

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT CODE	
2200 Contents of Master Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2202.01– Include a bullet for consideration of local wildfire hazard and community risks, especially those called out in the CWPP. <i>Proposed §2201.01.H identifies wildfire, flooding, and geological hazards as required elements for consideration in all basin master plans (Ch 2, pg 7).</i>
3200 Rezoning Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3201.01 – Purpose and intent modified by staff through recent proposed updates. <i>Proposed language would include assessment of wildfire, geological, and flooding hazards under rezoning policies (Ch 3, pg 11).</i> ▪ 3202.01 – Insert wildfire policy as one of the examples of number 5). <i>Proposed language would include wildfire hazards as a site characteristic to be evaluated with any rezoning application (Ch 3, pg 11).</i> ▪ 3202.01 – Replace the word comport. That is not commonly used in the plans or code. Consider “consistent with” or similar. <i>Done (Ch 3, pg 12).</i> ● 3202.05, Wildfire Hazard Areas – recently modified by staff. Use the word “shall” instead of “will.” In 3202.05.A, it states that a Fuels Reduction Plan “may” be prepared....and that a Defensible Space Plan “may” be prepared... Make these a requirement by using “shall.” <i>Proposed language requiring that rezonings must evaluate appropriateness of the proposed use(s)/density based on such factors as slope, aspect, vegetation types, access, availability of firefighting infrastructure, and other relevant factors as identified in the Summit County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) (Ch 3, pg 13)</i> ▪ 3202.05.A – If an applicant is required to submit both a FRP and a DSP, consider clarifying the language to allow for a consolidated set of information so that it is clear that the applicant will not have to submit two separate sets of the same information if the same is required for both a FRP and a DSP. <i>Staff has rewritten §3202.05.A to include; specific requirements for when a forest management plan (≥20 acres w/significant wildlife values), fuels reduction plan, or defensible space plan for properties <20 acres, establishment of minimum requirements for the contents of such plans, and requirements to maintain consistency with similar requirements under the County’s Subdivision Regulations where appropriate given the difference in the rezoning and subdivision processes (Ch 3, pg 13).</i> ▪ 3202.05.A.b – States “...if the inventory is deemed appropriate by the CSFS.” Clarify how the application will be reviewed by the CSFS. Consider revising the provision to allow for the Summit County Mitigation Specialist to review in addition to, or in place of, the CSFS. <i>This recommendation was based on a prior draft of Code amendments that has been replaced by proposed §3202.05.A(1-6). The currently proposed language references the County’s review and referral process (§12000.06 et seq.) and includes reference to the USFS, and local fire protection districts as deemed appropriate. In addition, this proposed language clarifies the specific requirements of an adequate forest management, fuels reduction, or defensible space plan (Ch 3, pg 13).</i> ▪ 3202.05.A.c – Reword this sentence to “the subdivision’s connectivity to internal and external roads, and the location of subdivision-wide shaded fuel breaks or fire breaks.” <i>Staff believes that the d language in proposed §3202.05.A(1-6) states in simple, clear terms access and fuel/fire break requirements (Ch 3, pg 13).</i> ▪ 3202.05.A.d – Remove the word “the” and the plural “s” in Service(s). <i>Replaced by proposed §3202.05.A(1-6) (Ch 3, pg 13)</i> ▪ 3202.05.A.e – Include the word “and” after the semicolon. <i>See response above.</i>

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3202.05.B – Use consistent terminology when referring to a zoning amendment or a rezoning. <i>For consistency staff is proposing that the term “rezoning” apply to zone changes for one or more properties, “zoning amendment” apply to changes to the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 3, and “modifications” apply to PUD amendments only. Such changes would affect Chapter 3 (Zoning Ordinance) & Chapter 12, (Development Review Procedures). Proposed changes specific to §3202.05.B address requirements for secondary emergency vehicle access if necessary to reduce wildfire hazard associated with a proposed rezoning (Ch 3, pg 13).</i> ▪ 3202.05.D – We understand the County already requires a will-serve letter from a fire district for properties outside the three districts. Consider including a clarifying statement requiring an affirmation or will-serve letter provided by the district. <i>Proposed language would specify that a “Can and Will Serve Letter” or its equivalent from the appropriate fire protection district is a requirement for a rezoning application if the property is currently unserved Ch 3, pg 13).