

LAC Development Code Update - Module 1 Public Comments					
Comments / Request for Change	Page #	Applicable Code Section	Applicable Sub-Section	Proposed Change	Response
What's the definition of "Outdoor storage" (in the Permitted Use Table under ACCESSORY USES) which is now forbidden in all residential zones? Can residents no longer store their garden tools outdoors, or store their RV between trips?	37	16-2-1 Permissive Uses	16-2-1(D) Permitted Use Table, 2(2)(D)(9) Outdoor Storage, Accessory Definition		Current standards are intended for commercial outdoor storage only, residential outdoor storage is covered in Chapter 18 and the recommendation is that this distinction is carried forward. RV parking is covered under accessory uses in section 2-2(D)(10).
Module 1 defines "Adult entertainment" as "An establishment such as an auditorium, bar, cabaret, concert hall, nightclub, restaurant, theater, or other commercial establishment, other than an adult retail establishment, that provides amusement or entertainment." Did you mean to include something about depiction of sexual activities, as in the definition of "Adult retail"? Or do you really classify any restaurant that provides entertainment -- say, a coffee shop with occasional live music -- as "Adult entertainment"? Is every concert hall "Adult entertainment" since the entire purpose of a concert hall is to provide amusement or entertainment"?	53	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Revised definition of adult entertainment to "An establishment such as an auditorium, bar, cabaret, concert hall, nightclub, restaurant, theater, or other commercial establishment, other than an adult retail establishment, that provides live entertainment, audio and/or video displays or other graphic representations that are intended to provide sexual stimulation or sexual gratification and is distinguished or characterized by an emphasis on specified anatomical areas or specified sexual activities".	
There are some references throughout to sections that may change. For example, the very last line of the module. Should we expect there will be at least one round of final review of the entire section 16?	52	Throughout		No change	The footnotes refer to sections that will be addressed in subsequent modules, either Module 2 for development standards or Module 3 for administration or procedures. Additional public comment opportunities will be provided for each of the subsequent modules and before the adoption of Chapter 16 as a whole.
The new WRTC zone is a problem.. The interactive map on https://losalamosconnect.org/2021/06/29/7-8-2021-development-code-update-module-1-release/ shows WRTC as applying only to the eastern part of the Mirador housing development -- which is mostly houses, though eventually it might include a few shops -- plus the Del Norte Credit Union at Rover and 4. That's not what I remember seeing when you had public meetings to discuss the downtown master plans. "WRTC" skips all the areas that most people would think of as the White Rock Town Center, like the commercial buildings across from Del Norte on the southwest corner of Rover and 4 including Metzger's, the shops along Rover down to Enterprise Bank, plus Smith's and Pig & Fig and the shops adjacent, and Longview. How is it that the "town center" omits all but one of the town's current businesses? And do the folks living in houses in that part of Mirador know that you've tagged them as "White Rock Town Center"?	Zoning Map			All of the parcels within the downtown boundary were converted to WRTC	There was an error in the original conversion; all of the parcels within the WRTC should have been converted to WRTC. The northwestern portion of the district that was originally indicated as WRTC is the only portion of the district that currently has a DT zoning designation, which is why the conversion showed it as WRTC. The recommendation is to rezone all properties within the district boundary as WRTC. Changes are shown in the revised map which can be viewed here: https://losalamosconnect.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/White-Rock-Zoning9.21.21.pdf
The overall consolidation of use zones from "Existing Zone Districts" to "Proposed Zone Districts" is well done, in that it preserves most residential neighborhoods zones but simplifies the zone names. HOWEVER, the devil is in the details and many details are missing from this draft. "Lot Standards", "Setbacks" and "Heights" are missing from all zones. To preserve the character of existing neighborhoods, "Lot Standards", "Heights" and "Setbacks" should match the standards of the "Existing Zone Districts". "District Standards" are missing from all zones. Standards of particular concern that must be addressed: Dwelling unit density limits are not defined for any of the "Residential Uses". To maintain the character of neighborhoods, proposed dwelling unit density limits should match existing dwelling unit density limits. Off-street parking minimums for "Co-housing" and "Cottage Dwelling" uses are not defined. For that matter, off-street parking minimums for all types of "Residential Uses" should be defined.		Modules 2 & 3		Development standards will be covered in Module 2.	The Development Code update was proposed to be carried forward in three subsequent modules that will build off of one another. Module 1: Zone District and Use Regulations focuses on updates to the zone and overlay districts, associated district standards, the use index table, and use specific standards. Module 2: Development Standards will reorganize and update any development standards found in the chapter including but not limited to dimensional standards such as setbacks and allowable densities, parking and loading, landscaping, architecture. Module 3: Administration and Procedures will focus on the reorganization and streamlining of content related to administration, enforcement and procedures. The concerns listed in this comment will be addressed in Module 2, anticipated to be released in Fall 2021.
