

Summary of discussion with the UDC Advisory Committee (Aug 2020 – Jan 2021)

Streetyards, Gateways, and Parking

SY.01 Discussion	
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Artificial turf heats up quicker</li> <li>• No objection to allowance in the rear yard</li> <li>• Major concerns allowing it in the front yard</li> <li>• Should not be visible from the street.</li> <li>• Will not be maintained by property owners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Follow Up Needed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Direction on Draft Solution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not recommended.</li> <li>• If allowed, should be limited to the rear yard only.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Direction on Final Terms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a standard that restricts artificial turfs within an easement</li> <li>• If limiting it to the rear, may not have any value to add maintenance requirements. Keep preferred turf standards.</li> <li>• Potential loophole – no permit required. Possible solution - include scope of work in the flat work permit currently issued by the City</li> <li>• Address how impervious cover may be impacted (what is considered impervious cover)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Direction on Redlines:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further comment.</li> </ul>	

SY.02 Discussion	
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that requiring higher level at the street may create conflicts as other phases develop</li> <li>• Look at limits of construction as an option</li> <li>• 1 and 2 okay</li> <li>• 3 and 4 not sure</li> </ul>	<p><b>Follow Up Needed (October 14 Discussion):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example of thresholds and possible solutions</li> </ul>
<p><b>Direction on Draft Solution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 2 – results in additional trees for smaller lots. Readjust numbers so that the smaller lots do not result in more trees. Run scenarios to compare requirements.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Direction on Proposed Terms:</b></p>	

### SY.02 Discussion

- Comparison were helpful – good with revised option 2.
- Okay with implementation of option 3

#### Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

### SY.03 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- Goal is to make sure gateway area is heavily landscaped

#### Follow Up Needed:

- 

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Proceed as proposed

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- Proceed with Option 2 for defining the boundary

#### Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

### SY.04 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- Does exempting inventory lots meet the goal of the City?
- Require shade structures?

#### Follow Up Needed:

- 

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Recommend reconsidering exemption in a future UDC amendment
- Look at definition of “inventory lot”

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- Proceed as proposed

#### Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

### SY.05 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- It may take away more developable land

#### Follow Up Needed:

-

## SY.05 Discussion

- May be 75% or may be 10 feet – look at percentage vs feet option (bullet point no. 2)

### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Recommend having all possible solutions as “or” options

### Direction on Final Terms:

- Proceed as proposed

### Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.