

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
21	-	3.6.6	Include a restriction on temporary vestibules/enclosures. Vestibules must be permanent and compliant with the building code	Addition	Completed
90	3.12		Consider removal of section 3.12	Substantive Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
92	3.3		Building Height language must be revised	Major Edit	Completed
93	3.3		Revise Building Height Language	Major Edit	Completed
94	3.3		Building Height shall be clarified.	Major Edit	Completed
95	3.4		Rename from Lot Occupation to Lot Standards	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
96	3.4.8	3.4.8.d.	Consider whether special language is necessary to address properties with three frontages.	Question	Completed
97	3.5		Strike the language: Site and building development is subject to the following regulations, excluding lots with principal buildings not visible from the public way.	Minor Edit	Completed
98	3.5	3.4.10	Address the prevailing pattern with lot frontages	Policy	To be Coordinated
125	3.1.1.a		How are "should" requirements to be interpreted and applied?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
306	3.10.1		Accessory Building language is unclear- consider relocation to Article 7.	Major Edit	Completed
264	3.11.3		Replace Should with shall.	Minor Edit	Completed
307	3.11.3	3.10.4.b.ii.	A standard should be created for a pedestrian walkway within a required buffer.	Question	Completed
355	3.11.3	3.10.3	The word "screen" or "buffer" appears to be missing.	Minor Edit	Completed
355	3.11.3	3.10.3	Is this provision too subjective?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
126	3.11.4.a	3.10.4.a.	Is limiting the use of buffers to planting and screening too restrictive?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
91	3.13.2.a	3.12.2.a.	Remove sentence: Existing grass playing fields located in a required front yard setback as of the effective date of this Code may be converted into an artificial turf field.	Minor Edit	Completed
245	3.14.3	3.13.2.f.	Add the following language from the existing Zoning Code: For the purpose of determining the amount of impervious surface on a lot served by a common driveway, the total impervious surface of that common driveway shall be allocated evenly among the lots served, unless it is otherwise allocated in a recorded covenant approved by the Township and binding on the properties affected, in which case such recorded allocation shall control.	Major Edit	Completed
246	3.14.3	3.13.2.f.	specify a length standard for shared driveways	Minor Edit	Completed
321	3.14.3.b	3.13.2.b.	Consider revising for clarity.	Minor Edit	Completed
128	3.14.3.d.ii	3.13.2.c.i.	Consider revising for clarity.	Minor Edit	Completed
129	3.14.3.d.iii	3.13.2.c.iii	Consider removing provision.	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
50	3.14.3.d.iv	3.13.2.c.	Consider revising for clarity.	Minor Edit	Completed
130	3.14.3.e	3.14.2.e.	Suggest removal of provision	Minor Edit	Completed
320	3.14.3.e	3.14.2.e.	Consider revising for clarity.	Minor Edit	Completed
131	3.14.3.g	3.13.2.e.	Revise: "The impervious surface for buildings within Special Districts..."	Minor Edit	Completed
132	3.14.3.h	3.14.2.h.	Strike this section: If the total area of wood decks exceeding 200 square feet, when added to the existing impervious surface on a property, exceeds the impervious surface limits permitted in the underlying district without regard to the expansion permitted by section 3.14.3, a stormwater management system meeting the requirements of section 3.14.3 shall be installed.	Minor Edit	Completed
331	3.14.3.i	3.13.2.c.iii.	Consider clarifying reference to steep slopes and flood plain.	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
434	3.14.3d.iii	3.5.5.a.	Review Off-Site Tree planting requirement with the Township Solicitor.	Minor Edit	Completed
133	3.15.1	3.14.1	Auto Fill - Effective Date of this Code	Minor Edit	Completed

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
332	3.15.1	3.14.1	Is this clear enough to regulate or too restrictive?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
134	3.15	3.14.1.a.	Add new section to include the following: Transformers shall comply with these requirements unless regulated by the Public Utility Commission (PUC) and required by the authority having jurisdiction under the PUC to be located closer to the street than the front faced of the building. If a transformer is located closer to the street as described above, the transformer shall be screened from view from the street with plantings and/or structural elements approved by the Township. The design shall be incorporated into the required landscaping plan approved by the Township.	Minor Edit	Completed
