

<b>Map Change Requests</b>		<b>Page 1</b>
<b>Map Changes Made After Worksessions with Aldermen</b>		
<b>North Oxford</b>		
Can the TNB parcel on North Lamar be squared up along Pleasant Drive to simplify the connections and property use?	Zoning has been changed to expand the area of TNB as requested in the Public Hearing Draft	
Rezone property along Pleasant Drive to SR rather than TNR	Zoning has been changed from TNR to SR in the Public Hearing Draft	
Change zoning to TNB from SR, lot 55 on Chickasaw near Molly Barr.	The zoning map has not been changed. The request is not supported. No change to the map.	
<b>East Oxford</b>		
Request that all of Tract E be zoned multi-family, and the portion of Tract J that is south of Della Davidson be zoned TNB to agree with the intent reflected in the PUD.	Zoning has been changed to TNB and SMF as requested in the Public Hearing Draft	
Concern was expressed that if the property at the southwest quadrant of Hwy 6 and Hwy 7 is rezoned from Agricultural (proposed for TNB), that the mobile home park located there; which provides affordable housing for some, would leave.	Zoning has been changed from TNB to NR in the Public Hearing Draft	
Please change 3.66 acre portion of a property owned by OUS from SR to SMF. This has the support of the Grand Oaks developers, and does not change the development potential for the PUD.	Zoning has not been changed in the Public Hearing Draft	

East Oxford	Page 2
<p>Request that the northern portion of #25982 in Grand Oaks 1 from SR to NR, as our immediately adjacent property #8948. This would make the flow of the development and the construction of the infrastructure much easier and less expensive. Please consider making this requested change (the portion of #25982 that is north of the TVA power line) to Neighborhood Residential.</p>	<p>The zoning map has not been changed. There is not support for the request as there is concern about the higher density being immediately adjacent to lower density suburban residential to the south. No changes to the map.</p>
<p>Re: 60+ acre piece at the southwest corner of the intersection of Rt. 6 &amp; Rt. 7 owned by RWB Limited Partnership(RWB). The proposed zoning for this property is Traditional Neighborhood Business. Immediately adjacent to the RWB property on both sides of Belk Road, the proposed zoning for those properties is Urban Center. We think Urban Center would be appropriate for the adjacent RWB 60+ acre piece also. In the past couple years, we have been approached by both multi-family developers and Big Box/shopping center developers for the property. They like the property for its location at a major intersection, a growing residential area, and the close proximity of the Hospital and medical offices. Urban corridor development at this location would be positive for the community. It would take traffic pressure off the Rt.6/West Jackson Ave. corridor; and, the multi-family would provide nearby housing for the medical workforce both at the Hospital and nearby medical offices. In addition, a hotel component would be very convenient for access to the nearby medical community.</p>	<p>The zoning map has not been changed. There is not support for the request. The proposed TNB zoning is what is recommended in the Future Land Use Map. There are enough other sites mapped to allow "big box" shopping; and the Vision 2037 Plan reflects a desire for more mixed neighborhoods and fewer strip shopping areas. In addition, this area is recommended as appropriate for a TND mixed-use development. No changes to the map.</p>

<b>South Oxford</b>		<b>Page 3</b>
<p>Surrounding the roundabout on Oxford Way in the Northwest section of Oxford Farms, the proposed zoning map indicates approximately 4.45 acres of my property to be zoned TNB and another 15.84 acres to be zoned TNR. 5 of the proposed 15.84 acres of TNR zoned property is currently zoned RC-Multi-Family. I am agreeable to retaining the 4.45 acres of TNB as shown on the proposed zoning map, but I request that all 15.84 acres of TNR around the roundabout be changed to SMF.</p>	<p>Zoning has been changed to from TNR to SMF for the 15.84 acres in the Public Hearing Draft</p>	
<p>Request the property that has long been indicated for a future YMCA, or an assisted living facility, be zoned as TNB rather than the currently proposed TNR zoning classification. The TNR zoning would not allow the YMCA.</p>	<p>Zoning has been changed from TNR to TNB in the Public Hearing Draft</p>	
<p>Request 57.33 acres of proposed SR zoned property within Oxford Farms be changed to a TNR zoning classification like the adjoining 38.65 acre property in Oxford Farms.</p>	<p>The zoning has not been changed. There is not support for the request. An area of SR is considered important for the overall Oxford Farms development.</p>	
<b>West Oxford</b>		
<p>A number of Woodlawn residents expressed objections to changing a small area of land north of Anderson at West Oxford Loop to Traditional Neighborhood Business, primarily because of certain uses allowed (by special exception) they do not want allowed near their homes. The uses include restaurants (with drive throughs or that serve alcohol), liquor stores, service stations, hotels, vehicle maintenance, and gas stations.</p>	<p>Zoning has been changed to an overlay called Legacy TNB, that will not allow several of the stated uses in the Public Hearing Draft</p>	

<b>West Oxford</b>		Page 4
Nine requests in support of the zoning to TNB from GB and PB in the area around West Oxford Loop and Anderson have been received in the past two weeks.	Zoning has been changed to an overlay called Legacy TNB at the request of Woodlawn residents	
<b>Central Oxford</b>		
Residents on Leighton and in the Stone Subdivision, and others have requested to be in Estate Residential rather than Suburban Residential.	Zoning has been changed from SR to Traditional Estate Residential in the Public Hearing Draft	
Rezone N. 11th Street from Jefferson to its terminus from TNR to TSR to not allow multi-family development.	Zoning has not been changed in the Public Hearing Draft. Changes in TNR will provide the desired protections. Also, MF is not allowed in either TNR or TSR.	
I think 18th Street south of University Avenue should be zoned light green, Suburban Residential District since it is definitely a single-family lot neighborhood.	Zoning has been changed from NR to TSR in the Public Hearing Draft	
Request to rezone 414 N. 11th Street (PPIN 5831) from DB/HUCN to TNR	The zoning map has not been changed. The property has been DB for many years, since before the last comprehensive rezoning, and the area has not substantially changed to become more residential in nature. A nearby resident is making the request. The owner has stated opposition to the request.	
Request to rezone 412 N. 11th Street (PPIN 5830) from DB/HUCN to TNR	The zoning map has not been changed. The property has been DB for many years, since before the last comprehensive rezoning. A nearby resident is making the request; which is opposed by the property owner. Further the area has not substantially changed to become more residential in nature.	

<b>Central Oxford</b>	<b>Page 5</b>
<p>Concerned that property currently zoned SC at northwest corner of Bramlett and University is to be rezoned TNB. We need more than 12 dwelling per acre (pushing student housing with 3/4 bedrooms), prefer more smaller units.</p>	<p>The zoning map has not been changed. Higher density is not supported at this location. Staff has, however, proposed a modification to several districts to establish density by the bedroom rather than unit (39 BR/A for TNB), for the reasons stated.</p>
<p>Currently this property is zoned multifamily. A design via architects and engineers was proposed to the city allowing 12 houses. This project met all criteria of all board and was put on the consent agenda. New zoning proposal would reduce the number of units allowed, therefore devaluing propoert. This property consists of 315 Martin Luther King, 212 N. 6th, 216 N. 6th.</p>	<p>The zoning map has not been changed. There is not support for the request. The prior consideration of this property was before the adoption of the Vision 2027 Comprehensive Plan. The TNR recommendation aligns with that Plan. No change to the map.</p>
<p>Same comment as R23. This property consists of 211 and 213 S. 17th Street.</p>	<p>The zoning map has not been changed. There is not support for this request. The prior consideration of this property was before the adoption of the Vision 2027 Comprehensive Plan. The TNR recommendation aligns with that Plan. No change to the map.</p>

## ZONING MAP COMMENTS AND REQUESTS

**West Quadrant**

**Page 1**

Name (Last, First)	Comment	Staff Evaluation
<b>Woodlawn Residents Comments</b>		
<p>1 Robinson, David Hillside Drive Woodlawn</p>	<p>Woodlawn Resident - I object to changing the zoning of property next to Woodlawn Park to a land use that allows bars, liquor stores, and gas stations. This property is currently zoned PB (Professional Business). I have been told that PB is now "Neighborhood Business." I am also told TNB will allow bars, liquor stores, and gas stations. THIS IS STUPID!!! Please do NOT allow bars, liquor stores, and gas stations in areas that are currently PB.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request.</b> The current zoning backing into this portion of Woodlawn is GB, not PB. The TNB will be substantially more protective of nearby homes. The TNB district is the lowest intensity commercial zoning district. There are multiple levels of design requirements and intensity limits that would make it difficult or impractical for most of the listed uses to locate in this area, when Jackson Avenue so nearby.</p>
<p>Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn</p>	<p>Ideally we would return this area to Professional Business and keep low intensity</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request</b> as the primary direction of the Vision 2037 Plan and new code is to have mixed use zoning districts with enhanced standards for intensity, buffering, lighting, etc. to provide protection rather than single purpose zoning districts.</p>
<p>Allison, Jones (Pete) Allison, Carol Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn</p>	<p>Y13: Please leave this area next to park as "Professional Business"</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request.</b> The revisions to the zoning code contain substantially more protection for nearby residential uses than the current code. There are more special exceptions rather than another zoning district.</p>

Woodlawn cont.

