			ReTool Final Draft Consolidated Comments Table		
Page	Section	Source	Reviewer Comment/Question	Staff Response	Optional langauge
1	7.1.103	PC	Can the Purpose statements be used to contradict future development. Folks could use the purpose statements to disagree with development. This is true of all Purpose statements throughout retool. - Per Item G in the Purpose, would like to see more focus on this, though unsure if the UDC is the place for this? Also, we need a definition for affordable	Generally speaking, purpose statements are worded using less specific language. We did however have some changes. Regarding "other" purpose statements, it is the charge of staff to evaluate the criteria for each application type to address the Other "purpose" statements to a certain degree. This is not an abnormal approach to code writing...start general and get more specific. and we have whittled down from current code	No change proposed
1	7.1	PC	Recommend Adding a new section to address Transition and Implementation to clarify the potential use cases for new development, coexistence with communities and zoning developed under the current zoning ordinances, and zoning change request within establish communities and infill. As I mentioned at the session: It needs to be made very clear that the old ordinance will remain in effect (with minor dimensional changes) until application is made for a zone change to activate UDC requirements. The UDC will govern the zoning for all new development upon approval and will also be available for zoning change request for infill and replacement within established communities with Planning Staff and Planning Commission approval at public meeting.	Pending discussion with consultant.	Open to discussion.
1	7.1.103.G	PC	Promote opportunities for affordable and attainable housing throughout the City. This is the sole mention of affordable and attainable housing in the UDC. There are no follow-on sections that really address how this type of housing will be promoted. This area needs expansion and a higher level of detail. Cost of housing is market driven. The market and changes in trends vary over time and cannot always be predicted within a given building cycle. The current housing boom, inflationary environment, supply chain shortfalls, and mortgage rate experience highlight the risks involved. The city can give incentives in the form of reduced fees to assist but this still does not provide the complete answer. Lower cost housing in developed neighborhoods can be made compatible for infill or for replacement but the market will have to produce them at a price point that will attract potential buyers in the envisioned demographic and that will also provide the developers and builders with a reasonable profit margin. The buyers must be willing to accept a home without high-end amenities using lower cost but still compatible materials to reduce cost. Suggestions made at yesterday's meetings included converting larger historic homes into multi-family buildings or the addition of duplexes/triplexes of compatible architecture to these housing districts. These suggestions would require buy-in from the neighborhood associations conceptually and use of special demonstration projects as proof of concept.		

2	7.1.105	PC			This means that the City Council has the ultimate authority to interpret the code	No change proposed
2	7.1.108	PC		Cost of housing is market driven. The market and changes in trends vary over time and cannot always be predicted within a given building cycle. The current housing boom, inflationary environment, supply chain shortfalls, and mortgage rate experience highlight the risks involved. The city can give incentives in the form of reduced fees to assist but this still does not provide the complete answer. Lower cost housing in developed neighborhoods can be made compatible for infill or for replacement but the market will have to produce them at a price point that will attract potential buyers in the envisioned demographic and that will also provide the developers and builders with a reasonable profit margin. The buyers must be willing to accept a home without high-end amenities using lower cost but still compatible materials to reduce cost. Suggestions made at yesterday's meetings included converting larger historic homes into multi-family buildings or the addition of duplexes/triplexes of compatible architecture to these housing districts. These suggestions would require buy-in from the neighborhood associations conceptually and use of special demonstration projects as proof of concept.	This language was vetted by the City Attorney's Office based on comments from City Council	No change proposed
3	7.2.1	PC		I think I asked this but are there going to be auto zone changes that don't need to go before the board and council? How do you define those changes? Is this what 7.3.106 is trying to state? I am hoping that we don't have a bunch of zone change hearings to establish that conversion.	We believe this is more of a process question that a language question. The intent is to perform a city initiated zone change for all non-residential properties as presented	We can show the conversion slide
5 thru 13	7.2	HNP		Retain the maximum lot coverage ratios as provide for in the existing zoning code	The intent behind this change was to provide greater ability for homeowners to add decks/patios etc. and to limit the number of variances submitted. However, we have evaluated some of those and propose a compromise to add the coverage back in but change increase them as indicated below to reduce the number of variances. We have been processing about 30 variances per year for lot coverage. •R-E: Single-Family Estate – from 20% to 30% •R-1 9: Single-Family Large – from 25% to 35% •R-1 6: Single-Family Medium – Range of 30% to 45% to 55% •R-2: Two-Family – Range of 30% to 45% to 55% •R-4: Multi-Family Low – from 35% to 45% •R-5: Multi-Family High – from 40% to 50%	Staff suggests adding back in the lot coverage percentages with the increases as shown. This concept was largely supported by the commission during the discussion at informal (10-6-22).