</i> ▪ 3202.05.F – We understand that SIAs are required under subdivision and site plan review, and typically includes guarantees for implementation of D-space, fuels reduction, and forest management requirements. It might also be worth stating in the rezoning provisions that financial guarantees will be required during site plan review. <i>Rezoning where there is no accompanying subdivision plat or site plan (e.g. a change in use), are not common and do not typically involve an increase in density or intensity of use. Therefore staff believes that the current improvements guarantee process set forth under the County’s Subdivision Regulations and site plan approval process are sufficient to ensure implementation of forest management/fuels reduction/defensible space at the time of rezoning approval.</i> ▪ 3202.05.A.a through f. – This list should be made consistent with proposed subdivision regulations in 8101.D. <i>See notation RE proposed §3202.05.A on Pg 1 above.</i>
3500 Basic Development Regulations and Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3504.02.A – Beginning with “It is a requirement of this code that a developer...”, start a new heading for submittal requirements. This is no longer part of the intent statement. <i>Done (Ch 3, pg 22).</i> ▪ 3504.02.B – Replace the word “indicia.” <i>Proposing “criteria” to substitute for “indica” (Ch 3, pg 22).</i> ▪ 3504.02.B – This paragraph states that “the final decision as to whether or not a proposed development project is major shall be made by the BOCC during a work session.” Clarify that only the appeal decision shall be made by the BOCC in a work session, not the Director’s determination. <i>Staff believes the current language is very clear and does not warrant a change (Ch 3, pg 22).</i> ▪ 3504.02.B.2 – Provide an example of urbanizing impacts upon surrounding properties (e.g., noise, light, traffic, etc.). <i>These impacts have been identified in this section as proposed (Ch 3, pg 22).</i> ▪ 3504.02.C – Throughout the code, use consistent references to decision makers. For example, is it Planning Department, or the Director? We recommend using Director, and then in the definitions continue using “or designee.” <i>Staff has made proposed changes referencing the Planning Director, Review Authority, BOCC, or Planning Department as staff has deemed appropriate depending on the type of application and County review process involved.</i> ▪ 3504.03.C.2 – Provision for emergency access. Following “20 or more acres in size,” insert “unless identified as a medium to extreme hazard rating in the County’s CWPP.” <i>Proposed revisions to this section of the Code would override the current exemption for 20+ acre A-1 and BC zoned properties and require emergency access if necessary to</i>

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<p><i>reduce the wildfire hazard due to the property's slope, aspect, vegetation, availability of firefighting infrastructure or other relevant factors as identified in the CWPP (Ch 3, pg 26).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3504.04.A.1 and 2 – Too much overlap of text in these two provisions. State it once for the preliminary review, then add only additional specifics that would apply to final review. <i>As these two code sections deal with two different processes (preliminary v final rezoning) Planning staff believe such duplication in this instance is warranted (Ch 3, pg 26-27).</i> ▪ 3504.04.B and C – Remove the word “so.” <i>Done (Ch 3, pg 27)</i> ● 3505.01.B – Following the sentence “It is the County’s intent in providing for PUD Zoning Districts to allow such flexibility in building and site design standards” add “where an overall benefit to the County is achieved.” PUDs should not generally be granted unless there is some benefit to the jurisdiction for doing so. <i>Planning staff fully agrees with this recommendation and have incorporated it verbatim into the proposed changes to this section of the Code (Ch 3, pg 28).</i> ▪ 3505.02, Density – Include the tables from figure 3-5 directly in this section. <i>While Planning agrees with the concept of reducing the length of the Code and making it simpler, moving Figure 3-5 (Development Standards Matrix) to this section of the Code would not result in such simplification or document length reduction. Therefore Planning staff are not supportive of incorporating this recommendation into the proposed Code amendments.