The terms "Low-density", "Medium-density" and "High-density" in "Multi-family Residential" districts and in the "Mixed-use District" are not defined. To maintain the character of neighborhoods (which may have abutting SFR and MFR zones), these definitions should match existing dwelling unit density limits.	52-78	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Definitions for residential, multi-family and non-residential zone districts have been added. An additional definition for low-density has been added as it will relate to neighborhood protection standards. Medium and high-density definitions will be added in Module 2 if code standards necessitate them.	Definitions have been added as necessitated by the recommended standards. Definitions will continue to be added, revised or eliminated as necessary throughout the update process.
Maximum dwelling unit densities for the new "Co-housing" and "Cottage Dwelling" uses are not defined, even though "Use Specific Standards" have been written for these uses.	37-38	2(2)(A) Residential Uses	2(2)(A)(1) Dwelling, Co-housing development and 2(2)(A)(2) Dwelling, Cottage	Co-housing and cottage dwelling use specific standards will be revised to reflect allowable density. The revised draft states "A cottage development shall have no more than the total residential gross floor area that would be allowed on an equal size property in the same zone district for single-family detached development."	Specific density standards for underlying residential zone districts will be included in Module 2.

LAC Development Code Update - Module 1 Public Comments					
Comments / Request for Change	Page #	Applicable Code Section	Applicable Sub-Section	Proposed Change	Response
"Non-residential Uses" that about "Residential Uses" should have special transition requirements and mitigation requirements when redevelopment would substantially change the character of the abutting residential neighborhood.		Module 2			Neighborhood protection standards that require height step down and landscape buffers between residential and non-residential properties will be covered in Module 2.
"Notification Standards" for redevelopment and new development should be well defined so that neighbors can assess potential impacts. Neighbors must have plenty of opportunity to review site plans and have concerns reviewed by the P&Z.		Module 3			Project team will address concern in Module 3 which will cover administration and enforcement.
The definition of "Accessory Dwelling Unit" is problematic. From the "Permitted Use Table" I can see that an "Accessory Dwelling Unit" used for any "Lodging" purpose requires a "Special Use Permit". If the "Accessory Dwelling Unit" is to be used for long-term rental or an additional owner-occupied unit it also requires a "Special Use Permit". There needs to be a well-defined and published process by which "Special Use Permits" are reviewed and issued. There should be "Notification Standards" for alerting neighbors, public opportunities for site plan reviews, and published alerts when the proposed "Accessory Dwelling Unit" would exceed the dwelling unit density limit of the zone. Such a process is not defined in this draft.	42	2-2(D) Accessory Uses and 16-5-2 Defined Terms	2-2(D)(1) Accessory Dwelling		The current draft standards were initial recommendations based on existing standards. The county is planning to undertake an independent process for public comment specific to Accessory Dwelling Units. The Chapter 16 Development Code updates will reflect the guidance and outcomes from that public comment process.
