

Why the LUDC Needs a Comprehensive Redesign

- ▶ • The LUDC has grown through amendments, not design
- ▶ • Issues are structural, not isolated
- ▶ • The updated Master Plan requires a modern regulatory framework

The Problem Is Systemic

- ▶ • Conflicting language across Parts and Articles
- ▶ • Undefined or inconsistent terms
- ▶ • Procedures that do not align with diagrams
- ▶ • Enforcement language lacking graduated steps

Internal Conflicts and Ambiguity

- ▶ • Multiple definition hierarchies
- ▶ • Unclear administrative authority
- ▶ • Nonconforming structures lack clear thresholds
- ▶ • Increased appeal risk

Evaluation Criteria Are Too Broad

- ▶ • Same criteria applied to different application types
- ▶ • Vague standards weaken findings of fact
- ▶ • Reduced predictability for applicants

Processes Are Illustrated but Not Enforceable

- ▶ • Diagrams exist but are not tied to code text
- ▶ • Applicants rely on diagrams
- ▶ • Decisions must rely on text

Administrative Burden on Staff

- ▶ • Multiple ordinances must be cross-referenced
- ▶ • Significant staff time spent interpreting code
- ▶ • Reduced efficiency and service

Why Professional Redesign Is Necessary

- ▶ • Code has force of law
- ▶ • Requires legal and technical expertise
- ▶ • Not suitable for incremental in-house edits

Benefits of a Comprehensive Redesign

- ▶ • Clear, predictable standards
- ▶ • Stronger legal defensibility
- ▶ • Easier administration
- ▶ • Better public experience
- ▶ • Alignment with Master Plan

Staff Recommendation

- ▶ • Proceed with comprehensive LUDC redesign
- ▶ • Engage professional consultants
- ▶ • Integrate Master Plan
- ▶ • Modernize structure and processes