

Responses to RFP Inquiries in blue font:

1. The RFP lists some of the challenges with the current ordinance and states “current zoning ordinance document prevents staff from creating sign ordinance”. Can you provide more clarification about this statement: Is it because staff would like the sign ordinance to be separate from the zoning ordinance or because the ordinance needs revision and the sign ordinance updates should be part of that or something else?

Response: Staff would like to create a sign ordinance based on land use rather than zoning district so that sign ordinance requirements may result in signage that more accurately reflects what the community would like to see. Under the current ordinance, permitted land uses are listed individually and are inconsistent with the rest of the document (e.g. land uses listed in parking ratio requirements don't correspond with land uses listed under requirements for each zoning district list of permitted uses.)

2. The scope of work states that the consultant will work with city staff and its IT vendors to make the code accessible and interactive with the public, including GIS display. Who are the vendors that will be involved and how do you envision them working with the consultant? Are they part of the project team?

Response: The City of Horace has not identified these vendors. The City would be interested to see who you propose to complete the work whether it's in house or a subcontractor.

3. Has the steering committee been selected or will staff and the consultant work to develop that committee?

Response: The Steering Committee has already been identified and has started to actively meet.

4. Does the City anticipate also needing suggested administrative policy recommendations (e.g. application review checklists) to support the new ordinance?

Response: I don't think this suggestion would hurt. We will be interested in reviewing what you propose.

5. Will the city's attorney be available during the process for review of draft materials?

Response: It's very likely that this will be the case.

6. Please describe intended involvement of the city engineer/engineering services.

Response: The City anticipates hiring a full time city engineer this winter to complement and retain the engineering services already provided to the city by an engineering firm. We would be very interested in involving the engineer in the crafting of a new ordinance.

7. Does the City intend a unified development code, or separate ordinances for zoning and subdivision?

Response: We are open to both, however we would want the result with the most optimal performance based outcomes.

8. Is there a master stormwater management plan for the City?

Response: Unfortunately, we do not have one at this time. We are aware that this is an issue.

9. The RFP's appendix provided links to some key City documents. Could you please provide a link to or copy of the current Capital Improvements Plan?

Response: Our current city engineer has indicated that the CIP is a work in progress and there is no current link or copy available to the public at this time.

10. How many non-conforming parcels exist today? Is it the City's intent that these non-conformities are also eliminated by the new ordinance?

Response: It is currently unknown how many non-conformities exist today. After I started my position in 2019, I discovered that the city did not have records from about 2011-2018.

11. What is the intended membership of the project steering committee noted near the bottom of the RFP page 3?

Response: The intended membership is an array of interdisciplinary committee members consisting of Planning Commissioners, City Council members, planning staff, city engineer, and city administration.

12. At the bottom of the RFP page 4, the proposed schedule is noted as "by the end of 2022 if possible." The tentative project completion date listed in the middle of page 3 is February 20, 2022. Please clarify the desired project completion timetable.

Response: The completion date has been left open ended. We would like completion of the ordinance as soon as possible. We are open to getting the ordinances completed earlier.

13. Please clarify the RFP page 3 statement that reads "The City anticipates that members of the interested, Planning Commission and County Council will play large roles in the process by guiding and supporting the project through a series of public updates, discussions and public engagement opportunities." Is there an existing third organization (in addition to the Planning Commission and City Council) that is anticipated to play an active role in the development of the ordinance? Or is this intended to refer to members of the public or development community?

Response: I assume that the third party will involve City staff, members of the public, and members of the development community. Those members will be identified in the future as the planning process evolves during the project.

14. (I think it might be counterproductive to include this last question, but I would really like to know what Barrett is thinking....)The RFP mentions parts of the

comprehensive plan cannot be implemented due to the outdated zoning ordinance. What specific parts of the plan cannot be implemented?

Response: We cannot implement development proposals that meet our stated goals and policies in the comprehensive plan. Some examples are that our code prohibits opportunities for missing middle housing types, commercial development and commercial development activities, fails to capture intended development outcomes that improve aesthetics, sign code regulation, etc.