<p>Allison, Jones (Pete) Allison, Carol Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn</p>	<p>Y19: Please leave this area next to the park as PB.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request</b> for the reasons noted in the response to 14 West and 15 West above.</p>
<p>Crosbie, Stephanie Crosbie, Miko Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn</p>	<p>Y25: leave as it</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request</b> for the reasons noted in the response to 14 West and 15 West above.</p>
<p>Sapp, Dinorah</p>	<p>I am completemy against the zoning of W. Oxford Loop extension to TNB. It should stay PB because thsee kinds of zoning would allow the character of the neighborhood to be the same as it has traditionally been. I don't want the nightmare of traffic, pollution, and noise that a TNB zoning designation make.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request</b> for the reasons noted in the response to 14 West and 15 West above.</p>
<p>Davis, Kendall Woodlawn</p>	<p>As a 22 year resident of Woodlawn Subdivision I am very much for the zoning change from Professional Business to Neighborhood Business. I think it will be a wonderful compliment to the neighborhood.</p>	<p><b>The comment indicates support for the proposed new zoning.</b></p>
<p>Davis, Corese Woodlawn</p>	<p>I have been a resident of Woodlawn Subdivision for 22 years and I am for the re zoning of property from Professional Business to Neighborhood Business. I believe it will only increase property value!</p>	<p><b>The comment indicates support for the proposed new zoning.</b></p>

## Woodlawn cont.

Sapp, Christopher	I am against rezoning land off W. Oxford Loop Extension (across from Woodlawn Park) to TNB. This should remain PB in keeping with the character of the businesses in the area, the proximity to the park, and the quiet of the neighborhood. If rezone to TNB, I am opposed to any restaurants, bars, vape shops, gas stations, and convenience stores. They will create high traffic, noise, and bright lights too close to our houses and park.	<b>Staff does not support the request</b> for the reasons noted in the response to 14 West and 15 West above.
Gray, Austin	As a resident of Woodlawn, I am concerned about the re-classification of the area around Woodlawn Park from "Professional Business" to "Neighborhood Business." Residents of the area would potentially see a significant decline on property values and, depending on the businesses permitted in the area, there may be significant health and safety concerns. I would request that the "Professional Business" designation remain or, in the altewrnative, I would request the Planning Committee/Dept. to provide substatial justification for the change. If TB zoning applies, I would ask that no gas stations, bars or liquor stores be permitted.	<b>Staff does not support the request</b> for the reasons noted in the response to 14 West and 15 West above.
Richardson, Hunter & Shannon	We are adamently against changing the designation of Professional Business to Neighborhood Business on the North and East lots of the Woodlawn Park. Our community does NOT want to open this area up for bars, liquor stores, gas stations and other businesses that detract from the residential, family friendly feel of the park area that is a recreational hub for many children and families.	<b>Staff does not support the request</b> for the reasons noted in the response to 14 West and 15 West above.

## Woodlawn cont.

Felker, Lance	While I like the idea of land use codes, I find TNB (which is targeted for the E side of Woodlawn-Davis Park) to be too flexible. It allows for businesses which I do not find to be characteristic or desirable alongside a public park and family neighborhood. We would like some assurance that taverns, service stations, and liquor stores would not be in our backyards.	<b>Staff does not support the request</b> for the reasons noted in the response to 14 West and 15 West above.
Quon, Esther Hillside Drive Woodlawn	We are concerned that a convenience store could be built on the currently empty lot that is bordered by West Oxford Loop and Anderson Road. If a business is built, we would prefer that a professional business be located on the lot.	The corner of West Oxford Loop and Anderson Road is currently zoned General Business. The proposed zoning is Traditional Neighborhood Business, which is substantially lower intensity than General Business. It was recommended to provide increased compatibility with Woodlawn.
Retnam, Rameesh	I am in favor of zoning change of property at Anderson road and West Oxford Loop from PB to NB. It would good for Oxford town. The people around this area will enjoy the convenience to have shops within walking distance of their home.	Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning
Anderson, Bonney	I am in favor of zoning change of proberity at Anderson Rd. and W Oxford Loopfrom PB to NB. I think it would be very beneficial to have shops close to us.	Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning
Graham, O'Keefe Nix-Tann & Associates	I'm a resident of Oxford and live and work near West Oxford Loop and am interested in the zoning for the property at the end of road. We use that park and would love for their to be retail shops or some type of place to grab a quick bite to eat without having to drive down Jackson Avenue.	Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning
Reeder, Amy	I am in favor of the proposed zoning change of property at Anderson Rd. and West Oxford Loop. It would be great to have shops within walking distance of homes in the area.	Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning

**Woodlawn cont.**

<p>Davis, Sterling B.</p>	<p>I have been a resident of Oxford for 24 years. I very am in favor of rezoning change of property at Anderson Rd and W Oxford Loop from PB to NB. It would be so nice to take a stroll at the park and go shopping at retails stores of grab a bite yogurt after.</p>	<p>Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning</p>
<p>Deweese, Clay</p>	<p>I am writing in favor of the zoning change from Professional Business to Neighborhood Business for the property located at the corner of Anderson Road and West Oxford Loop. I cross through this intersection daily during my commute to and from work as a means of staying off of Jackson Avenue. With the rapid growth of our community and extremely high traffic in the immediate area, intersections such as these will become more commonly used and Professional Business zoning would not be considered the highest and best use. Neighborhood Business will allow suitable options to achieve long term best use of this property.</p>	<p>Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning</p>
<p>Pannel, Rickie L.</p>	<p>I am in favor of zoning change of property at Anderson Road and West Oxford Loop from PB to NB. It would be nice to have shops within walking distance of homes.</p>	<p>Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning</p>
<p>McCay, Joyce</p>	<p>Call in support of proposed zoning at W. Oxford Loop. Has grand children and likes the idea of being able to walk to nice businesses.</p>	<p>Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning</p>
<p>McCay, Jason</p>	<p>Call in support of W. Oxford Loop zoning.</p>	<p>Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning</p>
<p>Jennings, Ted</p>	<p>I live in the Woodlawn subdivision and I am in favor of the zoning change of property at Anderson Road and West Oxford Loop from Professional Business to Neighborhood Business. I would like to see some of the small town charm return to Oxford.</p>	<p>Support of the WOL/Anderson Rezoning</p>

**Other Map Comments**

<p>Sapp, Dinorah</p>	<p>I prefer low density development behind my property line so the TNR zoning off TCJ Road is fine.</p>	<p><b>Indicates support for TNR</b></p>
<p>Sapp, Christopher</p>	<p>I am in favor of changing the land use off T.C. Jane road for TNR as this land is directly behind my house and I prefer lower density development..</p>	<p><b>Indicates support for TNR</b></p>
<p><b>Southeast Quadrant</b></p>		
<p>Laurenzo, Fred July 27</p>	<p>The trailer park on S. 18th will be sold as soon as the area is rezoned. Thought needs to be given to preserving affordable workforce housing in this area. What is the best way to write regulations to achieve this goal? The public housing across 18th argues for maintaining affordable housing in this area.</p>	<p>Mayor Tannehill will be forming a Housing Issues Commission to tackle this and other housing concerns after the adoption of the zoning code and map. The Future Land Use Map, and the zoning, reflect a 20 year perspective, not immediate uses.</p>
<p>2. Alger, Corey 7/20 Letter</p>	<p>Please change a 3.66 acre portion of a property recommended for SR to SMF. This has the support of the Grand Oaks developers, and does not change the development potential for the PUD.</p>	<p><b>Staff supports this request</b> which is supported by the school and the developers.</p>
<p>Poole, Wanda</p>	<p>Support the TNR zoning on #7.</p>	<p><b>Support</b> is for property proposed for TNR off South Lamar behind a bit of TNB</p>
<p>3. Callicut, Andy</p>	<p>G4: Surrounding the roundabout on Oxford Way in the Northwest section of Oxford Farms, the proposed zoning map indicates approximately 4.45 acres of my property to be zoned TNB and another 15.84 acres to be zoned TNR. 5 of the proposed 15.84 acres of TNR zoned property is currently zoned RC-Multi-Family. I am agreeable to retaining the 4.45 acres of TNB as shown on the proposed zoning map, but I request that all 15.84 acres of TNR around the roundabout be changed to SMF.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support this change</b> for property on the north side of Oxford Way. There are many other opportunities for multi-family development in Oxford. The proposed TNR zoning reflects the Future Land Use Map and the current RB zoning for this area. TNR affords more opportunities for family oriented development than SMF.</p>

<p>4. Callicut, Andy</p>	<p>G1: I request the property that has long been indicated for a future YMCA, or an assisted living facility, be zoned as TNB rather than the currently proposed TNR zoning classification. The TNR zoning would not allow the YMCA.</p>	<p><b>Staff supports this request</b>, the TNR zoning should have been TNB</p>
<p>5. Callicut, Andy</p>	<p>G3: I request the 57.33 acres of proposed SR zoned property within Oxford Farms be changed to a TNR zoning classification like the adjoining 38.65 acre property in Oxford Farms.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request</b> pertaining to property on the south side of Oxford Way. While it would be feasible to consider a PUD in this area to allow some added mixed of unit types, the Future Land Use Plan and proposed zoning reflect the existing zoning for Suburban Residential development.</p>
<p>6. Johnson, Bernard Grand Oaks, Inc July 17 Email</p>	<p>Already discussed with planning department about parcel in the Grand Oaks Pud I South of the TVA power line. Are now platting the southern portion as single family lots. However, north of the TVA power line, the other portion attaches to our parcel # PPIN 8948 (which is classified as TNR). We proposed that the northern portion of #25982 also be classified as TNR, as our immediately adjacent property #8948. This would make the flow of the development and the construction of the infrastructure much easier and less expensive. Please consider making this requested change to our property (the portion of #25982 that is north of the TVA power line) to Traditional Neighborhood Residential.</p>	<p><b>Staff supports the request</b> as the power line provides a substantial boundry between different areas of Grand Oaks.</p>

7.  
Johnson, Bernard  
Grand Oaks, Inc  
July 28 Email

Re: 60+ acre piece at the southwest corner of the intersection of Rt. 6 & Rt. 7 owned by RWB Limited Partnership(RWB). The proposed zoning for this property is Traditional Neighborhood Business. Immediately adjacent to the RWB property on both sides of Belk Road, the proposed zoning for those properties is Urban Center. We think Urban Center would be appropriate for the adjacent RWB 60+ acre piece also. In the past couple years, we have been approached by both multi-family developers and Big Box/shopping center developers for the property. They like the property for its location at a major intersection, a growing residential area, and the close proximity of the Hospital and medical offices. Urban corridor development at this location would be positive for the community. It would take traffic pressure off the Rt.6/West Jackson Ave. corridor; and, the multi-family would provide nearby housing for the medical workforce both at the Hospital and nearby medical offices. In addition, a hotel component would be very convenient for access to the nearby medical community.

