

| <b>ARTICLE 2: REVIEW AUTHORITIES AND POWERS – DISPOSITION REPORT</b>                          |                |   |  |
|---|----------------|---|--|
| Title   | UDC Sec #      | LUC Sec #   | Significant Revisions/Comments   |
| <b>Purpose of Article</b>   | <b>2.1</b>     |   |  |
| <b>Review and Decision-Making Bodies</b>  | <b>2.2</b>     |   |  |
| <b>Mayor and Council</b>  | <b>2.2.1</b>   | <b>5.1.2</b>  |  |
| <b>City Manager</b>   | <b>2.2.2</b>   | <b>5.1.3</b>  |  |
| <b>Planning Commission</b>  | <b>2.2.3</b>   | <b>5.1.5</b>  |  |
| <b>Zoning Examiner</b>  | <b>2.2.4</b>   | <b>5.1.6</b>  |  |
| <b>Board of Adjustment</b>  | <b>2.2.5</b>   | <b>5.1.7</b>  |  |
| Appeals of Design Review Board (DRB) Decision on Neighborhood Preservation Zone (NPZ) Permits | 2.2.5.G        | 23A-32.1.2.g  |  |
| <b>Design Review Board</b>  | <b>2.2.6</b>   | <b>5.1.8</b>  |  |
| Administrative Functions – Quorum and Voting  | 2.2.6.B.3      | 5.1.8.2.C   | <p>This section has been revised to clarify the role of alternate members and the DRB voting requirements, specifically as it pertains to making decisions on appeals to the PDSD Director’s decisions on NPZ design review applications.</p> <p>Staff has recommended that this provision be deleted because this process is rarely, if ever, used.</p> |
| Powers and Duties   | 2.2.6.C        | 5.1.8.3   |  |
| Environmental Resource Zone, Variances  | 2.2.6.C.5      | 2.8.6.8.A.2   |  |
| Gateway Corridor Zone, Variances & Historic Preservation Zone, Appeals                        | 2.2.6.C.7 & 15 | 5.1.8.3.H & Q   |  |
| Communications Land Use, Zoning Examiner Legislative Procedure                                | 2.2.6.C.13     | 5.1.8.3.N & O   |  |
| Neighborhood Preservation Zone, Appeals   | 2.2.6.C.17     | 23A-32.1.2.f  |  |
| <b>Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission</b>   | <b>2.2.7</b>   | <b>5.1.9</b>  |  |
| <b>Historic Preservation Zone Advisory Boards</b>   | <b>2.2.8</b>   | <b>5.1.10</b>   |  |
| <b>Planning and Development Services Department (PDSD)</b>                                    | <b>2.2.9</b>   | <b>5.1.4.2.D &amp; E, 5.1.11, 5.2.2.2 &amp; 5.2.2.3</b> | Text from LUC Sec. 5.1.11, with significant changes from staff. This section reflects the recent reorganization and renaming of the Development Services Department (DSD) to the   |

|  |               |   |   |
|--|---------------|---|---|
|  |               |   | Planning and Development Service Department (PDSB), and the Department of Urban Planning and Design (DUPD) to the Housing Community Development Department (HCDD).  |
| <b>Housing and Community Development Department (HCDD)</b> | <b>2.2.10</b> | <b>5.1.4 (except 5.1.4.2.D &amp; E)</b>                   |   |
| <b>Design Professional</b>                                 | <b>2.2.11</b> | <b>5.1.12 &amp; 5.1.13</b>                                | The powers and duties of the Design Professional and Design Examiner have been combined in the UDC for simplicity purposes and to eliminate redundancy.   |
| <b>City Development Review Committee</b>                   | <b>2.2.12</b> | <b>Development Standard 1-03.1.0, 2.4, 3.3, &amp; 5.0</b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The powers and duties of the CDRC is being relocated to the Administrative Manual for the following reasons: 1) CDRC is not a decision-making body; 2) CDRC is a policy group that reports to the PDSB Director; and, 3) CDRC's powers and duties can more easily be amended in the Administrative Manual than the UDC. References to the CDRC would be replaced throughout the UDC with "reviewed by the PDSB and other applicable outside review agencies" (or something to this effect).</li> <li>2. The Community Design Review Committee is proposed to be renamed to the City Development Review Committee. The new name more accurately reflects the duties of the committee.</li> </ol> |