</i> ▪ 3505.02, Density – In the opening statement, it says that “such density limits do not set an absolute level of density that will be permitted for any particular property or development proposal.” Although the text implies that the densities are “theoretical,” it should be clarified that those maximums could not be exceeded unless there are specific provisions for bonuses. <i>Planning staff believe the Code as currently written is very clear on theoretical densities and have never had a dispute arising from someone else’s interpretation of this language. Also, we do not have provisions for density bonuses in the Code (some PUDs do however) so Planning staff have not incorporated this recommendation into the proposed Code amendments (Ch 3, pg 29).</i> ▪ 3505.05.A.2 – Provide a cross-reference to the building material and color design standard that applies to sf homes (3505.05.D) to make this easier to find for the reader. <i>Planning staff inserted a reference in this section to §3505.05.D for the sake of clarity (Ch 3, pg 32).</i> ▪ 3505.13, Setbacks – These are entirely out of place here. Move them back to other dimensional standards with height and density. <i>Staff is not supportive of this recommendation for the same reasons as noted above for §3505.02 above.</i> ▪ 3505.14, Site Area – Same as above. These are out of place. <i>See discussion immediately above.</i> ▪ 3505.15, Site Coverage – Same as above. <i>Same as above.</i> ▪ 3505.17, Walls and Fences. 3505.17.C.1 – The use of natural materials should not be required when properties are included in a defensible space plan, which may prescribe more flexible alternatives. <i>Proposed language for §3505.17.C(1) provides relief from these wall/fence material standards if they conflict with an approved defensible space plan prescription. Fences constructed of flammable materials would be required to maintain a minimum non-flammable section of five (5) feet within 10-feet of any structure (Ch 3, pg 44).</i> ▪ 3506.02, TDR regulations. 3506.02A.2.a – Include an item for mitigating wildfire risk to

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<p>the immediate neighborhood or community. <i>Staff agrees that removal of development potential from the backcountry reduces overall wildfire hazards in the County, wildfire hazard reduction measures affecting a specific neighborhood are typically focused on improved infrastructure such as better access, provision of a firefighting water supply, and implementation of defensible space, fuels reduction, and forest management plans. Therefore staff has not included this recommendation in the proposed Code amendments.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3506.02.A.3, Exemptions – “...are exempt from the provisions of these regulations:” Clarify that the prohibitions against changing a property’s TDR designation when rated medium to extreme should apply to all zone districts, including PUDs. It is currently difficult to discern how far down the page the exemptions apply to. Consider also adding language to the end of the sentence that says “except for areas identified as a medium to extreme hazard rating per the CWPP.” <i>Staff does not support this recommendation for the following reasons:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>These exemptions pertain to the provision of workforce housing or to PUD’s that have their own density bank (e.g. Copper, Keystone, Blight Placer) and are not subject to the Codes TDR requirements for rezonings or intensification of use (Ch 3, pg 49).</i> ✓ <i>These exemptions have nothing to do with the requirements for amending a property’s TDR designation (set forth under §3506.02.C) (Ch 3, pg 51).</i> ▪ 3506.02.B.5 – At the end of the neutral areas paragraph, include subdivision in the parenthetical reference. <i>Done. This clarifies that applicable requirements covering TDR Neutral designated properties applies to subdivision applications as well (Ch 3, pg 51).</i> ▪ 3506.02.C.3.b.ii.ca – Wildfire hazard potential is referred to as medium to extreme. This should be reconciled with other references to moderate to severe hazards in the proposed subdivision regulation amendments. <i>After discussions with staff from the wildfire council it was determined that; 1) all of the unincorporated County lies within the WUI and is subject to significant ember transport, 2) completion of a new CWPP wildfire hazard rating plan may still be a long time off, and 3) given these factors, Planning and Wildfire Council staff believe it is more appropriate to apply the wildfire hazard reduction measures across the board instead of based on the current rating system which is not site specific and is intended for adjustment in the future.