**Staff does not support this request.** The proposed TNB zoning is what is recommended in the Future Land Use Map. There are enough other sites mapped to allow "big box" shopping; and the Vision 2037 Plan reflects a desire for more mixed neighborhoods and fewer strip shopping areas. In addition, this area is recommended as appropriate for a TND mixed-use development.

**STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS**

<p>8. Buchanan, Dr. Luanne Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>As a resident of 309 Garner Street, I'm writing specifically about the plan to change our area from estate residential to suburban residential. I am opposed to the zoning change from ER to SR. Cutting our minimum lot size in half and reducing setback requirements will lead to greater density and more traffic near a very crowded campus. It will involve removing green spaces and trees that make Oxford a desirable place to live. It drastically changes the character of a neighborhood that has been known for its stability, neighborliness, green spaces, safety for walkers and children, tranquility -- and for its appreciation of all those things.</p> <p>In the 30 years that I've lived in Oxford, I've been assured repeatedly and by multiple planning commissions that the goal is not to change the character of strong, stable neighborhoods such as ours. Consequently, I'm deeply confused about why this is being proposed. It can't help anyone but developers without a commitment to our city; it can only hurt a strong neighborhood and one of the green oases we still have in Oxford.</p> <p>As a long-time resident of this city who was welcomed 30 years ago by friendly neighbors who shared a clear, common goal of preserving the livability of Oxford, I hope our neighborhood and city will continue to provide the same experience to future new residents. Keeping our neighborhood in the estate residential zoning is the way that will happen.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated.</b> Further, no multiple housing is allowed. Only single family detached.</p>
<p>Tettleton, Sue Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>Please have it known that I am opposed to the rezoning of the area known as Stone Glen because it is one of the few older neighborhoods that we have been successful in not allowing this prime residential neighborhood from being developed into any type multiple housing.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerned. Further, no multiple housing is allowed. Only single family detached.</b></p>

STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS (cont.)

<p>Bradley, Laura Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>After the municipal leaders have repeatedly insisted that the established neighborhoods be protected, I see that Stone Glen is threatened with zoning change from Estate Residential to Suburban Residential. Stone Glen is not suburban. (Stone Glen includes Leighton, Philip, Stone Roads, Lewis Lane, Leggitt Lane, Garner Street and Beacon Point). Much of it has been a neighborhood in Oxford for at least sixty seven years. I have lived on Philip Road for fifty one of those years. We have worked too hard on preservation of this fine area to stop now. We have been a group of NEIGHBORS in a very special NEIGHBORHOOD and do not wish to become part of a commercial enterprise. Part of the beauty and restfulness here is in the great outdoor land, which allows us to live in a park-like setting and gives us restful homes and lives, with lowered fear of increased traffic and extra flow of people. People who do not live here like to run or walk around the circle of Philip, Garner, and Stone. They are welcomed with a wave, and occasionally with a chat. Why would the city want this to change? I oppose the degraded zoning from Residential Estate to a lesser level of protection.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated.</b> Denser development would be extremely difficult in an existing subdivision.</p>
<p>Bradley, Laura</p>	<p>I see that even ER, in which we are expecting to stay [in Stone Glenn], has the provision that under special exemption it would be allowed to have zero lot line housing. This is unheard of, and this neighborhood OBJECTS to that provision. I know that this means, for starters, the small houses on Washington Extended. This is one of the two approaches into this neighborhood and is totally unacceptable. I ask that this provision be removed. I also oppose cluster housing in Stone Glen neighborhood. It may be appropriate in some cases, but here, it will probably bring in students and the troubles we know so well that they bring with them: noise, blocked streets, MORE LIVING IN HOUSE THAN IS PROVIDED BY THE CODE, driving too fast, running over our pets, and much more traffic. We don't want cluster houses EITHER. We have narrow streets and don't want that to change, as that is a useful protection.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated. A zero lot line or cluster development do not allow any greater density than otherwise allowed in a zoning district. And the intent of cluster development is to protect streams and woodlands and allow greater buffering between adjacent developments.</b> While the dwellings may be on smaller lots, there would be substantial common open space that would allow for greater than normal buffers between the development and other nearby lots.</p>

STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS (cont.)

<p>Mattern, Dan Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>I wish for the Stone-Glen area to stay RE (ER) rather than change to suburban, which could allow denser development.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated.</b> Denser development would be extremely difficult in an existing subdivision.</p>
<p>Gelbard, Elaine Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>I would like Stone Glen zoning district to remain Estate Residential rather than rezoned to Suburban Residential.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated.</b> Denser development would be extremely difficult in an existing subdivision.</p>
<p>Simmons, Anne Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>I would like to register my strong opposition to the rezoning of the Stone Glen neighborhood to SR. As a resident of Garner Street, I would like to see the current lot size and setback requirements maintained in order to maintain the character of our neighborhood.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns.</b></p>
<p>Simmons, Brian Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>I understand that there is a plan to refine our neighborhood, Stone Glen. I strongly oppose this rezoning as it will negatively affect the safety of our family oriented neighborhood. Please consider leaving our zoning as is</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although there is no reason at all to think it would affect safety. There are many lovely neighborhoods in Oxford in other zoning districts.</b></p>
<p>Brammer, Dana and Jean Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>We oppose the proposed zoning change from ER to SR. We have lived on Philip Road since 1970.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns.</b></p>
<p>Mann, James &amp; Kitty Stone Subdivision</p>	<p>We strongly oppose changing our neighborhood (Stone Glen Subdivision) from ER to SR. We've all worked too hard to keep the neighborhood as is, peaceful and not congested.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns.</b></p>

STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS (cont.)

<p>Sullivan-Gonzalez, Douglass</p>	<p>My wife, Maribel, and I have been residents of 301 Philip Road since 1995 and are founding members of our Stone Glen Neighborhood Association. I am opposed to the proposed change of our neighborhood from ER to SR. To follow through on this proposed change will fundamentally alter the character of our stable neighborhood that we have guarded for more than three decades. The SR zoning will cut our lot size and encourage dense housing and alter the openness of our streets and neighborhoods. Green space will be lost, and increased traffic on our neighborhood streets will heighten the safety risk for our children and grandchildren.</p> <p>Please communicate to our policy makers that I expect our neighborhood to be protected as ER. We suffered a similar challenge more than a decade ago when a former commission proposed lowering our zoning protections. We lobbied successfully and intend to be equally persuasive this round. To change our zoning to SR will not serve the interests of our neighborhood but will yield to pressure of those who do not even live among us. We expect our neighborhood to maintain the highest protection offered by zoning regulations, and we expect our elected representatives to protect our interests in this debate.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated.</b> Denser development would be extremely difficult in an existing subdivision.</p>
<p>Mann, James &amp; Kitty</p>	<p>We strongly oppose changing our neighborhood (Stone Glen Subdivision) from ER to SR. We've all worked too hard to keep the neighborhood as is, peaceful and not congested.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns,</b></p>
<p>Scott, Steve</p>	<p>I would like to comment on how pleased I am to see the Salvaggio property re-zoned from Single Family Residential to Estate Residential. This 30 acre property is very hilly with very steep slopes, and almost all the storm water drainage is routed through Zilla Avent Drive. It is not practical or appropriate to build high density housing in this area. Thank you for making this change.</p>	<p><b>Comment indicates support for a recommendation.</b></p>
<p>Berton, Helene</p>	<p>Our area was labeled as Estate Residential or ER and as now is labeled as Suburban Residential or SR. We want to stay as before, ER - Estate Residential.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns.</b></p>

**STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS (cont.)**

<p>Symons, Regina &amp; Joe</p>	<p>We live on Leighton Road and are very opposed to the new plan which would move our area from ER to SR classification. We can see no good coming from this effort except to give developers a golden egg. They will not be satisfied until they have gobbled up every bit of open green space in Oxford for their selfish building projects. We urge you to oppose this change.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns.</b></p>
<p>Tettleton, Marysue</p>	<p>I was unable to attend the open housing about the rezoning but I did want to strongly state my opposition to the proposed plan for Leighton Road and the Stone Glen Neighborhood. This is a long established single family (Estate Residual) neighborhood with the original homes dating back to the late 1950's, and we have worked to keep it a highly desirable neighborhood. Currently there are two smaller homes that are rental, on Leighton Road, and we have managed to not allow addition homes to become rentals. The Neighborhood over the past 35-40 years has prevented Suburban development in three areas, and the subdivision of a corner lot to allow 3 houses, and the resident home owners are eaully opposed to this Rezoning.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns.</b></p>
<p>Davis, Brian</p>	<p>I strongly support having the Leighton/Garner/Philip/Stone neighborhood area be Estate Residential rather than Suburban Residential. I am glad to hear that it is planned at this point to be that way. I think the areas on the west side of South Lamar are exceptional scenery within Oxford and it seems like ER is more appropriate than SR for them.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns.</b></p>

STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS (cont.)

