

## Memorandum

To: Councilor Deb Crossley, Chair, Zoning and Planning Committee  
 From: Councilors Pam Wright and Lisle Baker  
 Subject: Zoning Ordinance Redesign – 8/7 and 8/11 Planning document errors or clarifications  
 Date: August 12, 2020



Article 3 version 3 was released on 8/7/20, followed by a supplemental memo dated 8/11/20. These are a lot to digest even for those of us who follow this subject. Because the conversation on Thursday will likely focus on policy, we feel it is important to raise some concerns about errors in the planning documents beforehand. While pointing these out, we still reserve the right to questions the policies in the work itself.

First, we appreciate the attempt to show changes from the prior version. That, however, does not substitute for a side-by-side and redline comparison with our current ordinance. This is essential so that we are viewing the proposed changes to our present zoning ordinance, not just changes from the Department's prior versions of its proposals.

Second, in reading over the 8/7/20 and 8/11/20 draft we noted apparent errors or inconsistencies which raise concerns about the accuracy of the draft that was provided and the backup memo from the Department.

1. The Planning memo itself of both 8/7/20 and 8/11/20 contains a significant error: The 3rd straw vote goal approved at the Zoning and Planning Committee meeting on April 27, 2020 was as follows: *"Context: Preserve and protect what we like in our neighborhoods. Encourage new development to fit in the context of our neighborhoods and villages"* has a very different intent and purpose from what the Planning memo reports: *"respect and control the physical character and scale of existing neighborhoods and new development according to adopted visions."* This statement needs correction in both memos.

2. In the Planning Department memo dated 8/7/20, the draft ordinance and document Appendix B that describes the changes also need correction and clarification. For example.

a. Duplexes went from three stories in height in version 2 to two and one-half stories in version 3, but was not documented in either attachment B or redlined version 3.

b. All the new N District setbacks were reduced in 3.1.6.C. Redline version 3 numbers are either incorrect (much smaller) and not documented in the change or intermediate numbers are used. This makes the new setbacks appear to have increased – but in fact that is not the case from version 2 and they have decreased.

c. In the R4 district, courtyard cluster lot coverage decreased but it was neither noted in attachment B nor redlined in the draft.

Even though some of these changes (other than about purposes) may seem minor, they undermine confidence in the accuracy of the work. Attachment B would have been a good document to explain the significant changes. Even more useful would be redlining our present zoning ordinance to the new article 3 version 3. We ask that this memo with our concerns be attached to the ZAP Report for the meeting on August 13 so that it will be part of the record. Thank you.

Cc: City Council, Jonathan Yeo, Planning Department, Planning Board, Inspectional Services and Law Dept.