291	3.3.1.e	3.3.1.d.	Clarify applicable standards	Minor Edit	Completed
333	3.3.2		Consider including a minimum height story	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
334	3.3.2		Consider additional height regulations for Live/Work	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
137	3.3.7		Delete	Minor Edit	Completed
335	3.3.7		Remove appurtenances	Minor Edit	Completed
420	3.3.8		Clarify the measurement for concealing	Minor Edit	Completed
33	3.1.2		Remove section.	Minor Edit	Completed
34	3.4.1		Delete " Newly platted " and start the sentence with "Lots"	Minor Edit	Completed
35	3.4.3		Clarify that there is only one principal building.	Minor Edit	Requires Further Coordination
138	3.4.4		Remove (occupation requirements) replace with standards.	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
139	3.4.6.e		Remove single limitation on the number of accessory buildings on a lot.	Major Edit	Completed
140	3.4.6.e		Strike - No more than one two accessory buildings shall be permitted on a lot.	Major Edit	Completed
336	3.4.7		Are 155.8.3d.ii.(2)[A] and 155.3.4.7 in conflict with one another?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
36	3.5.1	3.5.1.a.	Strike " and open space ".	Minor Edit	Completed
422	3.5.1 F and G- TABLES		Confirm walkways are required in the Frontage Yards as listed in A-E	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
423	3.5.1 G-TABLE	3.5.1 F-TABLE	Recommend habitable space on all sides	Minor Edit	Completed
421	3.5.1 TABLES		Consider removing the word "recommend" and replacing it with require.	Major Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
141	3.5.1.a		Is a walkway from the house to the street required for rear lots?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
338	3.5.1.C-TABLE	REMOVED	Cottage Court- If the 50% of the court shall be landscaped-why does the illustration show two trees?	Question	Completed
339	3.5.1.D & E & F - TABLE		Verify that fencing in the front is permitted in the residential setting and not permitted in non-residential settings.	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
142	3.5.1.F - TABLE	3.5.1.E - TABLE	Revise text	Minor Edit	Completed
143	3.5.1.F - TABLE	3.5.1.E - TABLE	AREA - Revise - a minimum 20 feet wide up to 30% of the allowable frontage and a maximum of 50 feet deep and proportional to the building. The court width shall be no less than the height of the tallest portion of the building. The maximum court depth shall be two times its width.	Minor Edit	Completed
341	3.5.1.F - TABLE	3.5.1.E - TABLE	Pedestrian Forecourt - Why establish a minimum 80% paved area? Should there be a larger planted area?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
342	3.5.1.F - TABLE	3.5.1.E - TABLE	Pedestrian Forecourt- SURFACE: Pervious paving is permitted (remove recommended)	Major Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
144	3.5.1.G. - TABLE	3.5.1.F - TABLE	ACTIVATION - Revise: Shall be lined with habitable space on two sides <u>along the building perimeter facing the forecourt.</u>	Minor Edit	Completed
340	3.5.1.G. - TABLE	3.5.1.F - TABLE	Illustration appears to contradict the language in 3.5.7	Minor Edit	Completed
344	3.5.2 B- TABLE		Why is the minimum height of the stoop 34" above grade? Depending on the use, this may require a large ramp to comply with ADA.	Minor Edit	Completed
356	3.5.2 F-Table		Is 70% too much glazing in the Storefront Guidelines? This much glazing has been a problem in the MUST District?	Question	Completed
146	3.5.2.a		Frontage Standards (remove occupation and activation)	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
147	3.5.2.a		Remove (occupation is regulated by District, according to) replace with standards are as given in Tables	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
148	3.5.2.A_B- TABLE		Suggest raising entry grade for porch to a minimum of 21 inches above grade and stoop entry grade of minimum 35 inches and max of 49 inches.	Minor Edit	Completed
149	3.5.2.B - TABLE		A stoop shall have a minimum depth of four feet.	Minor Edit	Completed
150	3.5.2.C - TABLE	REMOVED	Strike Cottage Court and remove the illustration.	Minor Edit	Completed
