

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"> • Studio, less than 400 sq. ft. GFA - 1.00 space per dwelling unit • Studio, more than 400 sq. ft. GFA, and 1 Bedroom - 1.50 space per dwelling unit • Two Bedrooms - 2.00 spaces per dwelling unit • Three Bedrooms - 2.25 spaces per dwelling unit • Four or More Bedrooms - 2.50 spaces per
--	---

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 / 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.

Subject: [EXTERNAL] 4.9.11.A.12

Date: Friday, January 27, 2023 at 10:03:17 AM Mountain Standard Time

From: Abreeza Zegeer

To: Daniel Bursuck

Good Morning Daniel,

At the 1/25/2023 PC meeting I brought up the adding “municipal” water pumping exception. I think this should have had more discussion. There are still many private wells (commercial and residential) in Tucson and the surrounding area. Without the addition of “municipal” to the code this would allow private wells to go unchecked.

The Utility Use Group Code (4.9.11) seems to be geared to Electrical utilities. Since we are looking at improvements and clarity to the UDC wouldn't it be better to have some code separation between the types of utilities (electric, gas, water and communications) to clarify and take into account the specific “Use” of the utility.

Most folks consider communications a utility of need, but it is included in the Commercial Use Group (4.9.4.1), maybe this needs to move to the utility use group. Water is our most limiting resource and is not addressed with the significance it deserves in our UDC codes.

As we move into a climate resiliency state of mind I think our utility UDC's should be more in step with our environmental goals.

I understand that this would not be an easy process and will take more time in the beginning but I think it will better serve the city in the long run.

Please pass my views onto the other Commission members.

Thank you,
Abreeza Zegeer

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Eileen Erickson](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#)
Cc: [Acacia Dupierre](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed UDC changes comments
Date: Saturday, February 4, 2023 6:19:35 PM

I am submitting the following concerns regarding proposals for the improved UDC, prior to the Feb 15 meeting.

1. reduction of parking requirements for small multi family developments is irresponsible, leading to street parking, and resulting in potential traffic safety issues. Concerns about urban heat issues should not trump parking congestion and traffic safety. This needs major rethinking.
2. creating UDC ZE Legislative procedure for Major Change of Condition: how is major change of condition defined. Looks vague now.
3. reduce DC package requirements for small projects: need to define small projects very clearly, using wording of 'such as' leaves a lot of open room for any kind of project.
4. a previous question I had: if two contiguous lots are considered for small infill, does that make them no longer small infill? How is small infill defined.
5. Sunshades and other driveway structures should not be allowed if they compete with existing set back requirements.

Thank you for adding these comments to your review.
Eileen

Eileen Erickson
ejeeileen@gmail.com