

## RICAP 8 Workplan Summary

Note: Items selected for the workplan are *not* proposed changes. These items will be researched and analyzed further, and if warranted, specific code amendment proposals will be considered in a legislative process beginning in 2016.

ITEM	Referred by
<b>Land Division Bundle</b>	
<p><b>ROW dedications in LDs and permits</b></p> <p>1. Land Divisions: Align MD calculations with SD LDs (do not count dedication along existing streets, only count new streets/street extensions)</p> <p>2. Permits: Calculate allowed density/FAR pre-dedication when a dedication is required.</p>	BDS, PBOT
<p><b>Minimum Density Calculations.</b> Allow exceptions to minimum density for multi-dwelling site constraints similar to single dwelling zones (i.e. landslide hazard and flood hazard areas). Currently only e-zone area is extracted.</p>	BDS
<p><b>Streams, Springs, Seeps and Drainageways.</b></p> <p>1. Align requirements more closely with EN chapter regulations.</p> <p>2. Clarify definitions for the types of features protected under the streams, springs and seeps chapter, particularly how it applies to wetlands</p> <p>3. Update drainageway definition to be consistent with Title 17.</p>	BES, BDS
<p><b>Pedestrian connections/Common Greens.</b> Review these street types:</p> <p>1. Requirement to dedicate reduces site area by automatic 15% in SD zones (sometimes making LD not possible)</p> <p>2. Creates corner lots with potential for added density (duplexes).</p>	BDS
<p><b>Lot Consolidation.</b> Lot Consolidations (Type Ix) have no approval criteria – just standards. Process should be administrative, like a PLA.</p>	BDS
<p><b>Plat Vacation.</b> Provide a simple process for vacating an approved (but unconstructed) plat, including the conditions, if the owner desires to return the parcel to its pre-land division configuration. A Type Ix procedure would provide opportunity to address any conditions that would need to be modified and/or retained.</p>	BDS
<b>PLAs / Lot Confirmations</b>	
<p><b>Lot confirmation process and standards.</b> Develop a process for reviewing lot confirmation requests, provide standards that must be met for approval, including service standards and required improvements</p>	BDS, PBOT, BES
<p><b>Property Line Adjustment Standards.</b></p> <p>1. Clarify service availability requirement</p> <p>2. Consider standards for requiring lot lines perpendicular from street</p>	BES
<b>Radio Frequency Regulations</b>	
<p>Update the Radio Frequency, Design and other overlay codes to ensure local regulations comply with the FCC determination regarding their updated rules approved under Section 6409 of the Tax Act.</p>	BDS, BPS
<b>Permit Issues</b>	
<p><b>Signs in Historic Overlay.</b> Currently, there are no exemptions for small signs in historic districts. Consider allowing a small sign to be exempt from historic review, especially if the building is not a landmark.</p>	BPS, BDS
<p><b>Loading Standards.</b> Modify requirement for forward ingress/egress for loading spaces with smaller development when limited parking is proposed</p>	BDS/ PBOT

<b>TECHNICAL ITEMS</b>	
<b>Tree Code</b>	
<p>Consider code amendments to fix technical issues that have arisen with the implementation of the new Tree Code:</p> <p><u>Non-Development-Related Situations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A request to add three definitions to 11.80 for tree, building, and attached structure.</li> <li>• Addition of the ability for UF to place a lien on property as an enforcement tool in 11.70 Enforcement.</li> </ul> <p><u>Development-Related Situations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification in Technical Specification 11.60 of 25% encroachment into RPZ</li> <li>• Clarify tree protection requirements when development is proposed far from tree or when there is other development between the tree and proposed development.</li> <li>• Clarify how tree preservation plan applies through a “project” – Demolition and new development ? Through land division or lot confirmation/property line adjustment?</li> <li>• Create allowance for very limited ground disturbance without triggering tree preservation requirements.</li> <li>• Clarify tree protection requirements when existing paved surfaces are within the RPZ.</li> <li>• Correct reference for tree density requirements in development impact area</li> </ul>	BDS
<b>Other Technical Items (automatically added to RICAP)</b>	
<p>The following technical fixes and clarifications have been identified as not requiring significant resources. These items are automatically added to the RICAP 8 package.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flag lot width requirements</li> <li>• Established building lines for primary structures</li> <li>• Non-conforming residential density when intentionally destroyed</li> <li>• Non-conforming uses, changing to another non-conforming use</li> <li>• Design exemption for rooftop ductwork, like mechanical equipment</li> <li>• IR zone and required design review</li> <li>• Pleasant Valley overlay (process and gardens in disturbed area exemption)</li> <li>• Plan District Maps (code references and consistent legends)</li> <li>• NW Plan District – FAR bonus certification letter</li> <li>• Clarify posted notice requirements for City Council hearings</li> <li>• Definitions (springs, seeps, wetlands, drainageways, hazardous substances)</li> </ul>	BPS

Minor Policy Issues: 13

Technical/Clarification Items: 24