151	3.5.3 - TABLE	REMOVED	Strike Cottage Court.	Policy	Completed
38	3.5.3.a		Remove (site boundaries) replace with lot lines.	Minor Edit	Completed
452	3.5.3.a		Buildings shall be set back from lot lines site boundaries according to tables	Minor Edit	Completed
152	3.5.3.b		Remove (occupation requirement) replace with Standards of	Discussion Point	Reviewed and determined no action
39	3.5.4.b	REMOVED	Strike 3.5.4.b.	Minor Edit	Completed
153	3.5.5.a		Replace the existing section with the following language: Where the minimum number of required trees cannot be reasonably planted, the cost of providing and planting those trees that cannot be accommodated on-site shall either be contributed as additional streetscape improvements or paid to the Township as a fee-in-lieu thereof	Minor Edit	Completed
424	3.5.6.a & 3.8.1		Sections regarding Townhouse specific standards should be all together. One relates to impervious and other Buildings. The standard should be the same for the entrances.	Minor Edit	Completed
345	3.5.7		Clarify whether a street screen has to be lined?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
154	3.5.8		Requires building entrances be clearly visible from the street- consider restricting to residential districts.	Minor Edit	Completed
346	3.5.8 f.ii	3.5.8.d.ii.	Why does the building have to be raised 18" above the sidewalk?	Question	Completed
394	3.5.8 f.ii	3.5.8.d.ii.	"Raised 18" above the sidewalk? This can only apply to single use residential buildings as it would defeat the design of mixed use Buildings with retail on the 1st floor.	Question	Completed
156	3.5.8.b.ii	3.5.8.a.ii.	Remove the exception of LI and justify the length standard.	Minor Edit	Completed
155	3.5.8.c	REMOVED	Strike this section. It refers to the Common Court.	Minor Edit	Completed
51	3.5.9.b.	REMOVED	Strike 3.5.9.b. Renumber.	Minor Edit	Completed
357	3.6.1		Projections according to Public Works. What does this mean?	Question	Completed
157	3.6.2.b.	3.6.2.b.	Consider revising the bay window projection into a setback.	Minor Edit	Completed
22	3.6.3	REMOVED	Relocate language to Article 7.	Minor Edit	Completed
425	3.6.2		Renumber.	Minor Edit	Completed
426	3.6.2.d.iii & 3.6.4.a.ii		Regulations appear inconsistent.	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
158	3.6.4		Consider making less restrictive/prescriptive	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
262	3.6.4		Replace Should with shall.	Minor Edit	Completed
263	3.6.5		Replace Should with shall.	Minor Edit	Completed
347	3.6.5.c		Why can't side or bottom panels be permitted? This seems overly restrictive.	Question	Completed
348	3.7.1		Clarify the fencing provisions.	Minor Edit	Completed
101	3.7.1 - TABLE - Fence Height		Remove columns OSP, HR and RC columns	Minor Edit	Completed
349	3.7.2	3.7.1 - TABLE	Table 3.7.1 allows taller fences than the language in 3.7.2.	Minor Edit	Completed
102	3.7.2 - TABLE	3.7.1 - TABLE	Remove columns OSP, HR and RC	Minor Edit	Completed
159	3.7.2-TABLE		Consider permitting solid fences in Institutional Districts in light of prior zoning and development approvals that have specifically required such fences.	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
350	3.7.3 a	3.7.3 - TABLE	Clarify frontage fence description	Minor Edit	Completed
351	3.7.4.a.i.	REMOVED	Clarify hedge standards	Minor Edit	Completed
352	3.7.6		Are there wall spacing standards in the underlying districts?	Question	Completed
427	3.7.6		Spacing of retaining walls is not included in the underlying districts for (LDR and MDR and COM) needs to be specified in those sections.	Minor Edit	Completed
100	-	3.7.8	Add a new section: When the Board of Commissioners finds that a significant need is met by the erection of the fence, the Board of Commissioners may approve a higher solid fence within the required front, side and rear yard setback when such a fence is requested in conjunction with the approval of a development plan.	Minor Edit	Completed
429	3.8 and 3.9		Consider relocating these two sections before 3.6 (Projections)	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
160	3.8.2		Ensure consistent with regulation in the Form tables 4.1-4.4, for distances.	Minor Edit	Completed
161	3.9.1		Intent provisions go beyond intent and establish certain (but unclear and amorphous) requirements.	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
430	3.9.1.a		Reword and consider removing reference to energy conservation and resilient design.	Minor Edit	Completed