It's a little tough to comment on most of Module 1, because it's full of big gaps. Like missing Dimensional Standards for all the zones. And the omission of RW-O from the Permitted Use Tables.	33	2-1(D) Permitted Use Table		Permissive uses for the recreational overlay have been picked up in the district standards of Module 2.	The Development Code update was proposed to be carried forward in three subsequent modules that will build off of one another. Module 1: Zone District and Use Regulations focuses on updates to the zone and overlay districts, associated district standards, the use index table, and use specific standards. Module 2: Development Standards will reorganize and update any development standards found in the chapter including but not limited to dimensional standards, parking and loading, landscaping, architecture. Dimensional standards will be picked up in Module 2 anticipated to be released in October 2021. Permissive uses for the RW-O will also be included in Module 2.
Module 1 doesn't seem to follow the Los Alamos Comprehensive Plan. The Comp Plan defines as core values "Protecting virtual all existing open space" and Protecting the character of existing residential neighborhoods". But Module 1 seems like it's taking away W-1 wilderness protection from open space, and has potential to drastically change neighborhoods by allowing high-density "cottage and co-housing developments".	30	16-1-4 Overlay Districts	1-4(C) Recreational Wilderness Overlay District (RW-O)		The project team is presenting these concerns to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council for direction. W1 and W2 could be retained as they are or 3 new open spaces districts created with one for parks, one for active open space uses, and once for passive open space uses as indicated in the Future Land Use Map of the Comp Plan.
The biggest problem is the removal of the wilderness overlay W-1. The Module 1 plan folds W-1 and W-2 into one overlay, RW-O, and it's hard to know for sure what the rules in RW-O are since it isn't included in the Permitted Use Tables. Is RW-O intended to have the protections of W-1, or W-2? If it's like W-1, then will the existing buildings like the stables be grandfathered? If it's like W-2, I'm concerned that we'd be losing important protection for natural areas. It would make more sense to keep W-1 and W-2, and to make them real zones, not overlays. It doesn't make much sense to have the wilderness overlays on top of P-L zones that have completely different rules.	30	16-1-4 Overlay Districts	1-4(C) Recreational Wilderness Overlay District (RW-O)		The project team is presenting these concerns to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council for direction. W1 and W2 could be retained as they are or 3 new open spaces districts created with one for parks, one for active open space uses, and once for passive open space uses as indicated in the Future Land Use Map of the Comp Plan.
There appears to be a plan to combine current W1 and W2 overlays into a single designation that doesn't supply the W1 protections anywhere. While there is something of a desire to simplify matters by reducing the number of zones, this is actually a place where the county should add three, and eliminate those two overlays. There should be a specific zone for what is now W1, a specific zone for what is now W2, and a specific zone for Parks. While by number of zones this would seem to be more complex, in the end it would probably make life simpler for everyone. It also avoids the appearance of being an attempt to remove the W1 protections.	30	16-1-4 Overlay Districts	1-4(C) Recreational Wilderness Overlay District (RW-O)		The project team is presenting these concerns to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council for direction. W1 and W2 could be retained as they are or 3 new open spaces districts created with one for parks, one for active open space uses, and once for passive open space uses as indicated in the Future Land Use Map of the Comp Plan.

