

## 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>	
<b>ROW dedications in LDs and permits</b> 1. Land Divisions: Align MD calculations with SD LDs (do not count dedication along existing streets, only count new streets/street extensions) 2. Permits: Calculate allowed density/FAR pre-dedication when a dedication is required.	BDS, PBOT
<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.	BDS
<b>Streams, Springs, Seeps and Drainageways.</b> 1. Align requirements more closely with EN chapter regulations. 2. Clarify definitions for the types of features protected under the streams, springs and seeps chapter, particularly how it applies to wetlands 3. Update drainageway definition to be consistent with Title 17.	BES, BDS
<b>Pedestrian connections/Common Greens.</b> Review these street types: 1. Requirement to dedicate reduces site area by automatic 15% in SD zones (sometimes making LD not possible) 2. Creates corner lots with potential for added density (duplexes).	BDS
<b>Lot Consolidation.</b> Lot Consolidations (Type Ix) have no approval criteria – just standards. Process should be administrative, like a PLA.	BDS
<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.	BDS
<b>PLAs / Lot Confirmations</b>	
<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	BDS, PBOT, BES
<b>Property Line Adjustment Standards.</b> 1. Clarify service availability requirement 2. Consider standards for requiring lot lines perpendicular from street	BES
<b>Radio Frequency Regulations</b>	
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.	BDS, BPS
<b>Permit Issues</b>	
<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.	BPS, BDS
<b>Loading Standards.</b> Modify requirement for forward ingress/egress for loading spaces with smaller development when limited parking is proposed	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