431	3.9.1.b		Remove the Word historic from last sentence "In Historic settings,	Minor Edit	Completed
353	3.9.2 a, b		Consider clarifying applicability	Minor Edit	Completed
162	3.9.3		Strike "cementitious board" as a permitted building material to ensure that dryvit would not be permitted.	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
163	3.9.3		Unclear zoning requirement that would need to be determined by the zoning officer and could be easily appealed by any protestant.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
164	3.9.3	3.9.3.a.iv.	Reference to Heavier Material in Exterior Wall Materials is too subjective to determine which is heavier.	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
165	3.9.3.d.i.	REMOVED	Concerns with mandating a white roof.	Minor Edit	Completed
354	3.9.3.d.i	REMOVED	Can a Green Roof be required on all new buildings?	Question	Completed
382	Table 3.7.1		Do we want to permit 8' fences along the frontage façade in LI and I districts?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
383	Table 3.7.2		Confirm that chain link fencing is permitted in LDR & MDR but are restricted along frontages.	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
305	4.2		If one unit is only partly over the other, doesn't there have to be a common party wall? Is a side by side duplex considered a twin and is it permitted?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
167	4.1.1-4 FORM Illustrations		Label the Edge of the Right of Way as shown for the measurement of the Front Yard Setbacks	Minor Edit	Completed
168	4.1.1-4 FORM Illustrations		Add a Key for the two crosshatching on the illustration or consider removing.	Minor Edit	Completed
169	4.1.1-4 FORM Illustrations		Label the Street for both sections.	Minor Edit	Completed

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
170	4.1.1-4 FORM Illustrations		Grey or Remove the picture/reference to the next Zoning category in the Section Illustrations.	Minor Edit	Completed
171	4.1.1-4 FORM		Building Height on illustration to be revised	Minor Edit	Completed
172	4.1.1-4 TABLE		Remove Façade Types	Minor Edit	Completed
173	4.1.1-4 TABLES		Remove Primary Frontage from table since listed as NONE	Minor Edit	Completed
174	4.1.1-4 TABLES		Revise footnotes to reflect change in height	Minor Edit	Completed
175	4.1.1-4 TABLES		Move Building Height (I) up in the Table after Accessory Building and Structure and Before Frontage Yard Types.	Minor Edit	Completed
176	4.1.1-4 TABLES		Revise footnote to clarify if the 600 square foot max is a footprint max or a floor area limitation.	Minor Edit	Completed
178	4.1.2 TABLE		Increase Impervious Surface for LDR2 from 20% to 21%	Major Edit	Reviewed and
1	4.1.2.b		REMOVE " boundaries of its Lot " REPLACE " <u>edge of Public Right of Way</u> ".	Minor Edit	Completed
177	4.1.3 TABLE		Increase Impervious Surface for LDR3 from 25% to 30%	Major Edit	Completed
179	4.1.3.b.i.		Concern with establishing the median level of the ground on the lot. It should have everything to do with where the house is sited and nothing to do with the corners of the Lot.	Minor Edit	Completed
180	4.1.3.b.i.		Concern with the second clause of the sentence.	Minor Edit	Completed
358	4.1.3.c		Is a maximum height (beyond the building height) for chimneys included in roof height exceptions?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
361	4.1.6 a		Concern that this provision is too permissive. Consider removing.	Major Edit	Completed
399	4.2 - TABLE		If an Accessory Structure includes a tree house, the height limit of 15' defined in Table 4.2 is too low since a standard platform is 8' above the ground and there is a sloping roof on the structure. Confirm that tree houses not supported at-grade are not regulate.	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
181	4.2.1 - FIGURE		Revise illustration to reflect height requirements	Minor Edit	Completed
182	4.2.1 - FIGURE - Page 97		Revise the illustration to show type and height of building permitted in that specific district.	Minor Edit	Completed
23	4.2.1 - TABLE		Frontage Yard Types - Permit Common Yards - MDR1 now includes Twin homes.	Minor Edit	Completed
40	4.2.1.A. - TABLE		Define Common Yard or add language to 3.5.5 clarifying what it is.	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
41	4.2.1.A. - TABLE		Clarify when the side setback is 0 feet and when it is 5 feet. Language may be added to 4.2.2. or a new 4.2.3	Minor Edit	Completed