LAC Development Code Update - Module 1 Public Comments					
Comments / Request for Change	Page #	Applicable Code Section	Applicable Sub-Section	Proposed Change	Response
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Module 1.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal to combine W-1 and W-2 in one overlay, RW-O. W-1 (Open Space Passive) should be a zone district. It is unique. I think W-2 (Open Space Active) should also be a zone district. However, it includes Pajarito Ski Area, which is not public land.</p> <p>Module 1 says on p. 5, 16-1-5:</p> <p>"The Development Code is the primary tool used by the County to implement the goals, policies and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan."</p> <p>DPS should begin with the Future Land Use Maps in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan says:</p> <p>p. 61 (actually p. 51) Los Alamos Open Space Management Plan, adopted in 2015, is based in part on the 2000 document from the Open Space Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Following the extensive work and analyses that the County has already completed, and also based on the current outreach and public participation efforts, and the current adopted strategic goals of County Council, the 2016 Comprehensive Plan adopts all the parcel-specific recommendations for open space as corresponding land use designations in the Future Land Use Map. In addition, the Future Land Use map confirms that all parcels called out in Ordinances 252 and 254 have open space or park status in the map.</p> <p>p. 98 (actually 88) The Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan adopts land use categories for open space that establish three levels of open space, based on intensity of use. Parks are the most developed and support the most intense level of uses. The Parks category includes Ashley Pond and the adjacent demonstration garden, and all other developed parks and playgrounds. Other open space is designated as Active or Passive Use Open Space, with these categories corresponding to the zoning district categories described above. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan adopts as land use categories the recommendations of the Open Space Management Plan, adopted by Council in 2015, and which categories were supported by the Parks and Recreation Board in 2016.</p> <p>p. 101(91)</p> <p>LAND USE POLICIES</p> <p>1. Be stewards of the natural environment, including the existing ecosystems</p> <p>2. Do not build houses in the canyons or on canyon walls</p>	30	16-1-4 Overlay Districts	1-4(C) Recreational Wilderness Overlay District (RW-O)		<p>The project team is presenting these concerns to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council for direction. W1 and W2 could be retained as they are or 3 new open spaces districts created with one for parks, one for active open space uses, and once for passive open space uses as indicated in the Future Land Use Map of the Comp Plan.</p>
<p>2-2(A)(2) Dwelling, Cottage has several problems. By starting with the word "If", item i (If cottage dwelling units are located on one lot, the minimum lot size for the cottage development shall be one (1) acre.) implies that a cottage development can span two or more lots, and if it does, they need not total 1 acre. Which would mean, of course, such a development could be put anywhere an interested party could secure two adjacent lots, in just about any residential area. No minimum size is set and the only requirements are at least one room and a kitchen, however minimal. It would be a simple matter to set this in 200 square feet and pack in an unknown, but surprisingly large number of units on almost any R1 lot, for example. But the clincher is in item iv, in particular (The development may contain a shared indoor community space ... not included in the maximum total residential gross floor area.) As worded, that means the total building area including cottages and common building can actually cover 100% of just about any residential lot in the county, save for required setbacks. There is no comment about parking either. At the very least, this new proposal requires a great deal of clarification. If the listed possibilities are actually what was intended, the public needs to know sooner rather than later. It's also puzzling why this concept is proposed in zones that currently have Dwelling Unit limits that would render the cottages impossible unless there is intent to remove those limits. If so, that's another thing the public needs to know loud and clear.</p>		2-2(A)(2)			<p>The project team is presenting these concerns to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council for direction. W1 and W2 could be retained or 3 new open spaces districts created with one for parks, one for active open space uses, and once for passive open space uses as indicated in the Future Land Use Map of the Comp Plan.</p>
<p>This is a terrible platform for responses. The paragraphs were run together and I was not given an opportunity to add my name.</p>					<p>DPS is exploring more efficient public comment mechanisms for future modules. Members of the public may always provide comments directly to County or project team staff by emailing either Bryce Ternet at michael.ternet@lacnm.us or Jessica Lawlis at jessical@dpsdesign.org</p>
<p>I think that the golf course, now zoned P-L, should be rezoned to permit housing. The golf course property serves relatively few people and occupies valuable space in the center of the community.</p>				No change	<p>Not within scope of project. This action would require a rezone that is particular to one particular parcels that is outside of the legislative process of this update.</p>