</i> ● 3506.02.D – Consider a higher value for development rights in the WUI high or extreme hazard rating areas. For example, perhaps 2.5 development rights per 20 acres. <i>Planning staff are not supportive of this recommendation for the following reasons:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>Virtually all sending site are backcountry parcels located well within the WUI. Therefore, under these proposed /code amendments all TDR sending sites would have their value inflated 2.5 times.</i> ✓ <i>Increasing the TDR value of a backcountry sending site 2.5 times severely undermines the ability of the current TDR to remove development potential from the backcountry or reduce overall density in the County as recommended per the Comp and basin plans (Ch 3, pg 53).</i> ▪ 3506.02.E.1, Additional Floor Area – The last sentence states that in no event shall additional floor area or fractions of development rights purchased allow for the actual number of dwelling units or density permitted per zoning to be exceeded. Clarify that once development rights have been transferred into a property through a rezoning,

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<p>unused square footage that is not constructed may not be sold or transferred to another property, but is available on the project site for future use. <i>Planning staff believe the restrictions on the transference of unused floor area are already clear and do not warrant further revisions (CH 3, pg 54).</i></p>
<p>3600 Landscaping Requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3602.A.4 requires compliance with mandatory landscaping design standards listed in Section 3604. Consider adding threshold requirements for existing single-family developments. For example, disturbance of more than 200 square feet requires compliance with 3604. <i>First, proposed changes to this section of the Code pertain to the implementation of defensible space requirements for all development. Secondly, Chapter 45 of the County’s building code requires implementation of defensible space requirements for any exterior change and/or addition to existing development requiring a building permit. Therefore a threshold of 200 ft² for requiring defensible space compliance is not necessary. Finally, proposed §3602.A(5) would establish a similar requirement under the County’s landscaping regulations in Chapter 3 of the Land Use & Development Code (Ch 3, pg 88).</i> ▪ Section 3603 offers flexible landscaping design standards. Section 3603.A mentions alternative methods of compliance, where the applicant may propose an alternative design that meets or exceeds the level of design expressed in Section 3601. This procedure is not clearly defined. Consider developing a performance-based landscaping system where certain landscaping provisions must be met (such as parking islands and buffers), but that all other landscaping provisions could be met using various alternatives such as bioswales, xeriscaping, heritage or significant tree preservation, or wildfire mitigation. <i>Proposed amendments to §3603.A reinforce requirements for compliance with defensible space prescriptions for existing single family development; proposed §3603.B identifies alternative methods of meeting landscaping standards such as the use of bioswales, xeriscaping, retention of significant trees, etc. while reinforcing the requirement that all landscaping comply with defensible space requirements (Ch 3, pg 88). As such, Planning staff do not believe additional flexibility through a complex performance based set of landscaping regulations would provide any greater benefit to the County’s efforts to ensure that proposed landscaping and defensible space requirements do not conflict.</i> ▪ 3603.C.5 – The proposed text states that “...fire mitigation measures are implemented on site in a timely manner.” This type of subjectivity can be difficult on decision makers and applicants. Clarify that fire mitigation requirements need to be implemented prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. <i>Proposed §3603.C(5) clarifies that implementation of forest management/fuels reduction plans may be phased but must be ensured through an Improvements Agreement and financial guarantee; §3603.C(5) also requires implementation and maintenance of defensible space prescriptions be incorporated into CC&Rs to ensure long-term compliance (Ch 3, pg 90). Compliance with defensible space requirements prior to CO is already required under the County’s building codes and enforced by the fire protection districts.</i> ▪ 3604.C, Defensible Space Requirements – Subsection 1.i should say “10 feet of the <u>habitable</u> structure.” Subsection ii. Should include the word “space” after defensible. Subsection iii should include the word “habitable” before structure. The landscape regulations pursuant to <i>§3604 have been restructured and the defensible space requirements noted in this recommendation are now in proposed §3604.P. As written, these amendments would: 1) require all landscaping to comply with defensible space requirements; 2) graphically identify the defensible space zones on the landscape plan;</i>