Cohen, Kim

Wanted to let you know that I STRONGLY disagree with new proposed Land Lot Development Code and the "Zero Lot Line Dwellings" that would effect the Stone Glen neighborhood. I have lived in my home over 15 years and have a large yard where I enjoy watching the family of about 7 deer live in the back where a creek flows along my property. I also am beyond blessed to have a group of owls make their home in the mature trees that are at the back of my home. My home isn't large, but I love it. My yard is large and there are many mature shade trees and family's of squirrels running around and many different types of beautiful birds. I love that I was able to raise my two children here where they were always safe. I didn't have to worry about traffic driving thru the neighborhood, my neighbors were always kind and kept a watchful eye out for them. I am blessed to still have the same neighbors 15 years later. Stone Glen is such a jewel in this town that has seen so many changes. Thank you for taking the time on this issue and I pray that you will take my heart felt thoughts on this issue that will directly effect my family's quality of life in the days to come.

**Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated. A zero lot line development does not allow any greater density than otherwise allowed in a zoning district.** While the dwellings may be on smaller lots, there would be substantial common open space that would allow for greater than normal buffers between the development and other nearby lots.

**STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS (cont.)**

<p>Lewis, Arthur &amp; Elween</p>	<p>This neighborhood has worked for many years to maintain a residential neighborhood. We object most strenuously to the inclusion of a "zero lot line" and cluster clauses in the new zoning. I strongly request that this neighborhood be zone RE or ER as the new code calls it without any special clauses which would permit zero setbacks, duplexes, nursing homes, half-way houses, condos, or similar non-family housing. I realize we have some student housing now, but our hope is that over the years, these will be converted as ownership changes. My particular concern is the lots now slated for demolition on Washington Ave (Ext) where we have four houses clustered on two lots. Roads in this neighborhood are not adequate for higher density housing. Please help us maintain this neighborhood.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns. Although</b> the other listed uses would be very unlikely to be able to meet the review standards for the special exception review in this area. The lot sizes in Suburban Residential reflect the average lot sizes in the area.</p>
<p>Poole, Frank &amp; Mary</p>	<p>We live at 302 Lewis Lane which is in the Stone-Glenn subdivision immediately behind the Chamber of Commerce. Please, please do not change our zoning but keep it in the RE (or ER) zoning. As it is we are inundated by students living 4 in a house, on Lewis Ln &amp; Stone Rd, which is illegal. If you allow lots to be smaller &amp; more density of homes it will destroy the sense of community in our neighborhood. Do not further damage the beauty of Oxford by letting greedy landlords squeeze as many houses as they can into our lovely neighborhoods.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns. The lot sizes in Suburban Residential, however, reflect the average lot sizes in the area.</b></p>

**STONE SUBDIVISION COMMENTS (cont.)**

<p>Cooper, Dr. Alice</p>	<p>I am currently out of the country, but I would like to add my voice to that of my neighbors in opposing the weakened zoning proposed for our neighborhood. I live at 401 Garner Street, and have owned the house for over 20 years. I would like to live there for the next 20 years and object to zoning changes that would alter its character and reduce the quality of life there. I therefore want to see our neighborhood retain its RE status, called ER under the new plan. I also oppose allowing zero lot lines or cluster houses. I also oppose allowing care homes or anything like that under special exception clauses. Basically, I want to see our neighborhood retain the strong zoning protections it has historically enjoyed. It is not in the interest of the neighborhood to see those protections weakened. I also do not see an interest for the city of Oxford in any weakening of those protections. I ask the city to help keep our neighborhood as lovely as possible in its traditional way: lots of trees, quiet streets, and people who know and help each other.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns. The lot sizes in Suburban Residential, however, reflect the average lot sizes in the area.</b></p>
<p>Gardner, Mark &amp; Tera</p>	<p>We are homeowners in the Stone Glen neighborhood of Oxford and have concerns with the proposed zoning plan for our area. Under the current zoning we are "Residential Estate," as befitting the character of this established Oxford neighborhood, but the proposed zoning of Suburban Residential will likely have a profound negative impact on the neighborhood (by, among other things, allowing lot sizes half as large as is currently required), to the detriment of both the town and the immediately adjacent university. We believe that Stone Glen should remain under the more appropriate zoning of Estate Residential under the new plan, as our neighbors across College Hill Rd will be. It doesn't make sense to use College Hill Rd as an arbitrary boundary between "ER" and "SR" when the character and age of the neighborhoods are very similar. Additionally, there are a few special use exceptions under the proposed plan that are concerning. Allowing reduced setbacks, zero lot line dwellings, and cluster developments are out of place in Stone Glen, and would make the neighborhood unrecognizable to our children, who will hopefully enjoy many more years with the property. We do recognize that Oxford is growing rapidly and it does look very different from when we attended Ole Miss in the early 90s, but our neighborhood has been a great example of much needed stability around which a town can grow sensibly and attractively for all citizens. There are many families who have lived here for decades, and hope to remain for more in this great neighborhood.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed an alternative to address these concerns, although they are rather overstated.</b></p>

**OTHER REQUESTS FOR MAP CHANGES**

<p>11. Butler, James Hudson, Lucretia</p>	<p>Change zoning to TNB from SR, lot 55 on Chickasaw near Molly Barr.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support this request</b> for a property that has frontage on Chickasaw.</p>
<p>McDavid, Stephan Land</p>	<p>The greatest threat to our historic neighborhoods {our stated highest priority in all visioning plans) is both the conversion of property to commercial and also commercial use that substantially interferes with the adjoining residential use. I have several recommendations to address these concerns. First, I ask the planning commission to modify the zoning on property at 412 and 414 North 11th to correctly zone houses PPIN 5830 and PPIN 5831 to the same residential zoning as the rest of the neighborhood, leaving the lots that face Jefferson as commercial. I understand that you are proposing to downzone 5 lots or areas around town, and I request that these two lots be considered as well. I am not asking to fully correct the mistake made in rezoning 2000, in that I do not seek to turn back the zoning on the properties facing Jefferson that have been or are presently commercial. I only ask a change to the two houses that are houses, and have never been operated as business of any nature.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request</b> to rezone the lots owned by people who live down the street from Mr. McDavid. These properties have had DB zoning since at least 2000.</p>
<p>Patricia Freeman</p>	<p>I do not want my property at 412 11th St. to be rezoned. We have been zoned Downtown Business for many years. I rent my house to the Oxford Floral for storage. There is business all around with a hotel going in across the street. There is business behind and to the side. Please let me know what else I need to do.</p>	<p><b>A letter protesting the request</b> of Mr. McDavid from the property owner.</p>
<p>Richard Knowlton 501-454-6533</p>	<p>I do not want my property at 414 N. 11th rezoned to a residential district. baxterknowlton@gmail.com</p>	<p><b>A letter protesting the request</b> of Mr. McDavid from the property owner.</p>
<p>9. Blackburn, David July 27</p>	<p>Request that all of Tract E and the portion of Tract J that is south of Della Davidson be zoned multi-family to agree with the intent reflected in the PUD.</p>	<p><b>Staff supports the request</b> that these properties be changed to SMF.</p>

**OTHER REQUESTS FOR MAP CHANGES**

<p>10. Davis, Brian</p>	<p>I think 18th Street south of University Avenue should be zoned light green, Suburban Residential District since it is definitely a single-family lot neighborhood.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request.</b> The proposed TNR zone is more reflective of the smaller lot sizes along this street, and reflects the recommendation for Traditional Neighborhood on the Future Land Use map.</p>
<p>12. Evans, Jay Evans, Mike</p>	<p>R4: a) Can the TNB parcel on North Lamar be squared up along Pleasant Drive to simplify the connections and property use?</p>	<p><b>Staff does not oppose the request.</b> It would not be a substantial modification and it would create a more regularly shaped TNB area.</p>
<p>13. Beard, Brad July 27</p>	<p>Concerned that property currently zoned SC at northwest corner of Bramlett and University is to be rezoned TNB. We need more than 12 dwelling per acre (pushing student housing with 3/4 bedrooms), prefer more smaller units.</p>	<p><b>Staff remains in support of TNB at this location; and we are proposing a modification to TNB</b> to establish density by the bedroom rather than unit (39 BR/A for TNB), for the reasons stated.</p>
<p>14. Beard, Brad</p>	<p>R23: Currently this property is zoned multifamily. A design via architects and engineers was proposed to the city allowing 12 houses. This project met all criteria of all board and was put on the consent agenda. New zoning proposal would reduce the number of units allowed, therefore devaluing property. This property consists of 315 Martin Luther King, 212 N. 6th, 216 N. 6th.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support this request.</b> The prior consideration of this property was before the adoption of the Vision 2027 Comprehensive Plan. The TNR recommendation aligns with that Plan.</p>
<p>15. Beard, Brad</p>	<p>R24: Same comment as R23. This property consists of 211 and 213 S. 17th Street.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support this request.</b> The prior consideration of this property was before the adoption of the Vision 2027 Comprehensive Plan. The TNR recommendation aligns with that Plan.</p>
<p>Pettis, Adalene</p>	<p>Please do not rezone our neighborhood off Longest; I would like this area to remain a single family neighborhood as it was designed to be with current setbacks.</p>	<p><b>Staff has proposed a modification to address the concern;</b> but the proposed SR has standard lot sizes closer to existing lot sizes in this area.</p>

