

**Petition: ZO-09-21**

**Amendment Number: 1**

**Sponsor: Susan Sandberg**

**UDO Section/Page: Table 03-1 / page 73**

**Proposal: Remove duplexes as a Conditional Use in R1, R2, and R3.**

**Purpose:** To allow for a time-limited pause on the most controversial aspects of the City’s UDO proposal—the plexes and mapping of the R4 zoning districts—in order to collect quality data, consider a variety of alternatives, and ensure meaningful community participation. Reference “Hit the Pause” proposal.

**Petition: ZO-09-21**

**Amendment Number: 2**

**Sponsor: Jillian Kinzie**

**UDO Section/Page: Table 03-1 / page 73 // 20.03.030(b)(3)(D) / page 70 of redline**

**Proposal:** Change duplexes to Permitted in R1, R2, R3, and R4. Change the beginning of the timeline for the Approval buffer from issuance of a Conditional Use approval to issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance.

**Purpose:** Expand the by-right option of duplexes to R1-R4, while maintaining the Use-Specific Standards.

**Petition: ZO-09-21**

**Amendment Number: 3**

**Sponsor:** Brad Wisler

**UDO Section/Page:** 20.03.030(b)(3)(D) / page 70 of redline

**Proposal:** Remove separation requirement for duplexes in the R1-R4 zoning districts.

**Purpose:** Increase the opportunity for duplexes by removing the space and time separation requirements.

**Petition: ZO-09-21**

**Amendment Number: 4**

**Sponsor: Beth Cate**

**UDO Section/Page:** Table 03-1 / page 73 // 20.06.040(d)(6)(C) / page 257 of UDO

**Proposal:** Modify the Conditional Use criteria aimed at minimizing or mitigating adverse impacts of duplexes. Specifically, modify existing language as noted below:

1. The proposed use and development shall not result in the excessive destruction, loss or damage of any natural, scenic, or historic feature of significant importance, **or substantially undermine the distinctive character of the neighborhood.**
2. The proposed development shall not cause significant adverse impacts on surrounding properties nor create a nuisance by reason of noise, smoke, odors, vibrations, **or objectionable lights, or parking conditions.**
3. The hours of operation, outside lighting, and trash and waste collection shall not pose a hazard, hardship, or nuisance to the neighborhood.
4. The petitioner shall make a good-faith effort to address concerns of the adjoining property owners in the immediate neighborhood as defined in the pre-submittal neighborhood meeting for the specific proposal, if such a meeting is required.

**Purpose:** To provide the Board of Zoning Appeals additional tools to ensure that duplexes are introduced in a sensitive way that does not undermine the character of the surrounding neighborhood.