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<p><i>3) prohibit any new trees within five (5) feet of a structure; 4) prohibit new conifers within 10 feet of any structure; 5) prohibit junipers within Zone 1 due to their highly combustible nature; and 6) establish requirements and recommendations for mulching within five (5) of any structure as well as recommendations to avoid highly combustible types of mulch anywhere within Zone 1 (Ch 3, pg 98). Staff did not limit these requirements to “habitable” structures since; 1) “habitable structure” is not defined in the Code (only “structure is so defined), and 2) staff believes that as all structures can be ignition sources (e.g. sheds where flammable liquids and fuels are stored) or subject to ignition from a wildfire.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 3604.C – A general statement should be included that says “non-compliance will be enforced as a zoning violation.” <i>A statement as recommended is proposed for §3609, <u>Landscape Maintenance After Completion of Construction</u> (Ch 3, pg 101)</i> ■ <i>3604.C – Include a diagram illustrating the defensible space zones. Staff has included a graphic depiction of Zones 1-3 under proposed §3604.P. However, this current graphic is not very accurate or illustrative so staff continues to work on developing an improved graphic to address this recommendation (Ch 3, pg 98).</i>
<p>3800 Regulations and Standards for Specific Land Uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>3812.04 - Add a requirement for a forest management and fuel reduction plan for all proposed mining or milling operations in a medium to extreme hazard area per the CWPP. Proposed amendments to §3812.04.B(2) would require preparation of a forest management/fuels reduction plan for any mining/milling permit (Ch 3, pg 146).</i> ■ <i>Section 3815.02 includes regulations specific to the outdoor storage of materials in residential zoning districts. One of the recent proposed changes to that section incorporates provisions for the storage of firewood. Those provisions should be further tested and the language clarified. As written, “firewood may be stored in the front yard other than in the front setback if stacked in an orderly manner.” Additional proposed language requires stored firewood to be located a minimum of 30 feet from any habitable structure unless within a fire resistant enclosure. We recommend revising “habitable structure” to say “any structure, if ignited, that will incur a financial impact (i.e., insurance), a threat to adjacent structures, or a threat to human life.” Proposed revisions to §3815.02.A would prohibit firewood storage within 30-feet of any structure unless stored within a 1-hour fire resistant enclosure during the wildfire season defined as May 1st to November 1st (Ch 3, pg 151). Please note that staff did not include any separation requirements for home-heating propane tanks as they are already regulated and permitted by the fire districts under Chapter 61 of the International Fire Code.</i> ■ <i>Specific Use Recommendations: Although not summarized in Table 4-2, the final report does include recommendations regarding expanded standards for various specific uses regulated under §3800 et seq. such as Special events, fireworks stands/sales, health care facilities, lumber yards, community gardens, community centers, auto service/repair, recreation facilities, churches, schools, fire/police/EMS, and commercial firewood storage/splitting (please refer to pg’s 44-48 of the Final Report). Below is a brief discussion of staff’s response to each recommendation.</i> ■ <i>Special Events—Fire response plan for any special event in a CWPP focus or moderate to severe wildfire hazard area: Special events located outside of PUDs require TUPs. As one of the criteria for approval of a TUP is protection of the public safety, staff believes it already has the authority to require implementation of appropriate wildfire hazard reduction measures through referral to the appropriate fire district(s) and County departments.</i>