OTHER REQUESTS FOR MAP CHANGES

Pettis, Ben	Our neighborhood does not need to be rezoned. We are in favor of a single family neighborhood.	<b>Staff has proposed a modification to address the concern; but the proposed zoning is single family.</b>
Foust, Gary & Susan	<p>In a review of the proposed rezoning of our areas, I want to petition that our neighborhood retain its current zoning statuses. I do not wish our neighborhood/subdivision's rezoning to be changed to SR. I respectfully request that the zonings for this area stay as they are for those of us in our neighborhood zoned RA, RE, and R1A. Specifically,</p> <p>1. Set-backs: I want setbacks to remain as they are. I do NOT want the changes an SR zoning would include of front set-backs 30 feet; back 20 feet; side 10 feet.</p> <p>2. Residential Density: I want the residential density to be as it is under the RE/RA/R1A zoning in our neighborhood. I do NOT want the SR zoning residential density of 6 per acre.</p> <p>3. Lot Size: I want the lot size to stay at the RE/RA/R1A zoning plan size. I do NOT want lot size allotment to be changed to 7,200 sf.</p> <p>Please allow our neighborhood/subdivision to remain as it is under the RA and RE and R1A zoning.</p>	<b>Staff has proposed a modifaciton to address the concerns.</b>

<b>Code Changes After Worksessions with Aldermen</b>	
<b>Question / Concern</b>	<b>Staff Evaluation</b>
<b>Article 2</b>	
Sec. 2.6.3 (ER), 2.6.4. (SR), 2.6.5 (TNR) - Concern about uses allowed in these districts when mapped in older neighborhoods.	<b>The Code has been changed in the Public Hearing Draft to limit uses allowed to only those currently allowed in these neighborhoods.</b> "Overlay" zones have been established for these areas. The protected districts are to be called Traditional Estate Residential, Traditional Suburban Residential, and Traditional Neighborhood Residential. The standard districts will be Estate Residential, Suburban Residential, and Neighborhood Residential.
Sec. 2.6.9. SCN, SCO, UCN, UCO - Please consider allowing up to 5 stories by special exception for a portion of a site plan if the overall FAR does not exceed what is allowed in the district.. The proposed SCN district is a down zoning from the current GB zoning classification because the maximum square footage allowed for a grocery store has been reduced in the Draft Land Development Code to 25,000 SF.	<b>The Code has been changed in the Public Hearing Draft to allow additional height by special exception if average height does not change, and FAR is not exceeded.</b>
Sec. 2.6.7. to 2.6.12. Request that the zoning only allow low impact commercial uses on the commercial lots that border residential zones. Limit the uses such as professional/public offices, banks, retail, and other uses that would not be open late, have loud noise or large crowds.	<b>The Code has not been changed. Staff has a neutral position about this request.</b> The change would be substantial if imposed in all commercial districts, as many of them are only one lot deep. Good buffers can protect bordering residential uses.

Article 2	Page 2
<p>Sec. 2.6.12.- HUCN: Height off Courthouse Square, can you go higher? Also surrounded by city property - would prefer to be urban corridor or flexibility!</p>	<p><b>The Code has not been changed. Staff does not support the request.</b> The areas near The Square are intended to be less intense, more of a low scale urban character. Building in HUCN can be 3 stories if they are not facing the Courthouse, and buildings in the TNB can be 3 stories. A potential for one additional story when buildings are at a substantially low elevation (at the bottom of a hill) could be considered if the Aldermen wish to consider that option; but parking would likely be a concern.</p>
<p>TNR 2.6.5.b) Due to the topography at the east property line of the TNR zoned property (future Pleasant Drive) modify from the detached requirement to an attached arrangement per unit type due to its distance and grade change to the adjacent east structures.</p>	<p><b>The Code has not been changed. The request is not supported</b> as the requirement for detached units reflects the support of Aldermen reflecting neighborhood concerns.</p>
<p>TNR 2.6.5.e) The lot size dimensions do not reflect the difference of a duplex/triplex/quad on a 10,000 sf lot. The property usage should be considered and the lot size adjusted.</p>	<p><b>The Code has been changed in the Public Hearing Draft. The lot sizes have been modified,</b> to get larger with each type of dwelling proposed: Detached, Duplex, Triplex, Quadplex</p>
<p>TNR: 2.6.5.f) The detached requirement along an adjacent property line to detached seems to be difficult to accommodate on a 25% ratio, it should be reconsidered in accordance to the plan/concept proposed for that property.</p>	<p><b>The Code has not been changed. The request is not supported</b> as the requirement for detached units reflects the support of Aldermen reflecting neighborhood concerns.</p>
<p>TNB: 2.6.7. Concerned that property currently zoned SC at northwest corner of Bramlett and University is to be rezoned TNB. Even if shift is made to bedrooms per acre, I request up to 65 bedrooms per acre by special exception in the TNB</p>	<p><b>The Code has been changed to set density by bedrooms per acre in the Public Hearing Draft; but the request is not supported.</b> It is too intense for the TNB district.</p>
<p>TNB: 2.6.7. No Drive-through (fast food) restaurants, liquor stores, taverns, or vehicle repair or maintenance facilities in TNB even as SE.</p>	<p><b>The Code has been changed in the Public Hearing Draft.</b> The request is from Woodlawn Subdivision, and pertains to an area of TNB north of Anderson. <b>This area has been mapped in a Legacy TNB Overlay</b> that would not allow the listed uses.</p>

<p><b>Article 2</b></p>	<p><b>Page 3</b></p>
<p>TNB: 2.6.7. No service stations in TNB even as SE.</p>	<p><b>The Code has been modified in the Public Hearing Draft.</b> The request is from residents of Woodlawn Subdivision, and pertains to an area of TNB north of Anderson. <b>The area has been mapped in a Legacy TNB Overlay</b> that requires service stations by SE; but would not allow a service station on property that adjoins ER.</p>
<p>TNB: 2.6.7. No Hotels and Grocery stores limited to 15,000 GSF or less in TNB.</p>	<p><b>The Code has not been changed.</b> The request is from residents of Woodlawn Subdivision and pertains to a small area of TNB north of Anderson. The request is not supported.</p>
<p><b>Article 3</b></p>	
<p>Sec. 3.9.1. Medical Facilities - Set minimum parking of 1 space per 200sf for a counseling office/physical therapy as practitioners say this is all they need.</p>	<p><b>The Code has been modified in the Public Hearing Draft.</b> The standard is set at 1.2 spaces per 100sf; but practitioners are likely to have a good idea of their needs, and it is good to not require more parking than is needed.</p>
<p><b>Article 3</b></p>	
<p>Sec. 3.11.9.5.e. Commercial Use of Unenclosed Rooftops. Suggest that the commercial use of unenclosed rooftops should be allowed if the rooftop is designed by a registered structural engineer. Old existing rooftops would have to be solidified (re-designed) to accommodate the addition load and therefore would not be "existing". The current standard limits property use and could limit tax base potential.</p>	<p><b>The Code has not been changed. The proposal is not supported,</b> as there is concern about the age/maturity of those who might use the rooftop access as well as the structural soundness of the use.</p>

<b>Article 4</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<p>Sec. 4.4.2.2. Emergency Access: Suggest allowing a boulevard to be considered as 2 points of access, provided that the median width of the boulevard exceeds a certain width (recommend 100' wide from back of curb to back of curb on median). Believe the intent here is to provide emergency vehicle access in the event of a blocked access point/street. With a median of sufficient width, it would prevent the access point(s) from being blocked, at the same time.</p>	<p><b>The Code has not been changed. The request is not supported.</b> The reason for the change is to require two separate points of access, two separate streets; and to stop considering a boulevard to be sufficient.</p>
<p>Sec. 4.9.3.4. Prohibit all commercial parking within a residential zone, or at least require that the parking be fully sided to the commercial lot and not simply touching by being cattie-cornered, and certainly not up to 500 feet within a residential area.</p>	<p><b>The Code has been changed in the Public Hearing Draft to eliminate this provision. Staff supports the request.</b> This comment relates to Sec. 4.9.3.4 (currently Sec. 203). This option could be useful in some limited situations although it does not seem to have ever been used. But it also has the potential to cause great concern in an affected neighborhood.</p>
<b>Article 8</b>	
<p>Sec. 8.4.3.8. Some Aldermen have proposed to lower the threshold for determining when site plans to go to the Planning Commission for approval.</p>	<p><b>The Code has been changed in the Public Hearing Draft.</b> A modification requires posting(signs on the property) for applications above 5,000sf; but allows the Planning Director discretion to determine if site plans (5,000 to 15,000sf) should go to the Planning Commission - based on public response to the notice for the proposed development or potential for it to cause substantial impact at the proposed location.</p>
<p>Establish time limit for construction of homes.</p>	<p><b>The Code has not been changed in the Public Hearing Draft;</b> but the Building Department Director is looking into modifications to address the concern.</p>