23	7.2.302	PC		MX-T, I. don't understand a 60' height in a SU (Colorado College housing) and the code is not specific to that type only. It is allowed for all transition development and I believe that is too high. Even for student housing in a residential setting the surrounding neighborhood needs to be considered. I would approve 45', not 60'.	60 feet is the max. height for SU in the current code	No change proposed

52	7.2.504	PC	(WUI-O) Wildland Urban Interface Overlay and related City of Colorado Springs Fire Prevention Code and Standards requirements. This section needs to be expanded based on public input during associated Planning Commission hearings. "A Prairie Necklace A Place in Time" (September 19, 2019), 2424 Garden of the Gods, and other lesser debates. The arguments emphasize fire prevention and risk mitigation as stated in the current WUI-O requirements but went further to argue for protecting the natural beauty heritage of the front range and of the shrinking prairie environs. These and other areas in Colorado Springs of natural beauty that help define our city and to make it a destination for people across the state and nation. The area of 30th Street from Garden of the Gods Rd heading into the park set the scene for visitors. Developers in this area to include the Verizon complex and Navigators built to enhance and not disrupt the natural beauty and these attributes should be followed if further development is to occur along the front range.	This section creates and Overaly zone for the existing established WUI, which refers to an appendix in the building code that contains additional standards for construction. There are no "Prairie Zones" established in Colorado Springs. This would have to be a separate endeavor than ReTool and would require support from the administration	No change proposed
52	7.2.504	PC	Can the link to the WUI-O map be added to this section? True for any of these sections where hard boundary is established	The boundary is in SpringsView - we do not have links to zoning boundaries in the event something changes so we don't have to update the Code. We want the WUI in the list to alert applicants/property owners that there could be another Overlay they are subject to and the link out to Appendix K shows where that is. The Code viewing platform (EnCode Plus should provide links to these maps	No change proposed
56	7.2.507.A	PC/HNP	HNP Response, recommended edit: "The purpose of the Area Design Standards Overlay is to enhance the residential, commercial, and/or mixed use areas with distinctive characteristics but are not historical or within a Historic Preservation Overlay (HP-O) district. The intent of the ADS-O is to enhance the area's character and to foster rehabilitation, development, and redevelopment in character with the existing development, or as recommended in an adopted neighborhood plan."	This language was reflective of the intended focus of the ADS-O (dimensional standards, architecture, landscape). Changing he wording from "preserve the bulk, form, and dimensional standards" to "enhance the" is not specific enough to the intent of the creation of the overlay	No change proposed
56	7.2.507B(1)	PC/HNP	HNP Response recommend adding: "If no neighborhood plan has been completed for this area, this eligibility requirement does not apply" to 7.2.507 B (1)	The intent in requiring a neighborhood plan before and ADS-O is similar to having a comprehensive plan being the guiding document for a zoning ordinance. This is the same approach. Further, the Neighborhood Planning effort includes robust stakeholder engagement, which then feeds the discussion on the potential ADS-O.	Staff recommends no change, however, Planning Commission can either choose to keep as-is or to eliminate the requirement for and adopted neighborhood plan. Discussion during informal CPC (10-6-22) involved evaluating an option other than requiring the neighborhood plan.
56	7.2.507.B2a	HNP	Propose to change "recognized" to "identifiable"	Either word requires a determination of whether something is "recognized" or "identifiable"	Staff recommends no change, but Planning Commission can choose to leave as-is or replace the word "recognized" with identifiable"
56	7.2.507.B2d/e	HNP	Propose to combine sub-sections d and e	This is not a necessary change and really comes down to style preference.	Staff recommends no proposed change, but Planning Commission can choose to combine these subsections or leave as-is
56	7.2.507.C	HNP	HNP proposes two additional standards: 1. for maximum lot sizes and maximum coverages and 2. for use limitations	Staff does not believe these are necessary additions and the intent of this overlay is to NOT limit uses within the overlay. Uses are a function of the underlying zoning district and the use table.	No change proposed

57	7.2.508	HNP	Propose to retain language specific to application of the HP overlay zone	This may require further discussion to understand exactly what language is needed to be added back in. The goal was to consolidate all rezonings, including overlays, in ReTool. Willing to have a discussion on specific language; however adding the entire section back in would result in duplication.	Discuss further with HNP
59	7.2.509	PC	What is the thought behind the High-Rise Overlay? Is there any hard boundary area established?	This already exists today and is being carried forward. Properties have the Overlay on top of the base zone, largely in the Downtown area and near USAFA.	No change proposed
69	7.3.103	PC	Should we change the first and second PDZ to PUD? Before the effective date it's a PUD, after it will be a PDZ.	No standards will change in the PUDs, just the name, so it doesn't benefit to keep PUD vs. PDZ	No change proposed - for now as need to understand if there would be unintended confusion.
