

NZO Recommendation Hearing – PC Feedback Table

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Robert Miller</b>	<b>Bill Shelor</b>	<b>Jennifer Smith</b>	<b>Ed Fuller</b>	<b>Katie Maynard</b>
<b>1. Vesting Section 17.01.040(E)</b>	9/9 In application review process. 9/23 Supports sunset of 2021	9/9 Add sunset provision. 9/23 Not present.	9/9 Add sunset provision. 9/23 Supports sunset of 2021	9/9 Add sunset provision. Wanted change from 9/20 to 12/20 for vesting. 9/23 Not in support of 2021 sunset. Believes that it should be longer.	9/9 Add time limit for vesting. 9/23 Supports sunset of 2021
<b>2. Day Care Section 17.41.110 &amp; .130</b>	9/9 Okay with changes. Does not expect objection to errata. 9/23 Supports as written	9/9 Not sure of new language. Too much incentive in mods. 9/23 Not present.	9/9 Defer to Council. Okay with mods and errata. 9/23 Supports as written	9/9 Likes consolidated language, not sure of 5% modification. 9/23 Supports as written	9/9 Concerned with IG. Does not anticipate other concerns with the errata. 9/23 Supports as written
<b>3. Residential Care Section 17.41.210</b>	9/9 Could clarify the language on supportive and transitional housing and target population. 9/23 Supports Maynard comments.	9/9 Agree with Fuller. Could allow with a CUP, concerned with clustering 9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports staff language.	9/9 Okay as written. 9/23 Okay with Maynard language with the requirement for a CUP.	9/9 Large senior care, 6-14, or max 10, with a CUP in RS 9/23 Supports allowing in RS and RP with a CUP with GPA (wherever needed).
<b>4. Transitional Standards Section 17.10.030(B)</b>	9/9 Good	9/9 Good	9/9 Good	9/9 Good	9/9 Good
<b>5. Open Space Section 17.05.050(B)</b>	9/9 Good	9/9 Good	9/9 Maybe further refine definition.	9/9 Good	9/9 Add clarification on private (not unusable landscape area or fully enclosed spaces)
<b>6. Fences and Hedges Section 17.24.090</b>	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 Okay with NZO	9/9 Okay with NZO	9/9 Okay with NZO. Wants fee low for fence ZC
<b>7. Visual Resource Protection Chapter 17.26</b>	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 Inconsistency re: “appropriate”. Glad to see new language.	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 Add stream and ocean call outs. Add examples of views to protect.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Robert Miller</b>	<b>Bill Shelor</b>	<b>Jennifer Smith</b>	<b>Ed Fuller</b>	<b>Katie Maynard</b>
<b>8. Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Chapter 17.30</b>	<p>9/9 Need to come back. Need a more effective process for determining "feasibility." Use UCC language.</p> <p>9/23 Supports EDC language &amp; GPA if needed.</p> <p>Supports adding back in lagoon and woodland buffers.</p>	<p>9/9 Original CE 2.2 represent will of the community. Wants to revisit CE 2.2 through GPA.</p> <p>9/23 Not present.</p>	<p>9/9 Needs to come back next meeting. Within current language of CE 2.2, EDC comments compelling. CCC will be addressing our regulations and will find them inadequate.</p> <p>9/23 Supports EDC language &amp; GPA</p> <p>Supports adding back in lagoon and woodland buffers from a policy perspective.</p>	<p>9/9 No specific direction given.</p> <p>9/23 Supports staff recommendation and does not believe the EDC suggested language provides any clarity or effective standards.</p>	<p>9/9 Needs to come back. Lots of previous comments. Not a good grasp of how this will address response to comments. Need more details. Why can county adopt CCC language and not us? More direction from staff on "feasibility." Need more work. Restoration/research activities. Wetland "could" rather than "should" restore. GPA for 4:1 mitigation ratio. Information on what is feasible needs to be clear.</p> <p>9/23 Supports EDC language &amp; GPA. Doesn't want to move forward without EDC language.</p> <p>Add back in lagoon and woodlands setbacks.</p>
<b>9. Lighting Plans Section 17.35.060</b>	9/9 Supports comments.	9/9 Supports comments. Need cumulative budget for the project.	9/9 Support Cecilia's comments. Uplighting reference inconsistent.	9/9 Leave some to DRB.	9/9 .010 (modify purpose); .060(A)(2) add "shielded"; Exempt RS from lighting plans; Add lumens per Cecilia's comments; .030, VH 1.3(e) inconsistency.
<b>10. Existing Development Chapter 17.36</b>	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 No specific direction given.	9/9 Exemption a good move.	9/9 Good.
<b>11. Parking Standards Chapter 17.38</b>	9/23 Add 10% EV for vehicles and bikes; increase 1 space to 2 spaces for studio and 1 BR; add back in Old Town parking reductions	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Add 10% EV for vehicle; require EV in all residential; add back in Old Town parking reductions; would also like some TDM items cited for Review Authority to consider (as a non-exclusive factor) in 17.38.050(c).  Okay with staff's proposed parking standards.	9/23 Add 10% EV for vehicles and bikes; increase 1 space for 1BRd to 2 spaces; require EV in all residential; add back in Old Town parking reductions; increase guest parking from 1:5 to 1:2 for multi-bed units.	9/23 Add 10% EV for vehicles, require in all residential; provide charging for electric bikes; increase 1 space per bedroom to 2 spaces; add back in Old Town parking reduction from previous use (redevelopment)  Support Fuller and Miller increase request.
<b>12. Trailers/RVs Parking Section 17.38.080</b>	9/23 Does not agree with NZO as written, but understands that there is a larger issue with a shortage of storage lot options.	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Robert Miller</b>	<b>Bill Shelor</b>	<b>Jennifer Smith</b>	<b>Ed Fuller</b>	<b>Katie Maynard</b>
<b>13. Height Section 17.03.090</b>	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written
<b>14. Cannabis Section 17.41.090</b>	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written
<b>15. Mobile Vendors Section 17.41.180</b>	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Asked that there be an exemption for non-profits.	9/23 Supported consideration of exemption for non-profits. Also asked that Time Limits in subsection (E)(4)(b) be reconsidered.
<b>16. Design Review Section 17.58.060</b>	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written
<b>17. Development Plans Section 17.59.010</b>	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written, but a bit hesitant on PER staff being able to review and approve SFDs and up to 4-plex development.	9/23 Supports as written
<b>18. Modifications Section 17.62.020</b>	9/23 Supports as written with Zoning Administrator as the Review Authority, but increase 3-foot side setback to 5 feet.	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written with Zoning Administrator as the Review Authority, but increase 3-foot side setback to 5 feet.	9/23 Supports as written with Zoning Administrator as the Review Authority, but increase 3-foot side setback to 5 feet.	9/23 Supports as written with Zoning Administrator as the Review Authority, but increase 3-foot side setback to 5 feet.
<b>19. Development Impact Fees Chapter 17.70</b>	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written	9/23 Supports as written
<b>20. City Facilities Section 17.01.030 &amp; .040</b>	9/23 Does NOT supports NZO exemption for City facilities.	9/23 Not present.	9/23 Does NOT supports NZO exemption for City facilities unless preempted by law. Supports existing practice.	9/23 Agrees with Smith.	9/23 Does NOT supports NZO exemption for City facilities.