# Zoning Code Comments and Staff Assessment

REQUESTS FOR	CODE CHANGES		
Name (Last, First)	Code Section	Question / Concern	Staff Evaluation
	<b>Article 2</b>		
1. Evans, Jay Evans, Mike July 27	2.6.5. TNR NE 6 Code Change R4	R4: f) The detached requirement along an adjacent property line to detached seems to be difficult to accomodate on a 25% ratio, it should be reconsidered in accordance to the plan/concept proposed for that property.	<b>Staff would support a modified version of this request allowing 50% to be attached.</b> The requirement for detached along lot lines adjoining detached residences reflects neighborhood cocerns. Staff believes that the larger lot size required for attached units would mean fewer residences along the lot line and similar protection.
2. Evans, Jay Evans, Mike July 27	2.6.5. TNR NE 16 Code Change R4	R4: e) The lot size dimensions do not reflect the difference of a duplex/triplex/quad on a 10,000 sf lot. The property usage should be considered and the lot size adjusted.	<b>Staff does not support the request.</b> The lot size for detached dwellings is intended to be smaller than the lot size for attatched dwellings.
3. Evans, Jay Evans, Mike July 27	2.6.5. TNR NE 14 Code Change R4	R4: b) Due to the topography at the east property line of the TNR zoned property (future Pleasant Drive) modify from the detached requirement to an attached arrangment per unit type due to its distance and grade change to the adjacent east structures.	<b>Staff cannot support the request</b> as the requirement for detached units reflects the support of Aldermen reflecting neighborhood concerns.
Evans, Jay Evans, Mike July 27	2.6.5. TNR NE 15 Code Change R4	R4: c) Will the unit p/acre definition of family/bedrooms per unit create the allowable bedrooms/units on that property? Example-- 9 units p/acre x 3 bedrooms/unit = 27 bedrooms; will 27 one bedroom units be allowable? Or a combination of one/two/three equaling 27.	<b>Staff is already proposing a modification</b> that will establish density based on bedrooms per acre rather than dwelling units per acre.

	Article 2 cont.		Page 2
Jones, Michael July 27	2.6.5. TNR NE 7 Code Changes R 12	R12: Ordinance change; landscape ordinance change 25 feet buffer between all residential; we prefer the old ordinance stating 25 ft. buffer between single family. New rule take acres from my cleint on some projects.	<b>Staff has already proposed a modified version of the request;</b> requiring the buffer between SFA and SFD from other uses.
4. Beard, Brad July 27	2.6.7. TNB NE 10 R 22	Concerned that property currently zoned SC at northwest corner of Bramlett and University is to be rezoned TNB. Even if shift is made to bedrooms per acre, I request up to 65 bedrooms per acre by special exception in the TNB	<b>Staff does not support this request.</b> It is too intense for the TNB district.
5. Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn July 27	2.6.7. TNB 2 West Y 10	No Drive-through (fast food) restaurants in TNB even as SE.	<b>Staff has prepared an option if this restriction is desired but staff does not support the request.</b> The use is already a special exception. In some of the areas where TNB is mapped, such uses may be acceptable, so it would be impractical or unnecessarily restrictive to deny them entirely. A special exception is required precisely because they will need extra scrutiny in areas that adjoin residential areas.
6. Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn July 27	2.6.7. TNB 2 West Y 10	No service stations in TNB even as SE.	<b>Staff has prepared an option if this restriction is desired but staff does not support the request for the reasons noted above.</b> The use is already a special exception. In some of the areas where TNB is mapped, such uses may be acceptable, so it would be impractical or unnecessarily restrictive to deny them entirely. A special exception is required precisely because they will need extra scrutiny in areas that adjoin residential areas.

	Article 2 cont.		Page 3
7. Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn July 27	2.6.7 TNB 3 West Y 11	Y11: No taverns in TNB even as SE.	Staff has prepared an option if this restriction is desired, but staff does not support the request for the reasons noted above. Staff does support requiring the use by SE only in TNB. A tavern is a restaurant that also serves alcoholic beverages, and in many of the areas where TNB is mapped, such a use may be acceptable, so it would be impractical or unnecessarily restrictive to deny them entirely.
8. Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	2.6.7 TNB 4 West Y 12	Y12: No vehicular repair or maintenance facilities in TNB as SE;	Staff does not support the request for the reasons noted above, but an option has been prepared if the restriction is desired.
9. Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	2.6.7 TNB 4 West Y 12	Y12: Grocery stores limited to 15,000 GSF or less in TNB.	Staff does not support the request. The size limit by right in TNB is 25,000 sf, a grocery of modest size, and any larger than that would require special exception.

	Article 2 cont.		Page 4
Allison, Jones (Pete) Allison, Carol Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn July 27	2.6.7 TNB 5 West Y 14	If you insist on TNB for that area, please make these exceptions -- no service stations, no drive-thrus, no taverns, no vehicle/repair businesses	Staff has prepared an option if this restriction is desired, but staff does not support the request for the reasons noted above.
Crosbie, Stephanie Crosbie, Miko Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	2.6.7. TNB 6 West Y 26	Y26: if TNB no gas stations, drive through, taverns, or vehicle repair	Staff has prepared an option if this restriction is desired, but staff does not support the request for the reasons noted above.
Crosbie, Stephanie Crosbie, Miko Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn July 27	2.6.7 TNB West Y 16	Y16: No service stations TNB, no drive-thru (fast food) in TNB, no taverns in TNB, no vehicle repair or maintenance in TNB, leave as is.	Staff has prepared an option if this restriction is desired, but staff does not support the request for the reasons noted above.
Allison, Jones (Pete) Allison, Carol Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn July 27	2.6.7 TNB 8 West Y 20	Y20: If you insist on TNB for that area, please make these exceptions -- no service stations, no drive-thrus, no taverns, no vehicle repair businesses, please	Staff has prepared an option if this restriction is desired, but staff does not support the request for the reasons noted above.

	Article 2 cont.		Page 5
10. Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	2.6.7 TNB 4 West Y 12	Y12: No hotels, motels or inns in TNB	<b>Staff does not support the request.</b> The use is rational for many areas recommended for TNB. Staff would support a modifcaiton to require SE for the use when it adjoins ER or SR.
Hauge, Matt and Loveall-Hague, Susan Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	2.6.7 TNB 4 West Y 12	Y12: We do not want student housing next to our neighborhood	There is actually no method to control who rents dwelling units - homes, attached, or apartments. The larger "purpose built student housing" complexes cannot be place in the TNB district.
Scott, Steve	TND District	In the August 9 issue of the Oxford Eagle there was a good editorial about the ill conceived zoning Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND). I realize the 2037 plan is based on the Nashville plan which represents a large urban area. Oxford is NOT a large urban area, and is best served not being a large urban area. Yet, for some reason we have chosen to put bars, liquor stores, gas stations and the like in quiet, traditional neighborhoods, much like the nasty neighborhoods in Memphis, and yes, Nashville. The small town culture of Oxford does not seem to sit well with the influx of developers that put personal weath over the community. This appears to be more money driven than enhancing the quality of life in Oxford. If you were to poll the local and incoming retirement population this would absolutely not be acceptable, however, it is being rammed through under the guise of progress by the city of Oxford. This zoning designation needs to be tabled until fullll input from the community.	The writer seems to be confused about the difference between TNB and TND, and the difference between commercial districts and residential districts. Staff is uncertain how to respond.

	Article 2 cont.		Page 6
<p>11. Callicutt, Andy July 25</p>	<p>2.6.9 SCN</p>	<p>Please consider allowing up to 5 stories by special exception for a portion of a site plan if the overall FAR does not exceed what is allowed in the district.. The proposed SCN district is a down zoning from the current GB zoning classification because the maximum square footage allowed for a grocery store has been reduced in the Draft Land Development Code to 25,000 SF.</p>	<p><b>Staff supports this suggestion.</b> There are some instances where one building or a portion of a building may be taller, but the rest of the structure or structures are as low as one story. This could be a better design than a monolithic 4 story structure or structures. We support a special exception to allow up to 5 stories in the SCN district, if the average height of proposed structures does not exceed the allowed height for the district, and the location does not border ER or SR. The request pertains to property at the intersection of S. Lamar at Oxford Way</p>
<p>McDavid, Stephan Land</p>		<p>Second, I suggest that the zoning document create a short list of low impact commercial uses that would be allowed on the commercial lots that boarder residential zones. I would limit the uses to low impact commercial uses, such as professional/public offices, banks, retail, and other uses that would not be open late, have loud noise or large crowds.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support this request.</b> The change would be substantial if imposed in all commercial districts, as many of them are only one lot deep. Good buffers can protect bordering residential uses.</p>
<p>12. Walsh, Mary Ann July 27</p>	<p>2.6.12 HUCN NE 8 Code Change R19</p>	<p>HUCN - height off Courthouse Square, can you go higher? Also surrounded by city property - would prefer to be urban corridor or flexibility!</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request.</b> The areas near The Square are intended to be less intense, more of a low scale urban character. Building in HUCN can be 3 stories if they are not facing the Courthouse, and buildings in the TNB can be 3 stories. A potential for one additional story when buildings are at a substantially low elevation (at the bottom of a hill) could be considered if the Aldermen wish to consider that option; but parking would likely be a concern.</p>

	Article 2 cont.		Page 7
13. Paul Koshenina August 2	2.6.8 to 2.6.11 SCN, UCO, UCN Height	The increased height (up to 65 ft in SCN and 72 in UCO and UCN) is for commercial and mixed use buildings. Why would a purely residential building not be included? A single condominium building is being contemplated at the Commons south of the large retail area and this would pose problems for that concept but regardless of that specific project it seems purely residential should not be excluded.	<b>Staff is uncertain about this request.</b> Multi-family development is allowed by Special Exception in these districts, but the Mayor and Aldermen may prefer to limit the height of purely residential structures.
	Article 3		
14 Annoymous	Table of Uses	Delete potential of Zero Lot Line homes in ER District	<b>Staff is uncertain of the reason for this request so we do not support it.</b> The use does not allow any additional density in the district, it just allows a different housing type. While this is unlikely in existing neighborhoods, it may be rational for future developments.
15 Corey Alger Email July 29	3.11.9.5.e.	Suggest that the commercial use of unenclosed rooftops should be allowed if the rooftop is designed by a reistered structural engineer. Old existing rooftops would hav to be solidified (redeisgned) to accomodate the addition load and threfore would not be "existiing". The current standard limits property use and could limit tax base potential.	<b>Staff would support the suggestion,</b> but some are as concerned about the age/maturity of those who might use the rooftop access as the structural soundness.