42	4.2.1.A. - TABLE		Since Twins are permitted in MDR, a Common Yard should be a permitted Frontage Yard Type.	Minor Edit	Completed
184	4.2.1.A. - TABLE		Consider using words to describe the standards and then including reference tables.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
363	4.2.1.A. - TABLE		Clarify what the 60% minimum is in relation to (Primary Frontage). Does it apply to the minimum lot width or the actual lot size?	Policy	Requires Further Coordination
185	4.2.2 - TABLE		Side yard setback is only 0-5' minimum, which is a significant reduction from the current code. Is this offset by the setback increases when adjacent to lower district?	Question	Completed
186	4.2.2. - TABLE		All housing types should have their own set of standards.	Policy	Completed
187	4.2.2.A - TABLE		Add "per unit" where applicable.	Minor Edit	Completed
2	4.2.2.b. & 4.1.2.b		A Building shall be located in relation to the "boundaries of its Lot", with setbacks...Replace with <u>Edge of Public Right of Way</u> .	Minor Edit	Completed
188	4.2.3 - TABLE		Consider increasing the minimum lot area to 2000 sq. feet per unit.	Policy	Completed
189	4.2.3		Consider the following: a. Side Yard Setbacks. A zero foot setback is allowed where there is a common wall. If there is not a common wall a minimum side yard setback of five feet is required. b. Front Corner. On a corner lot, an accessory building or structure shall be located a minimum of 20 feet from the rear of the principal building and also a minimum of 10 feet from any right-of-way.	Minor Edit	Completed
3	4.2.6		Delete entire section. Concern over long-term maintenance of permeable surfaces since a permit is not required for sealing of pavement.	Major Edit	Completed

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
265	4.2.7.b.i		Parking Structures- replace Should with Shall, add where feasible at end of sentence.	Minor Edit	Completed
52	4.2.7.b.iii		Consider deleting this section or revising the language	Minor Edit	Completed
440	4.3.11		Review for consistency with buffer standards	Minor Edit	Completed
190	4.3.2.c & e iv		Is requiring paved areas in front of buildings in commercial areas appropriate?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
364	4.3.4 c		Should a floor more than 2.5 above the lowest sidewalk be considered a 2nd floor? This can be a problem on sloped sites like the BM Village and Cricket Ave developments. This could potential require a lower building.	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
428	4.3.6		Remove Section.	Minor Edit	Completed
439	4.3.7	4.3.5.a.	Outdoor "accessory" Uses should be added to clarify.	Minor Edit	Completed
365	4.3.8	4.3.6.a.	Are we ok with 30% paved area not being considered impervious if the paver is a permeable surface?	Minor Edit	Completed
24	4.5 - TABLE (BT)	4.6 - TABLE	Remove the columns for RC, I, LI	Minor Edit	Completed
202	4.5 - TABLE (LI)		Consider revising to add a buffer for industrial uses	Question	Completed
53	4.5.1.a.i.		Revise reference to frontages	Minor Edit	Completed
203	4.5.1-TABLE		Increase Height: The region along the river calls for allowing greater height in order to take advantage of the view. Plus, there are no SF residences that would be close enough to be adversely affected by height. In the river district building 10 to 15 stories should be permitted	Policy	Completed
17	4.5.2		Single family, attached and multifamily buildings	Minor Edit	Completed
204	4.5.2		Remove single family.	Minor Edit	Completed
206	4.5.2.a	4.5.5.b.	If any portion of a lot is in a Floodplain District, permission to develop within the floodway fringe of the Schuylkill River shall be permitted by conditional use, rather than by Special Exception, subject to compliance with the provisions of Section "7.3.8 Schuylkill River floodway fringe."	Typo	Completed
18	4.5.2.b		Single family, attached and small multifamily buildings shall follow the form standards...	Minor Edit	Completed
6	4.5.3.a.		The following architectural design standards shall apply to all non- industrial buildings in the LI District...	Minor Edit	Completed
25	4.5.3.a.		Strike "non-industrial". The architectural design standards should apply to all buildings.	Minor Edit	Completed
207	4.5.3.c.		This section should be written as a standard. It is too subjective.	Substantive edit	Addressed with revised text and standards