71	7.3.201	PC	Make duplexes conditional in R1-6 and R1-9 subject to offset requirements (recommend 500').	These are currently permitted uses in these districts and are not proposed to be changed. We received public comments and previous Council direction to not change permitted uses in existing residential district.	No change proposed - City Council provided early direction to not change the permitted uses in the existing residential districts.
71	Table 7.3.2-A	PC/HNP	Concern expressed regarding conversion of OR to MX-N. Would prefer OR is preserved as is. - MX-N What is permitted? More clarity on intent/principles - I would change the "Permitted" Use for Bar, Bed and Breakfast, Micro-Brewery etc., and Restaurant to "Conditional Use".	Staff has completed an analysis of all the uses in the OR and OC zones and how they have changed in the proposed MX-N. We will present the analysis with proposed changes to maintain the MX-N and address the concerns	Analysis provided in separate table.
71	Table 7.3.2-A	HNP	Safety Separation distances be established between new fuel dispensing stations(gas stations) and residential areas and buildings/places where people congregate (to inlcude, but not limited to parks, churches, hospitals, schools, or other places of public assembly)	Researched other Cities to understand what is being done elsewhere. Have not received further direction from deicsion-making bodies.	No change proposed, but Planning Commission can provide direction.
80	7.3.301 A	PC	Should this really be under the MX-N definition? This is spreading out information for each use throughout the code, we should consolidate where we can.	It is an additional standard or "Use Specific Standard" that refers back to the table and makes sense where it is.	We will ensure the "Use Specific Standard Section" starts on a new page to avoid confusion.

83	7.3.301.D	PC	'1. Why limit a Tiny House Park to 2 acres? Basically one city block? You had a question on if there is one bigger, not sure it is a specified tiny house area and it may be in the county. That is the only one I have heard of that is tiny house approved) but look at the trailer park east of Comanchero Dr. It is probably the biggest that I have seen and still growing. 2. Replace "Park" with "Community" for all uses of "Tiny House Park" 3. We may have an inconsistency between the minimum lot area (1.b.2) at 45.56 du/ac vs the density standard in 2.a at 25 du/ac. I can see how these might not be in conflict but may be worth making sure potential confusion is limited. 4. Recommend setback requirement match the R-Flex Standard (I think that's 10 feet?). Also recommend either no separation requirement or 6' to align with building code/construction fire ratings, consistent with single family standards 5. Revise Installation Language to "Each Tiny House shall be installed on an engineered Tiny House Trailer or permanent foundation…" 6. Require 1 bike parking space per unit in addition to a car parking space	1. If these are to be integrated into neighborhoods then the smaller maximum size makes sense 2. Change made 3. Suggest maintaining the max density of 25 du/a and the 1000 SF min. lot size. Other areas within the proposed tiny home community would be taken up by access and or common area requirements. 4. Change made 5. Change made 6. Change made	Propose changes in accordance with specific comments on items 2 and 4-6 as noted.
84	7.3.301.D.9	PC	1. Access and Circulation (9.a) language needs potential revision. A 5-foot path requirement makes sense for the "primary" walkway through a tiny house community, but individual feeder paths to this walkway could be made up of all kinds of materials, be variable lengths and widths, etc. 2. Personal storage section (11) needs additional work. This could potentially allow individual stand-alone 100sf storage closets, which would result in a terrible design. How we can we write this to allow flexibility for personal storage, bikes, mail rooms, laundry, common space (gazebo or community building) etc. Might make sense to broaden this to "accessory structures" with a (higher than 100 SF) cap based on units and a structure cap at something like 6 accessory buildings. Happy to collaborate a little to think this through completely.	1. Suggest leaving this at 5 feet for accessibility reasons 2. We would need a suggestion	Open to discussion.