	Article 3 cont.		Page 8
<p>Blackburn, David The Blackburn Group August 11 E-mail</p>	<p>Article 3 Parking Standards</p>	<p>I am working with a physical therapy office and a mental health counseling center and they both feel like their max needs at the worst time of the day when they are completely full is 1 parking space for every 200 square feet of conditioned space. This is the absolute maximum so I recommend a minimum parking requirement of 1 parking space for every 250 square feet like other professional office should work for them especially when they are in a larger office park with shared parking. Their uses would be physical therapy office, mental health counseling center (including psychological testing, medication management, and nutrition support), and wellness center. Both clients I am speaking with are talking about doing 5,000 square foot buildings which would result in 20 parking spots per building. I could see potentially where someone who only wanted 1,500 square feet may need a higher parking ratio but I think once you get to a certain size building (4,000 square feet and larger), the lower parking ratio should work well. This will hopefully prevent us from having these huge empty parking lots when not needed. However, if a specific business owner feels like they need more parking, they would still be allowed to have it since this is only a minimum requirement.</p>	<p><b>Staff would support the suggestion.</b> It is always a mistake to provide more parking than needed.</p>
	<p><b>Article 4</b></p>		
<p>16 Granberry, John July 12</p>	<p>4.4.2.2 Emergency Access</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Would suggest allowing a boulevard to be considered as 2 points of access, provided that the median width of the boulevard exceeds a certain width (recommend 100' wide from back of curb to back of curb on median). Believe the intent here is to provide emergency vehicle access in the event of a blocked access point/street. With a median of sufficient width, it would prevent the access point(s) from being blocked, at the same time.</p>	<p><b>Staff does not support the request.</b> The reason for the change is to require two separate points of access, two separate streets; and to stop considering a boulevard to be sufficient.</p>

	Article 5		Page 9
Allison, Jones (Pete) Allison, Carol Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	9 West Y 15	Y15: Please make sure all lighting in this area is reduced light pollution, especially in consideration of all the homes backing up to Woodlawn Park	The revisions to the zoning code (sec. 5.4.) contain substantially more light protection than the current code.
Allison, Jones (Pete) Allison, Carol Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	10 West Y 21	Y21: Keep the impact low, no high or bight lights, no high traffic areas please	The revisions to the zoning code contain substantially more light protection than the current code.
Crosbie, Stephanie Crosbie, Miko Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	11 West Y 17	Y17: Reduced lighting footprint	The revisions to the zoning code contain substantially more light protection than the current code.
Crosbie, Stephanie Crosbie, Miko Oak Hill Drive Woodlawn	12 West Y 27	Y27: lighting - no extreme lighting, use reduced lighting footprint	The revisions to the zoning code contain substantially more light protection than the current code.
McDavid, Stephan Land	Sec. 4.9.3.4. and Sec. 4.9.4.	I would prohibit all commercial parking within a residential zone, or at least require that the parking be fully sided to the commercial lot and not simply touching by being cattie-cornered, and certainly not up to 500 feet within a residential area.	This comment is mixing two different sections, both taken from the current code. The language of the first part is from Sec. 203, and has not seemed to cause problems. Substantial screening is required. The second comment relates to existing language in Sections 205 and 209. Both options can be useful in some limited situations.

	Article 8		Page 10
Request		8.4.3.8. Some Aldermen have proposed for the threshold for site plans to go to the Planning Commission for approval be reduced from 10,000 sf to 5,000 sf.	This change has the potential to substantially increase the workload for the Planning Commission by requiring specific approval of uses that meet all standards of the code. Staff would be more comfortable with a modification that allows the Planning Director or Chair of the Planning Commission discretion to determine if the smaller site plans (up to 15,000sf) should go to the Planning Commission - based on public response to the notice for the proposed development or potential for it to cause substantial impact at the proposed location.

**General Questions and Answers**

Name (Last, First)	Section	Question	Staff Response
<b>Article 2</b>			
Granberry, John July 13	2.6.5 - 2.6.6	Concern about nuance of definitions provided. What is the difference between attached duplex/quad'/tri' vs. multi-family? Needs more distinction, for example, is a quad-plex considered multi-family?	SFA is 2-4 dwellings in a structure, MF is more than 4 dwellings in a structure
Andy Callicutt July 27	2.6.7.	I request that TNB be granted special exception for residential use on the entire ground floor until such demand for commercial use arrives. The units on the ground floor of the building will be designed in a manner that allows commercial uses to easily retrofit the existing spaces to create highly functional retail and office bays.	The proposed Code already proposes first floor residential by special exception for TNB.
Andy Callicutt July 27	Question 2.6.7. TNB	Question: In TNB zoning, how much retail SF is required on the first floor and what is the required timing of the retail being developed? Can the building just be designed to allow retail use to one day be developed inside? While the developer waits for the demand to become a reality, can the same space be used for residential units on the front end?	The proposed zoning allows residential on the first floor by special exception. Any other non-residential use (not just retail) allowed in the district is permissible as noted in Article 3.
Jones, Michael July 27	NE 18 Code Change 11 R	R11: Impervious vs. pervious ratios are more restrictive. End of East Jackson.	The impervious ratios are being adjusted to reflect the difference between just measuring building coverage vs. imperviousness.
<b>Article 3</b>			
Evans, Jay Evans, Mike July 27	NE 13 Question R4	R4: d) What determines the ratio of one/two/three/four bedrooms on a parcel/property?	The standards of Section 3.5.5 for Multi-family dwellings.

	Article 3		Page 2
Granberry, John	Table 3.3	Can you receive special exception for multi-family in TNR? Discrepancies in Table 3.3 for special exceptions in multi-family and TNR.	MF is not allowed in TNR, and is not indicated for TNR in Table 3.3.
Boutin, Juanita	20 West Y1	Woodlawn Resident - Wondering what the requirements would be for the construction of a service station on either the NE or SE corner of the Anderson Loop/W. Oxford Loop intersection. The handbook indicates that a service station would fall into the S/SE category since the zoning there is TNB.	Under the proposed TNB zoning a service station would be an SE use requiring approval by the Planning Commission with a directive to consider area compatibility.
	Article 9		
McLeod, Kevin	9.1.10	This wording leads me to believe that plat amendments now go straight to the Board of Aldermen, skipping the Planning Commission. Is this correct?	No, the Mayor and Aldermen make a decision after weighing the recommendation of the staff and Planning Commission.
McLeod, Kevin	9.2.6	As this has come up before (at least with me a couple of times), can this be clarified? What does "verified as complete" mean? Can you give an example of when something would go directly to the PC with no action by the SPR committee?	That is just there to establish due process. There is not going to be an instance in Oxford when the Site Plan Committee does not complete its review and send comments in time. Perhaps this is standard language for small towns?

Technical Corrections			
Name (Last, First)	Code Section	Question / Concern	Staff Evaluation
	Article 2		Page 3
Granberry, John July 12	2.6.4 SR	<p><b>Re:</b> Impervious coverage, maximum - 33%</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Does this include all of the final development (i.e. includes total of streets, sidewalks, driveways, and house pads/footprints) or just the streets and sidewalks? There is no way to hold a developer to these numbers unless the developer is having to design and build all of the houses and driveways. (which is rarely the case). So, how do you calculate the impervious area attributed by houses, driveways, private outdoor concrete areas, etc...? If you use a standard 60'x120' lot with the recommended setbacks, you have a "build-able" area of 2,800 sf. 2,800 sf is 39% of the lot area and this is before driveways AND the actual streets and sidewalks that will be required.</p> <p><b>From E-mail:</b> I believe the City will have problems with in several of the areas that call for a maximum impervious area requirement.(this one will be the most extreme, due to the small lot size with the 33% requirement). Basically would just shut down any residential developments in the SR zones...</p>	<p><b>Staff is already proposing modifications to correct this mistake in the draft code, so we support this recommendation .</b> The modifications correct a mistake in the draft code by adjusting the impervious limit in several districts to adjust to the the broader definition of Lot Coverage. Building area vs Impervious Coverage</p>

