

Comment Number	Article	Draft 2 Section	Draft 2.5 Section (If Different)	Comment	Type of Edit	Status
412	6	6.1		Move the "Special Districts" into the area of the Zoning Code where they make sense. For example, the MC and BMMD Districts should be moved into the Article containing the institutional districts.	Major Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
455	6	6.3	6.3.3.c.	ROHO Height needs to reference stories	Minor Edit	Completed
453	6	6.4	6.4.4.a.	BMV is not being amended but is not consistent with the height provisions in the rest of the code	Major Edit	Completed
218	6	6.1 - TABLE	6.1.3.e.	Revise Principal Building Setbacks Perimeter (up to 6 stories 65 ft. in height) 125 ft. min. Perimeter (6 to 7 stories 65 to 75 ft. in height) 125 75 ft. min. plus 7.5 ft./each additional story foot of height over 65 ft.	Major Edit	Completed
219	6	6.1 - TABLE		Revise Building Height (max.) Principal 10 stories 105 ft.	Minor Edit	Completed
436	6	6.2.4	6.4.6	Parking standard should be consistent with Article 8, verify.	Minor Edit	Completed
385	6	6.2.5.iv.1		Can public walkways be constructed of permeable materials? Not included as material in BMMD?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
437	6	6.3.1.b	REMOVED	Remove words regarding overlay for ROHO, "of this article shall be deemed an overlay on all lots"	Minor Edit	Completed
438	6	6.3.2.f.i	6.3.9.a.	Correct the reference to Definitions- Should be Buffers	Minor Edit	Completed
435	6	6.3.4 d and e	6.4.6.a.	Verify parking standards and bike standards are consistent with Article 8, verify	Minor Edit	Completed
446	6	6.3.4.a.ii	REMOVED	Remove the words "provided that" edit to two sentences with yard. Parking facilities...	Minor Edit	Completed
447	6	6.3.6.b.vii	REMOVED	Accessway should be plural	Minor Edit	Completed
417	6	6.4.1.b.		commonality and for that reason the regulations are combined under this single article chapter .	Minor Edit	Completed
448	6	6.4.2e	REMOVED	Formatting is incorrect, need to verify standard from Code and fix.	Minor Edit	Completed
449	6	6.4.4.b.iii	TABLE 6.4	Height for 3 stories is 38 feet (should be consistent with rest of code for stories) Edit to be consistent.	Minor Edit	Completed
455	6	6.3.3.c.	TABLE 6.3	ROHO Height needs to reference stories	Minor Edit	Completed
9	7	7.1.4.c.ii	REMOVED	Remove Dwelling Units and/or Edit Multi-family. Add after "is being lawfully used" for a religious, club, or lodge use.	Minor Edit	Completed
47	7	7.1.1 Table	TABLE 7.1.2	We should define repair services. A big difference between auto and watch repair.	Minor Edit	Completed
108	7	7.4		Steep Slope Overlay - Impervious penalty should be removed for the IN zones	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
109	7	7.4.2.e		Add a new section - These standards shall not apply to properties in the Institutional Nature Preserve (IN) District.	Major Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
110	7	7.5		Consider selected text removal-Concern with overlaps in the Natural Features Code (101-5.b) and SALDO. Does not address the maintenance of trees.	Policy	Completed
111	7	7.5		Recommendation to review and consider relocating some provisions sections to SALDO	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
112	7	7.5		Tree Canopy and Heritage Tree Conservation District, is applicable to virtually every lot; it applies to parcels subject to subdivision and land development, parcels subject to a Runoff and Erosion control permit, and parcels containing one viable 6" tree (in other words, most every lot.) The tree replacement provisions are quite onerous compared to existing Code requirements and may apply upon removal of a single 6" caliper tree on any lot. Maintenance requirements, including guarantees and escrows are required for replacement trees	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
135	7	7.5		Tree canopy and Heritage Tree conservation suggest increase from six inch to ten inch	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
136	7	7.5		Revise - "Any lot with a viable tree having a caliper of six inches or..."		Completed