442	TABLE 4.1.3		Add note to Setbacks- That reads as follows. "When there is a predominantly setback established the setback shall be greater than or equal to the predominant setback."	Major Edit	Requires Further Coordination
443	TABLE 4.1.4		Add note to Setbacks- That reads as follows. "When there is a predominantly setback established the setback shall be greater than or equal to the predominant setback."	Major Edit	Requires Further Coordination
441	TABLE 4.2.1		Side yard setback in MDR 1 should read 0-10 ft minimum (not 5ft).	Major Edit	Completed
444	TABLE 4.2.1		Add note to Setbacks- That reads as follows. "When there is a predominantly setback established the setback shall be greater than or equal to the predominant setback."	Major Edit	Requires Further Coordination
445	TABLE 4.2.2		Add note to Setbacks- That reads as follows. "When there is a predominantly setback established the setback shall be greater than or equal to the predominant setback." (Footnote).	Major Edit	Requires Further Coordination
470	4.4		Establish vision for institutions and standards for how they will be measured.		Reviewed and determined no action
472	4.4		Concern about small churches and their ability to expand in the institutional district.		Addressed with revised text and standards
366	4.4.1.d		Institutional Accessory Uses - clarify the regulations	Minor Edit	Addressed with revised text and standards

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
192	4.4.1.e		What is the incentive to spend all the time and money on a Campus Plan that may never be implemented? If a Campus Plan is submitted absent a development project it has to go through a conditional use process. Who is going to do that?	Question	Addressed with revised text and standards
367	4.4.10 a v		How are the setbacks applied to an elderly housing development?	Question	Addressed with revised text and standards
4	4.4.11.b		The Campus Plan shall <u>may</u>	Minor Edit	Addressed with revised text and standards
196	4.4.11.e.		Campus Plans shall require a significant amount of detail for a plan that may never be built and the need of "outreach and engagement of abutting property owners and surrounding neighborhoods.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
197	4.4.11.e.iv		The traffic and parking standards look too difficult to meet. Consider approval by the B&P director than via CU.	Policy	Requires Further Coordination
410	4.4.13.d.		Consider adding the donation of a façade easement as an additional incentive under 4.4.13.d.	Policy	Requires Further Coordination
198	4.4.2	4.4.4	Applicability – Does any change no matter how minor require a conditional use approved Campus Plan? Seems like anything can trigger the need for a Campus Plan and CU process	Question	Addressed with revised text and standards
199	4.4.2		What if an institution does not submit a Campus Plan for an addition to an existing bldg. or adding one bldg.?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
416	4.4.2.c.	4.4.4.d.ii	How many times an institution can achieve an additional 5% impervious surface through the Campus Plan?	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
200	4.4.3		Includes dimensional bonuses for Campus Plans that include the undefined "public Benefit"	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
369	4.4.3 f		The required buffer may include residential development. What does this mean?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
370	4.4.4 e & g	4.4.6.b.i	Clarify 1st floor maximum 3' above lowest grade level. How will this work on sloped lots?	Question	Addressed with revised text and standards
201	4.4.7		Architectural Standards – wouldn't they be better in land development so that the Twp. can grant waivers and the applicant not need variances for deviations?	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
7	5.1.1 - TABLE	136	Add Home Occupation as a regulated use in all districts.	Minor Edit	Requires Further Coordination
8	5.2 - TABLE		Hotels should get a separate residential line like student housing.	Minor Edit	Completed
46	5.5.1		Delete this section.	Minor Edit	Completed
54	5.1.6		A use identified by the letter "C" means the use may be authorized by Conditional Use. It is subject to the following conditions: Strike 5.1.6.a-d	Minor Edit	Completed
103	5.3	REMOVED	Strike this section. Criteria is provided in Article 11.	Minor Edit	Completed
104	5.3	REMOVED	Strike this section. Criteria is provided in Article 11.	Major Edit	Completed
105	5.5	REMOVED	Move this entire Section into Article 11.2.7	Major Edit	Completed
