Draft Provision/Section	NIC Comment/Concern	SAHBA Comment/Concern 4/6/06	Staff Response
RCP			
3.6.1.1 Purpose.	4/6/06: Use of RCP should only be allowed only if the proposed development is consistent with the purpose of the RCP as stated in #.6.1.1.A-G – otherwise the purpose will be ignored ORIG: Return to original intent focusing on preserving natural features		Consider rewriting of purpose to separate conservation and infill issues.
3.6.1.1.D Preserving to the *greatest extent possible* existing landscape features	3/20/06: Include percentage set aside/preservation		Consider separating conservation and infill issues. Consider including set aside (i.e. 30%) for conservation developments. Consider requiring private recreation areas or in lieu fees for infill sites.
3.6.1.2 Applicability.	3/20/06: Removing "…does not increase the density permitted by the underlying zone…" is an admission that RCP allows for density increase		Consider clarifying intent that a regular subdivision and an RCP subdivision has the same density.
3.6.1.3 Review and Approval Process.	3/20/06: Add the following language "The decision to allow a clustered residential development using the RCP provisions shall be granted only if the proposed development is consistent with the purpose of the Residential Cluster Project option in Sec. 3.6.1.1 A-G – (similar to 3.6.1.1 comment)		Consider rewriting of purpose to separate conservation and infill issues.
3.6.1.3 A-C DRB review for projects smaller than 5 ac RCP design modifications	4/6/06: Limited Notice Procedure is insufficient, needs to be more substantial; DRB meeting notification should be sent to neighborhood associations and residents and posted on the internet; DRB recommendations should be in writing and available to the public; quorum should be 7 rather than 5 members	DRB will increase review process at least 2 months	Explore options for timing, strong administrative design standards within ordinance, design standards with review process, or more stringent triggers for design review process (i.e. less than 5 ac. and 2 story).
3.6.1.4 Design Criteria. The following design criteria apply to RCPs and a conceptual grading plan and *other appropriate documents* ...		What are these documents and what will be required to comply with them	Clarify this, could include elevations, renderings, photo-simulations, etc.
3.6.1.4.A. General Criteria	4/6/06: Reinstate criterion that required compliance with design policies and criteria in the General Plan and area/neighborhood plans.		Consider more complete design standards within ordinance that accomplish area/neighborhood plan policies, may be better accomplished with Neighborhood Overlay Zone

3.6.1.4.A.1. *When developed with a density increase*, the RCP must provide for conveniently located commonly-owned recreation facilities…	4/6/06: Delete this phrase since all other references to with/without density increase has been removed		Scrivener's error
3.6.1.4.A.2. The architectural design of the RCP must be compatible with, or complementary to, the design characteristics of those existing...	3/20/06: Change "those" to "the"	Continuing problem with design compatibility; no distinction between good and bad design within existing neighborhoods; how will this be determined and by whom?	Consider more complete/specific design standards within ordinance.
3.6.1.4.A.2. ...detached or attached *structures along* the same block...	3/20/06: Add "located"		Edit and revise language.
3.6.1.4.A.4. Barrier-free accessibility	3/20/06: Tie this definition to the current definition in the LUC – Staff interprets this to mean "get the person to the front door but not necessarily inside"		Need to separate zoning issues from building code issues.
3.6.1.4.A.5. ...provide a buffer using one (1) of the following: A six (6) foot *high wall* ...	4/6/06: Add "masonry" before wall		Edit and revise language.
3.6.1.4.A.6. Bus turn-out lanes and bus waiting shelters must be provided if requested by the City	3/20/06: should be required automatically		Will review with Department of Transportation.
3.6.1.4.I. Additional Design Standards		Continued concern, entire section needs further review, based on Design Guideline Standards (*sic*) without Design Guideline Standards (*sic*) having been through typical stakeholder/public process	Need to better integrate design with process - draft RCP is opportunity for residential design review process. Need to further explore strong administrative design standards within ordinance versus design standards with an associated review process
3.6.1.4.I.3. Amenities. All RCP projects shall contain a passive/active amenity for residents of the subdivision…		This requirement is too absolute – not all RCP's can support or need amenities; central locations may not always be appropriate	Consider how and when to require recreation areas, when not to, and when to provide in lieu fee options

3.6.1.4.I.8. Terrain and Grading. a. For property within the HDZ, *sloped areas* in excess of 15% with an area greater than or equal to 7,000 square feet, shall be delineated and treated as Natural Undisturbed Open Space (NUOS)...		Define "sloped areas" as "naturally occurring"	Edit and revise language to better define this.
3.2.3.1.F. Residential Cluster Project (RCP) Density Matrix.	4/6/06: Delete references to Alternative B since density bonus has been removed		Scrivener's error
NEIGHBORHOOD OVERLAY ZONE			
	4/6/06: Concerns over legality of overlay zone, but otherwise supportive	No issues identified	Review legality
	ORIG: What does it take to implement NOZ? Does it require 51% of a neighborhood or 80%? What does "supercede the criteria of the underlying zone mean – could it provide fewer protections? (Example of developer acquiring majority of parcels in a neighborhood and relaxing restrictions)		Will further clarify these issues
MIXED USE ZONE			
	4/6/06: Does not support MU Zone Should require at least two different uses Should require minimum and maximum percentages Concern about possible locations, not restrictive enough Development standards don't offer enough protection for neighborhoods Should explore Pima County's CI-1 Mixed-Use Development Option	No issues identified	Will conduct further research and editing of mixed-use concept