

Line #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
<b>Process</b>							
1	83	33.526 Table of Contents	33.526.350 should be shown as "strikethrough", not "underlined"	This is a typo	BPS		Consent
2	117	33.720.030	Establish the PSC as an additional recommending body in Design Guidelines for Historic, Conservation Districts, and Design overlay zones (and also for the creation of such overlays)	Guidelines could have equity implications (e.g. driving up costs to build or renovate a building; making it hard to build anything within these overlay areas). Although the PSC would probably not have the expertise for the guidelines, it could bring an equity lens to recommendations that might otherwise get missed. The same logic would apply to the establishment of new districts (I think Brandon might be working on that).	Spevak		Discuss
3	123	33.730.050.A	The heading "A. Pre-ApplicationConference" should be underlined.	This is a typo	BPS		Consent
4	125	33.730.050.B	Remove the limit for one DAR	Provide more opportunities for applicant input early in the design process	Bortolazzo (from BDS)		Discuss
5	133-135	33.825.025 Table 825-1 Footnote #2	Consider maintaining the current requirement for a DAR if a lower land use process is chosen.	The current City process of requiring DARs for affordable housing projects that take advantage of a lower land use procedure is a successful way to set affordable projects on a path of certainty and predictability early in the applicant's design process. The current City process also allows the applicant to hear public feedback early in the applicant's design process.	Bortolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: As proposed, an applicant could go through an optional DAR before submitting the Type II review. The current process (reqd DAR & Type IIX process) is a unique process not relevant to any other reviews. Only 2 projects have taken advantage of this in nearly 4 years, implying a lack of incentive to use in its current form.	Discuss
6	139	33.825.035 Factors Reviewed in DZ review	Clarify what can and cannot be modified through Design Review through legislative adoption of a list of elements that can be modified. Consider adding height, setbacks and setbacks to parameters that cannot be changed by design review (as they are already regulated in base zone). Ok to allow additional façade articulation.  Question to staff: how often do developments run out of height before they run out of FAR?	Provide greater clarity to the process of review. Although design review is authorized by City code to look at many aspects of any building, such as "placement, dimensions, height and bulk, lot coverage and exterior alterations, including materials, color, parking areas, open space, landscaping and preservation of trees," there seems to be some degree of confusion about what are non-negotiable allowances and what may be modified.	Bortolazzo	Staff: Needs discussion. Height can often be changed w/o changing entitlements (FAR, Density)	Discuss
7	139	33.825.035 Factors Reviewed in DZ review	Consider removing the exception to the principle that zoning allowances for floor area ratios (FAR) cannot be reduced by decision-makers during the design review process.	The Proposed Draft contains an exception for the Central City related to transfers of FAR from non-historic properties, which would allow the Design Commission to consider whether the FAR transfer impacts the ability for the project to meet the design guidelines	Bortolazzo	Need clarification of what is requested for removal. The exception to limits on FAR review, or the limit itself?	Discuss
8	139	33.825.035 Factors Reviewed in DZ review	"may not require the applicant to reduce or increase the <i>height</i> or the total floor area..."	Height is an entitlement that should not be eligible for discretionary adjustment through design review	Spevak	Needs discussion. Height can often be changed w/o changing entitlements (FAR, Density)	Discuss
9	147	33.855.020.A	Remove "Planning and Sustainability Commission" from the 1st sentence; remove the 2nd sentence entirely.	Is there any reason why the PSC, HLC or DC should be able to initiate quasi-judicial zoning map amendments? If not, scrap that ability for all of these review bodies.	Spevak	Do we remove commission allowance to initiate QJ map amendments?	Discuss
10	147	33.855.020.B		In the 2nd to last paragraph, does 'these amendments' refer to <i>all</i> the amendments described in this paragraph (including those initiated by HLC)? I like that idea, but I'm not sure it matches with current practice or intent. Overall, I think this paragraph is kind of muddy and could use a little clarification.	Spviak	I believe "these amendments" refer to any amendment requested by any individual or agency.	Discuss