

**Unified Development Code and
its Supporting Documents and
Tucson Code Text Amendments
– Corrections, Edits, &
Clarifications**

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
April 2, 2014**

Background

- **October 9, 2012** – M&C adopted the UDC, Administrative Manual, and the Technical Standards Manual.
- **January 2, 2013** – UDC and supporting documents went into effect.



Background

- Staff has found additional corrections and clarifications (aka “clean ups”) needed.
- None of these proposed text amendments will result in a significant change to how the requirements are implemented or enforced.
- The proposed changes are to the UDC, Technical Standards Manual, and the Tucson Code.
- March 5th – Study Session with the Planning Commission. No significant issues were raised.



Types of Clean Up Amendments

1. Correction of scrivener's errors;
2. Correction of section references;
3. Correction to permitted use tables;
4. Removal of outdated references (e.g. Development Designator system);
5. Correction to the certain procedures; and,
6. Addition of the residential density calculation.



Key Proposed Amendment – UDC

Issue: The distinction between the Entertainment and Large Dance Hall uses is unclear.

Proposal: 1) Revise the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone permitted use table to clarify dance halls under 18,000 sf are governed by the Entertainment use-specific standards; and 2) Relocate the definition of Large Dance Hall to become a subtype of the Entertainment Use.

Reason: The proposal clarifies which standards apply to Dance Halls.



Key Proposed Amendment – UDC

Issue: The Industrial Zone permitted use table incorrectly indicates that the additional permitted accessory uses to any permitted Storage or Wholesaling Use Group use apply to the P-1 zone and not the P-2 zone.

Proposal: Correct this error and make the process consistent with the LUC.

Reason: The proposal corrects a mistake in the Industrial Zone permitted use zone.



Key Proposed Amendment – UDC

Issue: Two figures in Article 6 include references to the Development Designator system and perimeter yard designations.

Proposal: Delete these references.

Reason: These designations are a remnant of the LUC and are not used in the UDC.



Key Proposed Amendment – UDC

Issue: The method for calculating residential density is included in the LUC, but not in the UDC.

Proposal: Add the residential density calculation from the LUC into the UDC.

Reason: The residential density calculation was seen as being superfluous when the UDC was initially developed. However, now that the UDC has been in effect for over 1 year, there have been instances when the calculation has not been used consistently.



Key Proposed Amendment – UDC

Issue: The accessory wall provisions in nonresidential zones needs to apply more generally to any perimeter yard and not just to the side and rear yard as currently stated.

Proposal: Revise Sec. 6.6.2.J as follows: “In nonresidential zones, walls or fences, as permitted in Section 6.6.2.I above, may exceed the heights standards, provided the wall or fence complies with the perimeter ~~side and rear~~ yard standards applicable to buildings on the site.”

Reason: The correction will make the UDC consistent with the standards that have been in effect for years per the LUC.



Key Proposed Amendment – UDC

Issue: The Individual Parking Plan (IIP) procedures are incorrect (Sec. 7.4.5.A.6)

Proposal: Correct the procedure so that projects within 300' of R-3 or more restrictive zoning requires the 300' Notice Procedure and projects more than 300' requires the PDSD Director Approval Procedure.

Reason: The procedures were inadvertently switched when the UDC was developed. The proposed change would make the procedures the same as the LUC and the ordinance establishing the IPP.



Key Proposed Amendment – Tucson Code

Issue: The Water, Amenities, Safety and Habitat (WASH) procedure in the Tucson Code is inconsistent with the revised procedure in the UDC adopted by Council.

Proposal: Revise the WASH procedure in the Tucson Code from the 300' Notice Procedure to the PDSD Director Approval Procedure.

Reason: The proposal corrects this oversight.



Staff Recommendation

That the Planning Commission forward this item to the Mayor and Council with a recommendation to adopt.