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fireworks Stands/Sales—Prohibited in moderate to severe wildfire hazard areas: <i>Per County Ordinance the use of fireworks in the unincorporated County is not allowed (Summit County Sheriff’s Office telecommunication 5/15/15). As such, staff has revised Figure 3-2 of Chapter 3 to list fireworks sales/stands as “Not Allowed” in any County zoning district.</i> ▪ Health Care Facilities, Lumber Yards, Community Gardens, Community Centers, Auto Service/Repair, Rec Facilities, Churches, Schools, Fire/Police/EMS, Commercial Firewood Storage/Splitting—CUP required: <i>Each of these type of uses has their own permitting requirements whether it be a conditional use permit (CUP) or site plan review based in part on the underlying zoning. Submittal requirements are adopted by BOCC resolution unless specified in the Code. Under the proposed amendments defensible space plans would be required as part of any landscaping plan and all new subdivision and/or rezoning applications would be required to include either a forest management, fuels reduction, or defensible space plan based on the project specifics. As the Code does not include submittal requirements for CUPs and site plan reviews, such requirements are set forth in the application submittal information sheets maintained by Planning. All CUP and site plans are required to comply with §3600 (Landscaping Regulations) which under the proposed amendments would include a defensible space plan. However, for further clarity it may be appropriate to include specific requirements for preparation of defensible space plans in the information sheets. Because current submittal requirements already reference §3600, staff believes this can be accomplished through a staff initiated revision without the need for a formal BOCC resolution.</i>
<p>Figures for Development Constraints, Land Uses, and Dimensional Standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insert this information directly into text. Right now, it requires a lot of flipping back and forth. <i>As noted above, staff agrees that document simplification and length reduction is a good goal but does not agree that moving these tables from the end of Chapter 3 into the chapter’s text would result in either. Therefore, as noted above staff is not supportive of this recommendation.</i>
<p>8100 Subdivision Requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 8101.D – Make sure this list is consistent with proposed rezoning procedure amendments. Mention CWPP hazard rating maps for consistency with TDR regulations. <i>Proposed amendments to §8101.D list specific requirements for preparation of forest management, fuels reduction, and defensible space plans. Where consistent with the rezoning process, those standards have been carried over from the requirements for rezoning applications. Because the Wildfire Council is considering revisions to the CWPP wildfire hazard rating system, the proposed language does not mention CWPP hazard rating maps or any other wildfire hazard rating system (Ch 8, pg 7).</i> ▪ 8151.02 – Include high-risk wildfire areas in this paragraph. <i>Proposed changes include a reference to wildfire hazard as an environmental hazard (Ch 8, pg 18).</i> ▪ 8154.A.4 –Summit County will require showing building envelopes on plats. That information should be included here to make the procedures more predictable for applicants. <i>§8154.A establishes lot and block design standards. To address the frequent problem of trying to accommodate even Zone 1 defensible space (not to mention Zone 2) within parcel boundaries, staff has proposed language that requires such accommodation for lots in excess of 1 acre to the maximum extent feasible. For lots less than 1 acre, these new subdivision standards would require that Zones 1 and 2 be accommodated within the confines of the parent parcel to the maximum extent</i>

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<p><i>feasible, or in the case of Zone 2, that adequate provision for such accommodation on neighboring properties be made as part of the subdivision design (Ch 8, pg 19).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 8154.E.1.a – Insert “or wildfire” in between “geotechnical” and “hazards.” <i>This section of Code identifies environmentally sensitive areas and natural hazards such as steep or unstable slopes to be avoided by the use of restrictive disturbance envelopes. As wildfire hazards are addressed through implementation of fuels reduction or defensible space, staff does not believe that this recommendation furthers wildfire hazard reduction efforts.</i> ▪ 8154.E.1.b – What is an OWTS? Spell out Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems unless the acronym is defined nearby (within a couple pages). <i>OWTS is currently defined in the table of contents of Chapter 8 as well as §8159 (Water, Wastewater, & Utilities Design Criteria).</i> ▪ 8154.E.1.c – Amend the last sentence to say “The review authority may <u>adjust the separation requirement</u> require additional separation between the disturbance envelope and building envelope...” This offers greater flexibility in both directions. <i>This section of the Code already gives the Review Authority the ability to adjust the separation requirements between the building and disturbance envelopes upward for cause. However, Planning and Engineering staff have found that 10-feet between any building and disturbance envelope is the minimum necessary to allow for any grading or construction activities such to such restrictions (Ch 8, pg 20). Therefore staff does not see the need for further revisions to this section.