

**ATTACHMENT 1**  
**RESPONSES TO WRITTEN AND ORAL TESTIMONY REGARDING THE MASTER PLAN PROCESS**

Staff has addressed the highlighted responses.

<b>Name</b>	<b>SDC Reference/Summary of Testimony</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-105B.1. questioned "large scale" reference	"large scale" deleted
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-105B.3. questioned "establish specific uses"	revised text to "determine specific uses"
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-105B.3. questioned "intensities"	revised to "square footage".
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-105B.4. questioned "impacts"	revised text to define "impacts".
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-116C. "approval is granted"	revised text to add "approval is effective."
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-117 questioned "neighborhood meeting" process	revised text based on Corvallis regulations.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120 questioned forms/fees	new application forms will be required/the Final Master Plan fee will be 10% of the Preliminary Master Plan fee.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120 suggested adding Certified Planner/Civil Engineer	revised text as suggested.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120A.2. questioned "uses"	deleted Subsection A.2., renumbered subsections.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120A.5. questioned "impacts"	deleted Subsection A.5., renumbered subsections.
Satre/Farrington	SDC 5.13-120A.6.a./b. suggested "300 feet"	revised text to add "300 feet."
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120B.4. questioned "unstable soils and/or high water table"	did not change – same text used elsewhere in SDC.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120B.4. suggested "Geotechnical Engineer"	revised text as suggested.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120C. questioned "fill thresholds/contour intervals"	revised text to address both topics.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120D. suggested "coordinated with SDC 5.13-120C."	did not change - redundant.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120F. questioned "with the proposed design option"	deleted questioned text.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-120H. questioned intent of subsection/need for overall site plan	explained intent of subsection and reason for a Site Plan Review level of detail/the existing Site Plan Review process in SDC 5.17-100 allows as many elements as possible that can fit on the Preliminary Site Plan – the same is true for the Preliminary Master Plan.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120H. suggested making the architectural plan conceptual	revised text to state which aspects of the Architectural Plan may be conceptual.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120I.1.a. questioned the need for a parking plan and study	did not change, but explained why a parking plan and study are necessary
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120I.1.d. questioned the need for exterior lighting requirement	revised text to delete exterior lighting in this Subsection; it's still required in Subsection 5.13-120J.
Satre/Farrington	SDC 5.13-120I.1.e. questioned "bike parking space"	revised text to require the minimum amount of information.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120I.2. suggested adding ""or use of""/""if needed""	revised text to add "or use of"/"if necessary".
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120J. suggested deleting all lighting requirements	revised text to delete "lighting type and extent of shielding" only.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120L.suggested deleting "events"	revised text to delete "events"

Satre/Farrington	SDC 5.13-120M. questioned "...a statement of the applicant's with regard to the future selling or leasing...."	revised text to clarify if, when and by whom a financial guarantee is required.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-120Q.1. suggested more specificity re ESEE analysis	revised text to provide more specificity
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-125H. questioned the requirement to guarantee that all proposed development will occur	revised text to address why a Phasing Plan would be required.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-125J. suggested deleting "shading, glare"	explained why "shading", "glare were not deleted.
Satre/Farrington	SDC 5.13-130 questioned how the preliminary decision will be rendered/appeal period/effective date/when the Final plan can be submitted/same section questioned vague language	revised text to delete "minimize identified on-site conflicts and impacts.... And to clarify why/how conditions may be attached" - this process is similar to the Site Plan Review (SDC 5.17-100) and Land Division (SDC 5.12-100) review processes. The Type II review process is found in SDC 5.1.130 and is not repeated in each land use application review process to reduce redundancies.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-131 questioned the rationale to raise a Final Master Plan application from a Type I to a Type II review	revised text to address this question.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-132A.1. questioned "have been revised"	revised text to read "require revision".
P. Farrington	SDC 1.13-132A2. suggested additional language	revised text to address this suggestion.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-132A. EXCEPTION questioned "expiration date"	revised text "...30 days prior to the expiration of the Preliminary Master Plan effective date."
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-133B. suggested deleting "all applicable documents"	revised text to add "other" – there may be deed restrictions and other similar documents that also must be recorded concurrently.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-133C.1. questioned "7 years"	revised text to clarify when effective date begins
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-133D. questioned Final Master Plan notice of decision process	revised text to state that notice of the Final Master Plan effective date will be mailed to the applicant
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-134 questioned when a Subdivision and/or Site Plan Review application can be submitted.	revised text to state when a Site Plan review or Subdivision application can be submitted to implement Master Plan phasing
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-135A.1. questioned "change of scheduled phasing"	revised text to read: "for a specific phase of development".
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-135A.3. questioned "reasonable progress" and "remain available"	revised text to read "...as determined by the Director..." and "... to serve the site..."
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-135A.4. questioned the 10 percent threshold	revised text to clarify but not change – the 10 percent was utilized as a method to clearly separate a Type I review from a Type II review.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-135B. questioned "potential impacts"/"other properties"	revised text to read: "size of the Master Plan site, the potential impact on adjacent properties and/or infrastructure, or any unresolved Master Plan conditions of approval".
Satre/Farrington	SDC 5.13-135B.1. questioned zoning	revised text to address this question.

	district ranges/density	
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-135B.4. and 5. questioned the 10 percent threshold	did not change – the 10 percent was utilized as a method to clearly separate a Type I review from a Type II review.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-135B.4. suggested “or decreases”	revised text to address the suggestion.
R. Satre	SDC 5.13-135B.6. questioned review type	revised text – the Master Plan Modification would be elevated to a Type III review.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-135B.7. suggested deleting “realign”	revised text, but – the 10 percent was utilized as a method to clearly separate a Type I review from a Type II review.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-135B.8. questioned the 10 percent threshold	did not change – the 10 percent was utilized as a method to clearly separate a Type I review from a Type II review.
Satre/Farrington	SDC 5.13-135B.12. questioned “primary structure”/need	revised text – this is now Subsection B.2.
P. Farrington	SDC 5.13-140A.1. suggested “or as otherwise previously approved”.	revised text to add suggested language.