106	5.6	REMOVED	Move this entire Section into Article 11	Major Edit	Completed
107	5.7	REMOVED	Delete this entire section and renumber subsequent sections. NON-CONFORMING USES and relocated to Article 11	Major Edit	Completed
210	5.1.1 - TABLE		Delete columns for OSP, HR, RC, I.	Major Edit	Completed

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
211	5.1.1- TABLE		Institutional zoning districts as drawn and not allowing expansion on other properties. When this concept was previously discussed the uses were to be by-right in the new zone and eliminate the special exception process. Under new Code almost all uses are permitted by Conditional Use. Conditional use is legally the same as a special exception except granted by Board of Commissioners. Arguably this is a worse situation as it does nothing to simplify process and puts the use decision into a more politicized arena.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
212	5.1.1- TABLE		IE Zones have too few uses- Only schools are permitted	Policy	Addressed with revised text and standards
213	5.1.1- TABLE		Other uses (not listed) that should be considered Adult Day Care, Place of Assembly, Infrastructure, General Agriculture	Policy	Addressed with revised text and standards
214	5.4.6		Accessory Use Language is potentially problematic for Institutional Uses.	Policy	Requires Further Coordination
215	5.5.2	REMOVED	Revise this section or relocate to Article 11.	Minor Edit	Completed
216	5.5.3		Why have the Special Exception and Conditional Use requirements if have Institutional districts?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
217	5.4.2	5.8.3	90 day period for a CO after Use Permit is too short where permitting, construction, land development and or other approvals are required. If desire a limit, time should be lengthened, and time should be to take the next step.	Major Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
309	5.1.1 - TABLE		Include regulations for take out uses in Food & Beverage.	Minor Edit	Completed
375	5.1.2		Uses shall be in compliance with "Uses". Not clear what Uses means?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
377	5.4.6.b		Additional clarification is needed for accessory uses.	Question	Requires Further Coordination
378	5.4.4	5.3.4	Remove language "unless specified otherwise".	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
379	5.7.4	REMOVED	Relocate to Article 11	Minor Edit	Completed
409	5.2 - TABLE	138	Add "S" to the legend.	Minor Edit	Completed
413	5.3 - TABLE	150	Move standards for permitted "College/University, Private Schools, and Public Schools" under 4.4.6 "Uses"	Minor Edit	Addressed with revised text and standards
59	11.1.7		Should HARB be spelled out or kept in Board of Historical Architectural Review.	Minor Edit	Completed
60	11.2.2.a.iv	REMOVED	Remove this section completely. Covered under 11.2.7 and SE	Minor Edit	Completed
61	11.2.4		Align with MPC Remove and to attach such conditions...of this chapter (Sentence) Replace with and to attach such reasonable conditions and safeguards as it may deem necessary to implement the purposes of this chapter.	Minor Edit	Completed
62	11.2.7.a.		Uses of the same general character as any of the uses authorized as permitted uses by right, conditional uses, or uses by special exception in the zoning district in which the property is located shall be allowed if the Zoning Hearing Board <u>it can be determined</u> that the impact...	Minor Edit	Completed
259	11.5		Non-Conformity Section should be revised	Minor Edit	Completed
260	11.2.4.b.ii		Recommend elimination of the requirement "does not conflict with the LMT Comprehensive Plan." This requirement appears in the current Code using slightly different language and has been questioned by the ZHB. Similar comment on 11.2.5 (c) (ii) which mentions not only the LMT Comprehensive Plan but also "other plans adopted by the Township."	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
261	11.2.5.c.ii		Recommend elimination of the requirement "does not conflict with the LMT Comprehensive Plan." and other plans.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action

No.	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
397	11.2.4		This appears to go beyond the lawful purpose of conditions, namely, to mitigate impacts of an approved use rather than to assure compliance with all the purposes of the ordinance. Similar comment on 11.2.5 (a)	Comment	Completed