</i> ▪ 8154.E.1.h – Consider amending the paragraph as follows: The Review Authority shall require that all proposed lots shall be large enough to accommodate the fire mitigation prescriptions for Zone One as set forth in the Building Code entirely within each lot. In no case shall proposed lots be approved that would require Zone One defensible space prescriptions be implemented on any adjacent lot. To the maximum extent feasible, the Review Authority shall require that all proposed lots shall be large enough to accommodate the fire mitigation prescriptions for Zone Two as set forth in the Building Code on each lot. If it is not feasible to design a proposed lot capable of accommodating all Zone Two fire mitigation prescriptions within its boundaries, then the Review Authority shall require easements shall be required on adjacent proposed lots to ensure the ability to accommodate all Zone Two defensible space prescriptions. Under no circumstances shall a proposed subdivision require encroachment of Zone Two defensible space prescriptions on any property adjacent to the parent property being subdivided. <i>Proposed amendments to address the concerns noted by the consulting team have been incorporated into proposed §8154.A(4) (Lot & Block Design Criteria) (Ch 8, pg 19). Staff believes that this is the appropriate section of Code to include requirements for accommodation of Zones 1 & 2 defensible space within new subdivisions.</i> ▪ 8155, Establishment of Design Criteria – The opening sentence refers to single-family and duplex residential zoning districts. Clarify in the text that this would apply to all zoning districts where single-family or duplexes are permitted. <i>Amendments to this section of Code as recommended have been incorporated in §8155 (Ch 8, pg 21).</i>
8400 Subdivision Exemptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 8420, Rural Land Use Subdivisions – Mention wildfire hazards in the purpose and intent statement and in the list of land use goals (currently A through I). <i>Proposed §8421.J includes language adding wildfire hazard reduction to the purpose and intent of rural land use subdivisions (Ch 8, pg 34).</i> ▪ 8428.05 – The site visit requires “...a quorum of members of the Planning

Table 4.2: Detailed Review of Current Summit County Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Name of Document	Comments and Suggested Revisions
	<p>Commission.” Reminder that these site visits are quasi-judicial by nature, and would likely require public notice when a quorum (or 3 members) is present according to Colorado Open Meetings law. <i>The consultant’s recommendation is duly noted but the Code currently addresses this issue under §16010 et seq. of the Code.</i></p>
8700 Plat Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 8701.Y – Remove “whichever is less” from the end of the sentence. That is not a factor for whether or not the BFE is required. <i>Staff believes that this section already is clear enough and does not need revision.</i>
9000 Sign Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add a requirement for addressing/residential identification signage to be maintained at all times, in clear view from the ROW, and constructed with non-flammable materials. <i>Staff has prepared amendments to Figure 9-1 (Specific Sign Regulations) requiring all residential identification signs to be visible from the adjoining road.</i>
12400 Temporary Use Permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12401 – Add a “G” to this list to include “Temporary Use Permits are not permitted in areas rated as high or extreme wildfire hazard unless appropriate mitigation measures are taken as approved by the Director.” <i>As noted above staff believes that the current review and referral process and criteria for approval for all TUPs is sufficient to ensure that needed wildfire hazard reduction measures are incorporated into any approved TUP.</i>
12600 Site Plan Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 12602.01.A – Add provision for any development or modification in an area of high wildfire hazard, regardless of whether a building permit is required. <i>Site plan review is currently required for any Class 1, 2 or 4 development application which includes all structures in excess of 200 ft² or 12-feet in height, essentially anything exterior requiring a building permit. As defensible space requirements currently apply to all three review classes, staff does not believe that the recommended amendments are warranted in this instance.</i>