

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] UDC Text Amendment Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 25, 2023 at 6:09:40 AM Mountain Standard Time  
**From:** Chuck Martin  
**To:** Daniel Bursuck  
**Attachments:** image001.jpg

Daniel,

Since I am unable to attend the meeting tonight, I am sending my comments to you to share with the commission and public.

**11.3.7.A.4** I understand the purpose of this amendment is to allow “townhomes”. Townhomes are currently allowed using the standards in Section 8.7.3 Flexible Lot Development. The separation between units is governed by the Building Code by Section 8.37.3.K.1. I think the text should be changed to match the FLD standard. (It seems like it would be difficult to construct townhomes, usually on smaller lot, without using the FLD because of the minimum lot sizes in the residential zones.)

**Table 7.4.4.1** I have concerns about 1 parking space per unit. Single-Family requires 2 spaces per unit. Five three-bedroom units would currently require 12.5 spaces. This shortage of parking would potentially impact the surrounding properties. I would recommend that the parking be based on the current multi-family standards.

Multifamily Dwellings - 0-70 units/acre	The number of spaces per dwelling unit is based on the number of bedrooms in each unit as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Studio, less than 400 sq. ft. GFA - 1.00 space per dwelling unit</li><li>• Studio, more than 400 sq. ft. GFA, and 1 Bedroom - 1.50 space per dwelling unit</li><li>• Two Bedrooms - 2.00 spaces per dwelling unit</li><li>• Three Bedrooms - 2.25 spaces per dwelling unit</li><li>• Four or More Bedrooms - 2.50 spaces per</li></ul>
--	---

**6.4.5** As we discussed on Monday, I think the intent of these changes is good, especially for commercial development, there are unintended consequences for

residential infill development. The changes to the way the street perimeter yards measured are significant. I have not had time to evaluate the full impact on the current standards we currently use to design residential projects. I believe that there needs to be further study of this revision to make sure it is not detrimental.

Thank for your consideration of these issues,

Chuck

---

**Chuck Martin**

PRINCIPAL PROJECT PLANNER

**RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY**

3945 East Ft. Lowell Road / Tucson, AZ 85712

t 520.795.1000 / c 520.906.0719

[cmartin@rickengineering.com](mailto:cmartin@rickengineering.com) / [www.rickengineering.com](http://www.rickengineering.com)

SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE ORANGE SACRAMENTO SAN LUIS OBISPO DENVER **TUCSON** PHOENIX

Civil Engineering / Transportation / Traffic Engineering & Planning / Urban Design & Planning  
Water Resources Engineering / Surveying & Mapping / Photogrammetry / High Definition Surveying  
GIS & Geospatial Technology Services / Storm Water & Environmental Services / Landscape Architecture  
Redevelopment & Urban Revitalization / Construction Management Services / Forensic Services



WARNING: The information provided via electronic media is not guaranteed or warranted against any defects, including design, calculation, data translation or transmission errors or omissions.