

## Hazard Maps Ordinance- COW notes from PC Mtg. 4/11/23- notes from MOC

### Overarching concerns:

1. No clear evidence that avalanche risk is easier to predict vs. landslide risk- PC is not convinced that development must be differentially managed (ie. development greater than SF home in avalanche zone with CUP vs no development greater than SF home in landslide zone). Possible solution- Draft Section 2(c)1 to mirror Section 2(b)1. If we leave development options more restricted in severe landslide, see Line change 3 below.
2. No consensus that moderate avalanche zones must also be regulated- PC preferred the original draft which only addressed severe landslide and avalanche zones. Possible solution- eliminate “moderate” references from draft.
3. No distinction between “landslide” and “debris fall”, which appear to be different issues. Debris fall appears to be mitigated by man-made structures. Allow for CUP application with “site specific engineering” in severe landslide zone. Possible solution- draft Section 2(c)3 to mirror Section 2(b)2.
4. Need additional clarity- any portion of the lot in hazard zone means entire lot is in the zone...why? Can lots remain buildable if the structure portion is not in the hazard zone?

### Line Changes:

1. Section 2(a)1: Development in mapped severe avalanche and severe landslide areas shall be managed per this section to minimize the risk of loss of life or property due to landslides and avalanches.
2. Section 2(a)4, line 1: change “should” to “shall”
3. Section 2(c)2, line 18, delete “or any part of a development”

Line 19, delete “by the addition of bedrooms, conversions of buildings, or otherwise”

Line 19, now reads: ...increase the “housing unit count”.

Delete “density of the lot or increase the occupancy of the building”