LAC Development Code Update - Module 1 Public Comments					
Comments / Request for Change	Page #	Applicable Code Section	Applicable Sub-Section	Proposed Change	Response
<p>Retail Sales in Los Alamos</p> <p>1.0 Background</p> <p>1.1 I've been following the level of business activity in Los Alamos since 1985. I use the Gross Receipts Taxes (GRT) to measure business activity. To be specific, I follow the level of taxable business activity. I started doing this because the GRT is the major source of revenue for Los Alamos County and I was a County Councilor. The information is currently available at https://www.tax.newmexico.gov/all-nm-taxes/gross-receipts-taxes-overview/monthly-rp-80-reports-gross-receipts-by-geographic-area-and-naics-code/.</p> <p>1.2 Currently (with LANL paying GRT) the main levels of taxable business activity in Los Alamos are Services, Construction (9%), and Retail Sales (4%). Clearly lab activity dominates the Service sector.</p> <p>1.3 Figure 1 shows the change in GRT revenues since 1985. Clearly the county has done quite well since LANL started paying taxes.</p> <p>2.0 Relevance</p> <p>2.1 I believe that a healthy retail sector is important to our quality of life. At the turn of century in my terms on the County Council and School Board I worked to change the landscape of the East end of town by converting school and county property to what is now the Smith's Marketplace area.</p> <p>2.2 I've been following the discussion regarding a potential change to our zoning that would limit the types of businesses that could occupy sidewalk access. I think that the well-meaning intention is to enhance our retail activity.</p> <p>2.3 I saw somewhere a comment that internet sales may be hurting Los Alamos retail sales. I contacted NM Tax and Rev in an attempt to identify the level of internet sales in Los Alamos. They were no help. Apparently buying light bulb at Metzger's or Amazon looks the same to Tax and Rev. It is a retail activity.</p> <p>2.4 So, how's retail activity doing in Los Alamos? Figure 2 shows the level of taxable retail GRT in Los Alamos. Surprising, at least to me, retail activity surged in CY 2020 to an all-time high! I suspect that internet sales are responsible.</p> <p>3.0 Conclusion</p> <p>3.1 My guess is that no actions taken by the downtown master planning and County code revision work being undertaken by the County's consultant Dekker/Perich/Sabatini can change</p>				No change	<p>This comment appears to be referring to the pedestrian retail overlay that is no longer being considered at this time. The project team has been given no direction to limit ground-floor uses within the downtown areas of Los Alamos or White Rock and the Development Updates will work to create mixed-use development standards for these areas.</p>

LAC Development Code Update - Module 1 Public Comments					
Comments / Request for Change	Page #	Applicable Code Section	Applicable Sub-Section	Proposed Change	Response
<p>Accessory Dwelling Units</p> <p>The clear need, as well as the policy of the County in the Comprehensive Plan and multiple strategic policies adopted by the County Council, is to create additional housing of all kinds in the County.</p> <p>Given the limited amount of vacant or re-developable real estate in the County, either privately or publically owned, the County will not be able to reach anywhere near the projected 1600 residential units needed now in the County, in addition to the current projects in various stages of development and approval, expressed in the 2020 Housing Study conducted pursuant to the North Mesa Housing Project process, if there are important administrative policies that substantially restrict or eliminate a substantial category of potential residential growth. That is exactly what has occurred with respect to approval of Accessory Dwellings in the County. If I understand correctly, The County Attorney office has opined and the Community Development Department has been obliged to enforce a definition of Accessory Dwelling that categorizes accessory dwellings or apartment as an additional dwelling under every respective residential zoning district, resulting banning accessory dwellings for any residential zoning district limited to a single family unit.</p> <p>Now that the County Council has mandated an updating and revision of Chapter 16 and given the large shortage of needed residential units, now and in the coming years, the largest single category of potential additional residential units in the County is through encouraging and widely approving large numbers of Accessory Dwellings.</p> <p>As I read this Module 1, I believe the authors intended to address this issue. However, given current administrative guidance, I think it would be wise to insure residential landowners can widely apply for and, where approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, receive a special use permit for an Accessory Dwelling.</p> <p>Accordingly, I suggest a number of additions to address this issue, while still protecting neighborhoods from undesirably intense growth where necessary:</p> <p>SECTION 16-2-2(D)(1) iii:</p> <p>iii. The underlying zoning district requirements including lot, setback and coverage standards shall apply to an Accessory Dwelling unit, provided that an Accessory Dwelling under this</p>		16-2-2(D)(1) iii: 16-5-2 16-2-2(D)(1)(xi) 16-2-2(D)(1) 16-2-2(D)v 16-2-2(D)(1)viii	2-2(D)(1) Accessory Dwelling		The current draft standards were initial recommendations based on existing standards. The county is planning to undertake an independent process for public comment specific to Accessory Dwelling Units. The Chapter 16 Development Code updates will reflect the guidance and outcomes from that public comment process.