87	7.3.303.3a(1)	PC	Cold frames, I have seem many above ground gardens that are 2.5' - 3' tall for those that want to keep animals out and not bend over to garden. Will those be grandfathered in or can the height in the code be increased? Should we change the name to above ground garden?	Noted and makes sense	Propose to change the maximum height to 3 feet. We will also define "Cold Frames" in the definitions section
108	7.3.304.F	PC	This is probably not the right section but believe that all new houses have an electrical panel large enough for a EV and would prefer to have the dryer plug needed for the station.	The UDC is not the appropriate place for this type of standard. This comment would be more appropriate in the Building Code as that is how it would be enforced	No change proposed
109	7.3.304.H	PC	Please provide the state statute that dropped in home day care regulations.	HB 1222	No change proposed

112	7.3.304.N	PC	Are there development standards for a playhouse?	No. This section just ensures that play structures over 6-feet tall must mee the standards in the zoning district, such as setbacks and maximum heights	No change proposed	
113/115	7.3.305 A&H	PC	I have pulled these permits but do you have an idea on the numbers that don't? Can you provide that as a number or percent? Is this effective and or should it be changed to do this out of regional when they pull their building permit?	It is not uncommon to have an standard in the UDC so that it is enforceable, which is why these are here. We have had several code enforcement cases involving shipping containers so we needed some regulations in place	No change proposed	
118	Table 7.4.2-A	PC	Front Setbacks - In R1-6 and R1-2 the table mentions a minimum, or an average of the 2 adjacent properties to determine the front setback. Seems to me the builders would always revert to the minimum, not the average if they wanted to build bigger therefore changing the potential look and feel of the surrounding area. My comments would be to limit any residential front setbacks to the average of the 2 properties adjacent to the project site. I think that would help preserve the look and feel of these existing neighborhoods greatly. Is there a reason only R1-6 and R1-2 take into account an average setback of adjacent properties? I would also recommend keeping side setbacks consistent with adjacent properties.	Intent behind this change is to allow for contextual setbacks. When new homes are built in existing SF districts, the front setback must be met which, in some cases, creates a wall effect on either side. Goal is to maintain character of older neighborhoods that have front setbacks closer to the ROW than what is currently required.	No change proposed.	
118	Table 7.4.2-A	HNP	Retain 30-foot maximum height in A, R-E,R1-9, R1-6, and R2	The proposed code change remains relatively unchanged. In the current code height is 30 feet and measured to the top of a flat roof or to a point 5 feet below a peak. Proposed code is to measure 35 feet to either the top of a flat roof or the top of a peak. Proposed code is essentially the same for peaked roofs and adds 5 feet to flat roofs. This is not a significant increase and clarifies/simplifies how we measure height.	No change proposed	
118	7.4.2-A	HNP	Change the street side minimum setbacks for corner lot in the R1-6 and R-2 zoning districts to 15 feet or the average of the two nearest developed properties facing the same street frontage.	Currently do not have clearly defined side setbacks which has notoriously caused confusion for applicants and development review staff. Side street (corner) setbacks are the current side setbacks + 10'.	No change proposed	
119	7.4.2	PC	Up to 6 DU/acre will not promote affordable housing in any SF Low zone. There are several ways to address this if we are serious about this issue. - We can advance affordable housing by allowing smaller lot sizes, which will lead to smaller units (more naturally affordable)	What is proposed in ReTool represents a compromise among several stakeholders. The creation of the Flex Districts for future development is intended to address these concerns. This district will allow for a mix of housing types within a development and flexible setbacks.	No change proposed	
121	7.4.2	PC	Note 1: Why not Flex high density instead of R5?	We may need a better understanding of this comment. The note #1 on this page applies to the R Districts. The notes on page 120 apply to the Flex Districts	Open to discussion.	
123	7.4.202	PC	EV rough in in all new homes needs to be added.	The UDC is not the appropriate place for this type of standard. This comment would be more appropriate in the Building Code as that is how it would be enforced.	No change proposed	
124	7.4.202.B	HNP	TOD incentives should be limited to predesignated overlay zones, such as North Nevada Renewal Area or Citadel area. The proper use of this incentive is to have high enough concentration of transit rider in one area that an effective BRT stop would be utilized. This can be achieved by restricting TOD areas that higher density is desired through the use of a TOD overlay zone	The incentive itself provides 6 eligibility requirements. Subsection b requires that BRT or bus service must exist. The BRT or bus service placement would depend on potential ridership and would be identified separately from this code. We believe he eligibility requirements address the concern expressed	No changes proposed	

125	7.4.202.C	PC	I personally don't like the addition of building height incentives. I like the LEEDish or LEED certification and other like Energy Star, Breeam, etc. The others are if you get lucky to have your lot is close to an arterial street or bus stop which can change at any time. That should not add to an allowed building height. I agree with incentives but not for building height. Great example, CC want a new dorm, 60" high, they could now have a 72' tall building surrounded by single story homes, seems a bit out of place.	The concern expressed is addressed in 7.4.202.C.1c where the use of the height incentive is limited adjacent to single-family zones. This section attempts to drive more context sensitive design.	No change proposed
127	7.4.301.A	PC	Could the purpose statement really reduce development approval if these criteria are not met and they are subjective.	These are not review criteria. Purpose statements provide context for review of the criteria.	No change proposed
131	7.4.302.J	PC	This may not be new but is it correct that homes more than 600' from the entrance to a cul-de-sac and or 10% slope have monitored fire alarm or sprinkler?	Looking into this.	Response pending.
