advertising.**
- 59. Need new studies, GQ has experienced large reduction in Parking for nightlife due to ride sharing.**
60. NA.
61. Clarify Accessory use and shared parking requirements in mixed use.
- 62. Change is from 1/12 of a block to 1/6 of a block.**
63. Not currently applicable, but with expansion of City College to 4 yr degrees and new campus plus law school and New School may become future issue to keep an eye on.
64. No comment.
65. Downtown guidelines apply, however getting trees in location not to impede traffic while still providing shade is a challenge.
66. NA

67. Could these Regulations supersede PDO?

68. NA, Downtown already has.

69. NA

70. NA

71. Should not be allowed, Street trees are requirement of adjacent landowner.

72. No comment.

73. No comment.

74. No comment.

75. NA

76. NA

77. No comment

78. NA

79. No comment

80. NA at this time, See 63 above.

81. Define "community".

82. Precludes informal lot subdivision.

83. Already defined in Downtown?

84. Mostly NA

85. Already in Downtown

86. No comment.

87. No comment.

88. Already in Downtown.

89. Should roof signs be again allowed? Seems choice now being given to owner.

90. No. Single deviation could then include view corridor, tower separation, Sun access criteria for parks, etc.

91. Clarification.

92. NA once MTS yard removed.

93. NA

94. No comment

95. How to avoid closed blind problem vs blank walls or garage venting issues. See 42 above.

96. Should discuss how "typical", typical is. Eg. Single lot in original plat, single lot as originally built on, or single lot by which sqft measurement?

97. Also should include definition, and "cost" of transfer of development rights from Ballpark and parks.

98. Allows non bona fide eating establishments, ie Bars, to be NUP vs CUP. Eliminates Public hearing and constrains appeal process.

99. Should be included.

100. No comment.

101. No comment.

102. No comment.