I believe a much better definition is needed for "Accessory Structure." Is it a "building" and excludes anything else? Is a small cabinet-like storage shed a structure. What dimensions make it an Accessory Structure. This definition needs to be improved and clarified. I believe limiting the number allowed is going to create problems. Maybe a maximum percentage of property area would be better?					
what is this a joke? the video is not a meeting! I sat through 12 minutes and this was NOT A MEETING AND NO PRESENTATION!					The project team has updated the presentation on the project website to remove the pause at the beginning of the video.
It was difficult to understand. I am concerned that we will be required to have look-alike yards within a residential zone, and I strongly disagree with that. Anyone's home and yard should allow for expression of landscape that the owner finds aesthetically (subjectively) pleasing. That is what makes it interesting to walk through neighborhoods and enjoy the creativity of each yard. I saw no mention of the danger of dead trees and large dead branches, which can cause damage and injuries. Code enforcement should be strictly on a complaint basis. There should be no code enforcers dropping in unannounced, and they should stay out of the back yard unless invited in to answer questions. Only the safety issues should be a criminal complaint. The esthetic issues should not be criminal or civil complaints. People are working a lot, raising families, and already under enough stress. It is very threatening to think a code enforcer can enter my private property unannounced.					This comment refers to issues addressed within the Chapter 18 nuisance code, not the Chapter 16 Development Code Update. The Chapter 18 Nuisance Code update is ongoing and public input opportunities are anticipated to occur in Winter 2022.
Page 77 X May be useful to define Xeriscaping	77	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Xeriscaping definition will be provided in Module 2 with landscape regulations.
Also, "Trailer sales lot" must include automobile sales? Seems odd.	76	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Deleted Trailer Sales lot definition	This was an old use category that will not be carried forward.
Small conflict between "Tenant" and the use of the word in "Multiple Tenant Buiding" on page 66.	76 and 66	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Definitions pertaining to content about development standards will be revised in Module 2.
page 75 Structural alterations -- only outside walls or roof?	75	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Definitions pertaining to content about development standards will be revised in Module 2.
Story -- very confusing.	74	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Definitions pertaining to content about development standards will be revised in Module 2.
Next item, 'passive' the final clause "for structural heating" is unnecessary and may cause problems down the road.	74	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Revised definition to read "A system that employs siting and orientation, structural materials and landscaping to take advantage of solar energy."	Revised definition to remove the term for structural heating

LAC Development Code Update - Module 1 Public Comments					
Comments / Request for Change	Page #	Applicable Code Section	Applicable Sub-Section	Proposed Change	Response
Solar energy collection system, active Might want to say mechanical or electrical rather than just mechanical.	74	16-5-2 Defined Terms		<i>Revised definition to read "A mechanical or electrical system for heating or cooling a structure by collecting, storing and transporting solar energy."</i>	<i>Revised definition to include electrial systems</i>
Sign, temporary "limited period of time." Since the earth will eventually be burned to a cinder, we can assume all signs will be up for a limited period of time. Without some idea of the actual limit, this is a meaningless proposal.	73	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Signage definitions will be comprehensively updated in Module 2 with the recommendations for signage regulations.
Consider defining "quasi-legal"		16-5-2 Defined Terms			Quasi-legal may be defined if necessary depending on the standards within Modules 2 and 3.