158	7.4.4	PC	When do we get to review the engineering criteria manual?	Planning Staff is not involved in the update of the ECM. Will coordinate with their staff to understand when a copy for review will be available.	Response pending.
159	7.4.404.A.3a(1)	PC	How do we define safe, comfortable, and convenient	The applicant and staff work together to meet this standard	No change proposed
159	7.4.404.A.3a(2)	PC	1000' feet is almost 5 minutes to walk. This is not a walkable number. Imagine making cars divert 5 minutes to get somewhere they want to go.	Typically, walkable is 660' (1/4 of a mile).	This can be changed to 660' to be consistent with National standards and other Code section.
160	7.4.404.A.3b(1)	PC	Let's make it a minimum of 8 foot walkways	5 feet is the minimum required for ADA. Anything more would receive significant pushback from the industry.	No change proposed
198	7.4.10	PC	Small daycare, no parking required, large day care only 1 parking required, all houses are required to have at least one spot but STR none? These don't make sense.	We are not revising any of the STR regulations and this language was adopted in 2018. This has been noted throughout the project that STRs are not within the project scope.	No change proposed
199	7.4.10	PC	We should eliminate minimum parking standards. One major reason is this will promote affordable housing.	We have discussed this and it is more of a cutting edge approach; however, this would not be supportable both from the development perspective and the residents who have expressed concerns about parking standards.	No change proposed
199	7.4.1002B	HNP	add a 3(d) stating that reductions in parking requirments shall not apply to properties zoned for any residential use.	Adding this would eliminate the current right for many property owners, thus negating one of the main goals of the RetoolCOS project.	No change proposed
200	Table 7.4.10-A	PC	Eliminate the 2/DU parking requirement for SF homes. If homes must have a 20' driveway and 25' of frontage, 1/DU is sufficient. - Eliminate the 2/DU parking requirement for 3+ BR multifamily. Drop to 1.5.	We added this in with a lot of discussion and its intention is to mitigate guest parking for higher density developments.	No change proposed
200	Table 7.4.10-A	PC	Parking maximums - Why we don't have them? With all the expansion of the city, parking is a thing. I came from NYC. Parking is an issue	The parking maximum concept did not receive support during work sessions with City Council; therefore, this standard was removed	No change proposed, however Planning Commission may choose to add this back in.
200	Table 7.4.10-A	HNP	Make Short Term Rental parking requirements the same as Bed and Breakfast	We are not making any changes to the short term rental section of code. The STR section was drafted separately and recently and involved a number of stakeholders. We have made this clear in the number of presentations made.	No change proposed

203	Table 7.4.10-A	PC	We are wildly overparked for commercial retail parking with few exceptions. Eliminate minimums.	Same comment as above. This concept would not receive any traction	No change proposed
205	7.4.1005.A	PC	On street parking credit should be specifically called out as an option for SF units	Good suggestion	We need to work on proposed language and are open to suggestions.