<p>Paul Koshinina</p>	<p>2.6.8 to 2.6.11</p>	<p>2.6.8 to 2.6.11 - SCN, UCO, UCN Height - The increased height in these districts is only for commercial and mixed use buildings. Why would a purely residential building not be included? A single condominium building is being contemplated at the Commons south of the large retail area and this would pose problems for that concept but regardless of that specific project it seems purely residential should not be excluded.</p>	<p><b>Staff supports the request. The height provision should have applied to all authorized structures.</b></p>
<p>McLeod, Kevin July 13</p>	<p>2.6.8. SCO Zone</p>	<p><u><b>Comment:</b></u> SCO zone shows the side setback goes to 50 feet if abutting ER, SR, or TNR, but the rear setback is 25 feet with no special requirement if abutting ER, SR, or TNR. The SCO/TNR boundary is very near my house, as well as my neighbor's. Depending on how a development was situated, this could have a negative effect on Woodlawn Subdivision. I would suggest the rear setback be 50 feet when abutting ER, SR, or TNR, as the side setback is required.</p>	<p>Yes, we've already found that mistake as well, and it will be corrected.</p>

	Article 3		Page 4
McLeod, Kevin	Table 3.3	<b>Comment:</b> Table of Uses shows Dwellings – Multi-Family is not allowed (blank cell) in TNR, but Section 3.5.5 says they are allowed as Special Exceptions in TNR. As TNR abuts up to the west side of Woodlawn, I would hope the Table is correct and the text in 3.5.5 is a typographical error. Which is it?	We have found that mistake. The table is correct; the language in 3.5.5 is incorrect. Although, I wish it were not a mistake. We had wanted to allow a smaller percentage of multi-family in TNR on developments of 10 or more acres; but a request has been made by others higher on the food chain to remove it.
Granberry, John July 12	Article 3 Dimensional Standards Table	Another issue that is very misleading is one with the attached “Dimensional Standards” table. Of course most everyone will immediately go to this table for comparison between the old and the new and the issue is with the “Impervious” column. As it is shown, one would think that the new code, in every zone, is going to a less stringent “impervious” requirement. (e.g. RB – 30% to TNR – 50%) However, the 2006 code calls for coverage area (as relates to building coverage) and not impervious area, so you’re not comparing apples to apples. I would suggest maybe adding another column for the building coverage area to represent the 2006 code. The only “zone” in the 2006 code that could be compared to the Proposed code in that column is the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District, and overlay districts aren’t even shown on this table.	This mistake has been corrected.
	Article 4		
Granberry, John July 12	4.2	<b>Re:</b> Table, Tangents Column: <b>Comment:</b> Should clarify this is tangents on approach to intersections.	

	Article 4 cont.		Page 5
Granberry, John	4.2.6.2(a - c)	<b>Comment:</b> Worried about ambiguity of classifications. (especially difference between arterials and collectors) The last thing a developer would want is the City deeming a proposed collector street is an arterial street and overly restricting access to the developer's property. I believe with definitions the way they are proposed, the City is subjecting themselves to potential adversities with developers. These definition are subjective, (especially the arterial definition, which all collector roads meet the definition of the arterial street). Would suggest adding measurable parameters (maybe with traffic volumes or # of proposed units served) to definition or at least expanding on the definition (see Traffic Engineering Handbook for ref).	Cross reference to Table 4.2 added.
Granberry, John	4.3.2	<b>Comment:</b> Would suggest requiring a note on the final plat that "All street stubs are intended for connection with future streets on adjoining undeveloped property."	Cross reference to 4.5.9.2. added.
Granberry, John	4.5.3.2	<b>Comment:</b> Start paragraph with "Collector streets.", as you did in all other street classifications within this section.	Done.
Granberry, John July 12	4.6.2.05 Street Types	<b>Re:</b> Design Specifications (F - Max/Min Row): 48' <b>Comment:</b> Conflicts with Table 4.2 (i.e. 48' min conflicts with 50' ROW)	Corrections are proposed by staff.
Granberry, John July 12	4.6.2.07 Street Types	<b>Re:</b> Design Specifications (C): highlighted language "(Not illustrated)" <b>Comment:</b> Appears to be illustrated?	Corrections are proposed by staff.
Granberry, John July 12	4.6.2.10 Street Types	<b>Re:</b> Design Specifications (F - Max/Min Row): 47'/40' <b>Comment:</b> Conflicts with Table 4.2 (i.e. 47'/40' conflicts with 50' ROW)	Corrections are proposed by staff.
Granberry, John July 12	4.6.2.12 Street Types	<b>Re:</b> Design Specifications (G - Max/Min ROW): 36' <b>Comment:</b> Conflicts with Table 4.2 (i.e. 36' min conflicts with 50' ROW)	Corrections are proposed by staff.

	Article 4 cont.		Page 6
Granberry, John July 12	4.7.1	<b>Comment:</b> Some of your zoning divisions allow for 0 side yard and minimum rear yard build-to requirements. Will these easements be required in those areas? If so, suggest adding verbiage to allow for provisions for zones that allow for 0' side yard setbacks and require rear yard build-to distances.	
McLeod, Kevin	4.8.4.1	<b>Comment:</b> mentions "Mississippi Standard Specifications for State Road and Bridge Construction". I believe the word "Aid" was left out after the word "State". It's correctly named in 4.8.5.2. Also, there will be a new "Green Book" soon, so you might want to add "latest edition of" before the specs.	Corrected.
Granberry, John July 12	4.8.4.4 Infrastructure	<b>Highlighted Language:</b> "The use of curb and gutter along all streets to be constructed and dedicated to the City of Oxford is required." <b>Comment:</b> This conflicts with some of the allowable street types as outlined in the Section 4.6.2 tables.	<b>Staff supports changing the section</b> to state that the open section roads noted 4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.2, and 4.6.2.12 may be used when authorized by the Planning Commission with a supporting recommendation of the City Engineer.
Granberry, John July 12	4.8.6.1 Infrastructure	<b>Highlighted Language:</b> "Sidewalks are required in all zoning districts" <b>Comment:</b> Conflicts with the "Sensitive" street type requirements.	<b>Staff supports the suggestion and has proposed a modification.</b> Language will be added for shared use paths where authorized.
	Article 5		
McLeod, Kevin	5.5.3.3	<b>Comment:</b> Some words were left out. Or maybe you meant "decorative faced engineer or architect"?	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	5.7.3.6	<b>Comment:</b> "at the discretion of the Director's discretion"?	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	5.7.6.6	<b>Comment:</b> "use use"? In third line of first paragraph.	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	5.7.6.4	<b>Comment:</b> Is the word "solid" supposed to be struck through?	Corrected.

	<b>Article 5 cont.</b>		<b>Page 7</b>
McLeod, Kevin	5.7.7.2	<b>Comment:</b> I believe the word “run” was left out at the end of the sentence.	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	5.7.8.2	<b>Comment:</b> Mississippi Department of Environmental Compliance. Should it be Quality?	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	5.8.4.8a	<b>Comment:</b> I’m assuming the unit of measure of the “5,000” is square feet?	Corrected.
	<b>Article 8</b>		
McLeod, Kevin	8.3.2.1, 8.3.2.15	<b>Comment:</b> Sections are the same text.	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	8.4.3.4, 8.5.10, 8.6.2.1	<b>Comment:</b> The quick guide mentions the Board of Adjustment has been eliminated, but the term “Board of Adjustment” is found all throughout various parts of Article 8.	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	8.4.3.7	<b>Comment:</b> I think some text was left out in the second line before the “;”	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	8.5.2	<b>Comment:</b> "City of Oxford Department of Planning Department." This made me smile.	Corrected.
McLeod, Kevin	8.5.2	<b>Comment:</b> The sections following 8.5.2 list the responsibilities of the Department of Planning. Shouldn’t these be indented and numbered 8.5.2.1, 8.5.2.2, etc.?	Corrected.
	<b>Article 9</b>		
McLeod, Kevin July 13	9.1.6 Subdivisions	<b>Comment:</b> – I like the idea of a Pre-application conference, but this only shows up in Subdivision of Land. I’d suggest adding the same thing in Site Plans. As we (Consultants) are learning the new code and desire to layout sites that meet with the Planning Department’s guidelines, I think it would be a benefit and would save a lot of reworking of site layouts after much of the design has been completed.	<b>Staff supports the suggestion.</b> Recommend adding the potential for a Pre-application conference for site plans in Sec. 9.2.

	<b>Article 9</b>		<b>Page 8</b>
McLeod, Kevin	9.1.7.4	<b>Comment:</b> The review timeframe is now different for subdivisions and site plans (9.2.5 closely resembles what we do now for both). Is this correct? If so, can you further explain the two notes under 9.1.7.4? I assume it means we turn in the plans and they're reviewed in 45 days, but at 30 days' prior we turn in the application? I would think you'd want the fee, application, and plans all at the same time. Maybe I'm missing the point of this subsection or it needs clarification.	Corrected – now states 45 calendar days for both site plans and subdivisions.
	<b>Article 10</b>		
McLeod, Kevin	10.1.6	<b>Comment:</b> by this definition, 45 days is actually 9 weeks (9 weeks of 5 business days). Is this the intent? Doesn't really bother me, just want to be sure I can explain to clients or my staff that 45 days doesn't mean 45 calendar days.	Language to be changed so specify calendar days.
	<b>Appendix</b>		
McLeod, Kevin	A.7.1.7	<b>Comment:</b> zone DB (Downtown Business) is mentioned, which no longer will exist.	Corrected to HUCN
McLeod, Kevin July 13	A.7.1.14	<b>Comment:</b> I would suggest adding A.7.1.11 and A.7.1.12 to the list of items prepared by a registered professional.	Staff supports this suggestion and the section will be modified.