Page 72 Setbacks Might want to define "projections"	72	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Projections into the setback areas will be addressed in Module 2.
Kennel As worded, this would mean six birds, six cats, six lizards in a terrarium?	64	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Revised definition to refer to cats and dogs rather than domesticated pets.	
Frontage What determines the front of the lot when on a corner or curve?	61	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Definitions pertaining to content about development standards, such as frontage calculations, will be revised in Module 2.
Equestrian trail Is this intended to specifically exclude bicycles?	60	16-5-2 Defined Terms			Equestrian trail definition does specifically exclude bicyclist use.
Dwelling, live/work Could this include retail? Restaurant?	59	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Added a new standards on the use standards for live/work dwelling to limit the uses that can occupy the work component. New standard reads "The nonresidential work use shall not be used for the following uses identified in Table 2-1 1 Permitted Use Table: any use in the Agricultural category; any use in the Recreation & Entertainment category; any use in the Food and Beverage category; and Indoor Entertainment category; any use in the Vehicle and Equipment-Related category; any use in the Industrial Uses category except artisan manufacturing; construction contractor facility and yard; crematorium; mortuary; or laboratory".	
Unnecessary gender specification County clerk means the elected clerk of the County of Los Alamos or his agent.	57	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Change to "their agent"	
Archaism? Dry-cleaning, coin-operated, means the use of single-batch, automatic cleaning machines, activated by the insertion of a coin.	59	16-5-2 Defined Terms		Deleted dry cleaning defintion	This was an old use category that was not carried forward.
Do the vehicle storage rules apply to vehicles that are driven regularly, but we lack the space to park them all in the carport? Do the vehicle maintenance restrictions apply to the simple things most of us do at home, such as a quick oil change, add air to tires, add water to battery? Do the storage unit restrictions apply to temporary items such as a large Rubbermaid storage cabinet? Is a violation still a criminal offense, or can it be changed to a civil offense? If a permanent storage building was permitted and inspected, but the rules have changed, we should not need to tear it down and obtain a new permit. Dead tress and dead tree limbs should be added as a hazard to neighbor properties, as they are more of a threat than a dandelion. Any rules related to our yards should allow for the homeowner's choice to avoid mono-culture clipped green grass in favor of healthy biodiversity and pollinator habitat and soil health. green plants and healthy soil sequester carbon, helping us reach our carbon-neutral goal. Concrete and gravel add reflected heat to the atmosphere.				No change in Chapter 16 update	This comment appears to be concerced with issues that are covered within the Chapter 18 nusiance code, rather than the zoning standards within the Chapter 16 Development Code.
Regarding outdoor vehicle storage, it is not clear whether this applies to the three vehicles we drive most days and if we may continue parking one in the carport, one offset in the driveway, and one in the street. It is also unclear whether homeowners will continue to be allowed to perform minor maintenance (add air to tires, change oil, add water to battery, change a tire) in our own carports. It takes time to get appointments at repair shops and time to find a ride home.				No change in Chapter 16 update	This comment appears to be concerced with inoperable vehicles, which will be covered under the Chapter 18 Nusiance update, not in the Chapter 16 Development Code.
Regarding accessory structures, does the maximum number include temporary storage bins (such as Rubbermaid) and temporary small metal sheds?				Revised definition of accessory structure to read " A structure detached from and located on the same lot as a primary building, customarily used with and clearly incidental and subordinate to the primary building or use. Accessory structures include but are not limited to barns, garages, carports, sheds, greenhouses, gazeboes, pergolas, or similar roofed structures."	The maximum number of accessory structure would include all metal sheds. If it was a temporary storage structure it would need to meet the defintion for temporary storage which only permit the placement of items like PODS on-site for a maximum of 45 days. Rubbermaid containers wouldn't qualify for the definition of temporary storage or accessory structures within Chapter 16, but may qaulify as "rubbish" under the Chapter 18 nusiance code.