205	7.4.1005.B	HNP	define affordable housing	The application of this reduction and definition is in the section. See subsection 2	No changes proposed
207	7.4.1005.I	PC	I would like to revisit the EV parking discussion if there is a majority/consensus among the planning commission. If so, my comments on EV requirements are rows 26-28. - EV ready spaces should count for something between 1 and 2 spaces for parking reduction	This has been a point of significant discussion with City Council. Initially, we required EV spaces and then allowed one EV space to count as two. After further discussion, the incentive was changed so that one EV space counts as one parking space.	Staff recommends no change, but Planning Commission may add the standard back in to code if they choose to do so after discussion
211	7.4.1007	PC	Has bike parking been required in the past? I have no objection.	No, this section is new	No change proposed
216	7.4.1009	PC	Increase hotel and multifamily requirement from at least 10%-25%. EV ready from 20%-50%. Requirement for multifamily should be reduced to 20-50 units from 200 units.	See comment above under page 207	Staff recommends no change, but Planning Commission may add the standard back in to code if they choose to do so after discussion
216	7.4.1009	PC	Can we require new single family residential to at least OFFER EV ready?	This would be a building code requirments and not a zoning code requirement	No change proposed
225	7.4.12	PC	Dark Sky - Agree with ensuring exterior lighting doesn't spill over or unduly brighten surrounding areas unnecessarily. (Though seems this is well covered in Section 7.4.12) Should more attention be given here?	Exterior lighting requirements are new to Code. We currently require automatic shutoff lighting. We cannot require dark sky principles in Code.	No change proposed
228	7.4.13	HNP	Establish criteria to regulate murals and require a permit for murals	The sign section of Code is not part of the scope of ReTool. There is currently a separate endeavor to amend the sign code that will be presented to PC sometime in 2023 after public engagement. Murals are tied to the sign code. That said, there are 1st amendment considerations and Supreme Court cases related to how local governments regulate signs.	No changes proposed
261	7.5.302.C	HNP	Proposed significant changes to this section expanding on scope and areas of review	Not enough information to make a comment. This section has been revised to incorporate necessary changes based on feedback from development review staff and applicants with vetting through the City Attorney's Office.	No change proposed

272	7.5.416 - Appeals	PC/HNP/Public comment at CPC	As stated in the RetoolCOS meeting, I support a review of the criteria for appeals in an effort to encourage more participation by citizens. I do not believe it should be City or county wide but should be more than the current requirements. This can be further evaluated based on establishing standing. I think this article makes sense, with the exception of one issue brought up by the HNP, and that is the "preserved standing" requirement. I think removing that requirement would make sense so the city is not seen as restricting participation in the process. I think the overall radius of 2 miles makes sense, but it does seem like it is limiting participation from the publics perspective. I would think if the radius was increased, or applied to all citizens in Co Spgs, it would be helpful. I think for the most part, people out side the 2 miles don't really care anyway, so I believe the appeals from outside the affected area would still be minimal. Just my thoughts. I support the 2 mile radius for participation and appeal - I understand the wording as currently written but it does seem to raise questions with the public about providing full public input and participation. The 2-mile radius is appropriate for most appeals, but not all. I recommend that a paragraph be added to allow appeal from parties outside the 2-mile radius that allows for situations where the nature or import of the appeal opens the issue to higher level interests than just those in the small area currently proscribed. There are State level conservation, fire safety, environmental, geological, water, and similar broad issues that require resources at the State level to provide informed expert research and debate to the appeal. This higher-level input could either be in support or denial of any given appeal. A legal equivalent would be for the appellant to show standing for the specific appeal	The proposed language has been vetted to a significant degree. Staff and Council believe this is a reasonable approach and will still provide a large number of the population that is able to appeal. ALL residents can STILL participate in the process. The proposal is a 2-mile radius, which is a 4-mile diameter circle. Furthermore, preserving standing for appeal through participation is a common approach. We will provide more data for future discussion	Staff recommends no change, however, Planning Commission may make changes to the language based on discussion. Some options: 1. Remove the automatic appeal langauge for those within 1000 feet and open appeals up to anyone in Colorado Springs but REQUIRE participation at the public hearing 2. Change the radius to incorporate more area...for example change it to 3/4/5 miles 3. Leave language as is 4. other based on discussion
289	7.5.515	PC	I'd like to better understand how land use plans are different from the current concept plans requirement.	Land Use Plans = consolidation of Concept and Master Plans, so there is not a major difference beyond providing clarity on the intent and requirements.	No change proposed
291	7.515.C1a(7)(a)	PC	A 10 year fiscal analysis is worthless for decision making. This time horizon should be reconsidered.	This standard has been vetted internally and is supported by the administration	No change proposed
296	7.5.516.D1(c)	HNP	Add a new criterion after c: The development plan is compatible and harmonies with the lot size, density, maximum lot coverage, setbacks, height, intensity of use, and public safety of the surrounding properties and neighborhoods	The proposed added language adds unnecessary specificity to the approval criteria. What is currently in Code is enough to evaluate all that is listed as well as those things that may not have made the list in the proposed language and has been vetted by the City Attorney's Office. This section has also been amended after further conversation with development review staff and applicants.	No change proposed