



Topic	Related Section(s)	Master List No.	Item for Discussion	Current Approach	Key Challenges, Concerns and Questions
Subdivision Name Standards	42-41	4	The current subdivision naming requirement can result in complex subdivision names for a replat requiring a public hearing.	Require partial replats of single-family residential subdivision containing separately filed deed restrictions to be sequentially numbered and referred back to the original subdivision name. For example, the first partial replat of "Sunny Land Subdivision" would be named "Sunny Land Subdivision partial replat no 1".	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subdivision names can be long when including the original plat name and may not have any significance to the new development. 2. It is difficult to determine the name when several replats have been completed in one area. 3. A variance to the rule is the only option for an applicant to provide an alternative subdivision name.
		5	There appears to be no clear connection between the subdivision naming standard policy and the ordinance requirements.	A subdivision naming standard policy exists but there is no clear connection to C42 or ordinance authorization for the policy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the subdivision naming standards be referenced in the ordinance? 2. Should the ordinance authorize the creation of a subdivision naming policy developed by the director or the Commission?
		6	Current rules do not prohibit the use of derogatory, defamatory, or vulgar words or phrases within a subdivision name.	There are currently no rules or standards to address use of derogatory, defamatory, or vulgar words or phrases within a subdivision name.	Should there be a prohibition against using derogatory, defamatory or vulgar words or phrases within a subdivision name that is offensive to the general public?
City Planning Letter (CPL)	42-1; 42-42; 42-44; 42-45	7	Practice allows the use of a CPL in place of a current title report; however, there is no definition of a CPL in C42.	City planning letters have been used by policy for several years as they can provide the same information that a current title report does as it relates to platting.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City planning letters can be a more cost effective method in providing necessary platting information similar to a current title report. 2. Should there be a change to the ordinance align the ordinance with current practice?
Park Sector Numbers	42-1	8	The number of park sectors identified in C42 does not match the current number of park sectors.	The actual park sector numbers are listed in C42. Since the ordinance was approved, more park sectors have been created.	Should the ordinance be updated to include the actual number of park sectors, or should the reference to the number of park sectors be removed from the ordinance itself?
Time for submittal	42-53	9	C42 does not allow flexibility to account for holiday cycles and other unique needs for the submittal of a complete application.	By policy, staff adjusts the submittal time for plats when holiday cycles occur and the time is posted on the Department's website during that period. This policy does not match the ordinance as written.	This is necessary to avoid possible delays in review.
Submittal Requirements	42-44	16	ROW geometric information is required at final plat only.	The ordinance does not require an applicant to provide ROW geometric information on preliminary plats. All engineering and surveying data must be shown on final plats only.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since street ROW geometrics are not required on the preliminary plat, compliance issues may not be identified until the final plat, at which time the corrections may cause delay in review or require an applicant to make design changes. 2. Applicants have raised concerns that by the time the final plat is submitted it is too late in the design phase to make changes without incurring additional cost.

Topic	Related Section(s)	Master List No.	Item for Discussion	Current Approach	Key Challenges, Concerns and Questions
			Requiring Street Reference Monuments (SRM) data to be shown on plats. (Request per City Surveyor)	Code requirement for inclusion of SRM data on plats is not consistent between C42 & C33. Clarification is needed on appropriate requirement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of SRM data on plats increases the potential for boundary disputes and encroachments into the ROW. 2. Does the cost outweigh the benefit? 3. C42 AND C33 should be consistent.
Points of access	42-189	26	The intent of the requirement for the maximum number of lots from one point of access is unclear and is subject to a variety of possible interpretations.	<p>Two points of access to a public street must be provided when a subdivision includes more than 150 lots.</p> <p>As a policy, the two points of access requirement is considered satisfied even if both points of access are from the same street. The street from which the two points have access may be a cul-de-sac as well.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the basis of the lot limit and is it still relevant with current development trends? For example is the requirement based on infrastructure, safety and emergency access, or traffic circulation needs? 2. What if any of these 150 lots are later subdivided, thereby creating more than 150 lots? 3. If the street is a divided roadway, should that qualify as two points of access? 4. Two points of access are allowed from the same street, including from a cul-de-sac. This often conflicts with C42-131, which limits the number of dwelling units on a cul-de-sac to 35 or 43. 5. Should further increases in the number of lots beyond 150 lots warrant additional points of access? 6. If the street with two points of access does not connect to the rest of the existing street network, does it satisfy the requirement? 7. If connections are made to recorded streets that will cross a drainage ditch or fee strip that may not be built, does it satisfy the requirement? 8. Should the standards be same for infill re-development and greenfield development? 9. Why is multifamily use not subject to the calculation?
Cul-de-sac	42-131	25	Neither the intent nor the requirement for cul-de-sac length is clear.	The maximum length of a cul-de-sac is determined by the number of single family residential units. (35 detached units or 43 attached units)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is a cul-de-sac defined? For example, if a cul-de-sac has branches, does the 35 dwelling units requirement apply to each branch, or the whole? 2. How does this requirement work in connection with the two points of access requirement? 3. What is the purpose of having 35 units on a cul-de-sac requirement? Is it infrastructure, safety and emergency access, or traffic circulation, etc.? 4. Should the standards be the same for infill re-development and greenfield development? 5. Should an existing cul-de-sac that already exceeds the maximum dwelling units be allowed to provide access to other uses or additional dwelling units? 6. Is single family residential dwelling units the appropriate measure of cul-de-sac length?
Lot Access to Streets	42-188	29	The classifications of major and minor collector streets are new. As a result, there are no limitations and/or requirements for lot access along major and minor collector streets.	A lot can have direct access to a collector street regardless of the designation. In contrast, lots are prohibited from accessing major thoroughfares directly, with some exceptions.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Backing on to collectors contributes to traffic conflicts and reduction in traffic flow. 2. Driveway cuts interfere with the continuity of sidewalks and bike routes and affect the functionality of collector streets. 3. The Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan (MTFP), and Policy were recently updated. As a result new street classifications were added. 4. Should there be access requirements or limitations for collector street types?

Topic	Related Section(s)	Master List No.	Item for Discussion	Current Approach	Key Challenges, Concerns and Questions
Lot Access to Streets	42-188	30	Narrow lots with direct access to the public street results in negative impacts to the public ROW.	<p>Lots can take access to a street by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Direct driveway access; b. A shared driveway; or c. An alley. <p>The minimum lot width allowed along a street is 16 feet.</p>	<p>Frequent driveways result in the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. loss of street parking; 2. loss of unobstructed sidewalks; 3. loss of permeable ground cover, which contributes to flooding; 4. loss of existing street trees and space for new street trees; 5. limited available space for the placement of trash containers; 6. changes to public streetscape and neighborhood character; and 7. loss of space for public utilities and easements.
Building Line Standards	42-152, 153, 154, 155	32	Building Line (BL) requirements for properties located along grade separated freeways without frontage roads may be excessive.	This topic is pending coordination with the Walkable Places Committee.	
Building Line Standards	42-152, 153, 154, 155	33	Building Line standards should be updated to support urban walkable places where appropriate.	This topic is pending coordination with the Walkable Places Committee.	
Transit Corridor Development	42-401; 402, 403	40	Transit Corridor development requirements may not align with current development practices and market trends. Coordinate with the Walkable Places Committee on a comprehensive evaluation of this item.	This topic will be handled by the Walkable Places Committee.	