220	7	7.1.1 - Table		The bed and breakfast use has remained in the code but has been questioned whether this is an appropriate use in residential districts. This should be considered.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
221	7	7.1.2.c	REMOVED	These provisions seem to be improperly located in an "Applicability" provision	Minor Edit	Completed
222	7	7.1.2.e	7.1.2.d.	Removal of "any use".	Minor Edit	Completed
223	7	7.1.2.g		If you refer to the standards it makes them part of the Zoning Code, which may be problematic.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
226	7	7.1.3.b.iv(3)[g] [2]	REMOVED	Limited to a maximum of 20% addition at visible frontage lines - Not sure what this means. Need to rewrite this.	Major Edit	Completed
227	7	7.1.3.d.iv	REMOVED	Revise.	Major Edit	Completed
228	7	7.1.5.a.iii	REMOVED	provides an additional requirement that "No use is permitted which generates noise perceptible at the property line." [Hearing a car door closing or people speaking could be a disqualifier]	Policy	Completed
229	7	7.1.5.a.v.	7.1.7.a.iv.	This provision appears to be an attempt to give the "leg up" to protestants instead of the applicant, as is the case now under the special exception process	Policy	Completed
231	7	7.1.8.c	REMOVED	Appears to unlawfully restrict any lawful non-conforming use of Class I and Class II resources.	Policy	Completed
232	7	7.1.6	7.1.8	deviations to preserve resources are too limited. Only apply to bldg coverage, impervious surfaces and setbacks. Should applied to all zoning criteria.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
233	7	7.1.6.c	7.1.8.d.	50% cap on bldg area should be removed. Too limiting and complex to ascertain	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
235	7	7.2.8		TDR - hold in reserve.	Policy	Completed
238	7	7.5.3.j	Removed	Consider revision.	Major Edit	Completed
274	7	7.3.8.a		Correct reference for 155-5.3 Criteria for Conditional Use (since section was removed from Article 5 into Article 11) update reference.	Minor Edit	Completed
276	7	7.4	TABLE 7.4.1	Steep Slope Overlay- The formula for average slope is missing.	Minor Edit	Completed
280	7	7.5.3.c		Replacement trees shall be "a variety of" native..... However , applicants may substitute a variety of native evergreen tree....)	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
281	7	7.5.3.d	Removed	Correct reference of Table 7.5.3 to Table 7.5.1	Minor Edit	Completed
282	7	7.5.3.e	7.5.3.c.	Where an applicant prior to removal submits... Remove the last sentence, The Township maintains a list of invasive tree species exempt from the replacement-planting requirements-	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
381	7	Table 7.4.1		Do the steep slope penalties still apply and make sense when applied to the new requirements for non-residential development?	Question	Reviewed and determined no action
386	7	7.1.6.a.i		Should HARB be spelled out or kept in Board of Historical Architectural Review.	Minor Edit	Completed
396	7	7.1.2.d		Means to guarantee preservation provisions does not belong in applicabilty section. Means to guarantee doesnt apply in all instances	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
408	7	7.1.1 - Table	239	Remove rows "Permitted Use By District" and "Conditional Uses". Change "P" to "C" throughout the chart and add a key	Minor Edit	Completed
419	7	7.1.5	237	Section 7.1.5 as written allows the <i>entire property</i> – not just the historic structure – to be used for a specified purpose. Section 7.1.2.f says that "this section" (i.e., 7.1.2) does not apply to non-contributing resources. Thus, arguably this leaves only 7.1.5 which says the whole property can be used for one of the specified purposes. Further, 7.1.2.h seems to reinforce that idea, saying additional uses can be used on "properties" designated Class I and II. I recommend putting the limitation to the historic structures directly into section 7.1.5 to be consistent with the current code and to avoid any possible ambiguity.	Minor Edit	Completed
197	8			The traffic and parking standards look too difficult to meet. I'd like to see approval by the B&P director than via Conditional Use.	Policy	Reviewed and determined no action
239	8	8.2.1	Removed	Change the 2nd 8.2.1 to 8.2.2. After the word reduced add and held in reserve. Is this a conditional use approval or by right? Add a new section c for mixed use building referencing Table 8.2.1	Policy	Completed
240	8	8.2.2 (1)	8.3	Reworking section entirely to add in provisions for reserve parking.	Major Edit	Completed

242	8	8.2.3	REMOVED	Remove section completely	Major Edit	Completed
243	8	8.2.5	REMOVED	Remove section completely	Major Edit	Completed
244	8	8.4.1.c	8.5.1.c.	Consider revising 3.14.3 to address Impervious surface and expansion.	Policy	Completed
248	8	8.5.1 TABLE		Edit Standard Space size to 9 ft. wide and 18 ft long min.	Minor Edit	Completed
249	8	8.5.1.c (2 new)	8.6.1.c.iii.	Compact car parking- Add item iii. Must demonstrate compliance with standard stall parking lot design and not increase development potential on the site, then can apply percentage of compact spaces.	Major Edit	Completed
250	8	8.5.1-3 FIGURES	8.5.4.c.ii.	Do not permitting vegetative façade element alone.	Minor Edit	Completed
253	8	8.5.4.c		Edit C to read Parking structures shall screen the upper floors with one or both of the following , as illustrated in "Figure 8.5.2 Ground Floor Liner", with opaque façade elements providing openings shall be a maximum 50% of the wall area of each facade.	Major Edit	Completed
256	8	8.2	8.3	Are we allowing for reserve parking in the new code? Reserve parking has resulted in the preservation of green spaces and should be permitted in the new code. Edit Heading to Reserve Parking- Not reductions.	Policy	Completed
257	8	8.2	8.3	Adding provisions for reserve parking (Mixed use buildings and on-street parking, will be moved to the calculations.)	Minor Edit	Completed
258	8	8.4.1	266	C add resulting in reduced curb cuts after Shared driveways.	Minor Edit	Completed
271	8	8.4.3	266	Replace Should with shall. Add where feasible at end of sentence	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
272	8	8.7.2	270	Replace Should with Shall	Minor Edit	Reviewed and determined no action
467	8	8.2.3	REMOVED	Remove- Parking for properties within 1,500 feet of train stations may hold either 0.5 or 1.0 of the required parking spaces per unit in reserve with up to .5 parking spaces held in reserve.	Minor Edit	Completed
478	8	8		Revise parking minimum standards to ensure they are consistent with current code and conservative.	Major Edit	Completed