# Development Ordinance Workshop Summary March 9, 2002

Near Downtown Neighborhood Residential-3 (R-3) Zoning District

Group # 3

Facilitator: Ruby Sinreich

Staff: Phil Mason, Rob Wilson

Participants: Council Member Edith Wiggins, James Carnahan, and David Bleicher

## Scenario #1 - Redevelopment of Single-Family Lot as a New Single-Family Residence

The group reviewed a scenario where an existing single-family lot (with 8,250 s.f. of gross land area), redeveloped as a new single-family residence. The following issues were identified:

### > Setbacks change significantly.

- A much lower minimum street setback (reduced from 24 feet to 10 feet) and the establishment of a maximum street setback (35 feet) force a house to be designed with greater proximity to the street.
- The establishment of a zero-foot interior setback allows houses to potentially be built right up to the property line, significantly affecting the character of a neighborhood.
- Zero-foot setbacks also create a bigger building foot print, potentially allowing larger homes to be built. Small lots and those lots with RCD limitations will have additional flexibility.
- A zero-foot setback could create problems if two adjoining property owners both build to the property line (do two adjacent detached dwelling units thus become attached?).
- The new proposed setbacks could also be problematic between different uses.

#### > Impervious Surface Limits

- A 24% impervious surface limit on single family lots is a significant change from the existing ordinance.
- In particular, the 24% impervious surface limitation becomes a major constraint on lots that are less than ½ acre in size (lots above ½ acre do not have an impervious surface limit imposed on the individual lot).
- The impervious surface limitation encourages you to build upward rather than outward, which may be desirable in the more urban neighborhoods.

#### Scenario #2 – Assemblage of 5 Single-Family Redeveloped as New Single-Family Lots

The group reviewed a scenario where five lots were assembled (with 52,150 s.f. of gross land area) and redeveloped as single-family residential lots. The group noted that the existing ordinance would allow the land to be subdivided into six (6) lots (once minimum lot size, minimum lot width and setbacks were considered). The group determined that the proposed

ordinance would allow the land to be subdivided into seven (7) lots (due to the reduced setbacks proposed in the revised ordinance). The proposed impervious surface limits would be a major constraint however, given the small size of the lots.

# Scenario #3 - Assemblage of 5 Single-Family Lots Redeveloped as Multi-Family

The group reviewed a scenario where five lots were assembled (with 52,150 s.f. of gross land area) and redeveloped as a multi-family residential development. The following issues were identified:

- > The existing development ordinance requires a minimum of 5.0 acres for a multi-family development. The proposed ordinance only requires a minimum of 0.43 acres for a multi-family development (3 to 7 units per acre).
- > The opportunity to development multi-family residential on lots smaller than 5 acres could be problematic or could be a significant but positive change, depending on the character of the neighborhood.
- > A total of eight (8) multi-family dwelling units would be theoretically allowed on this hypothetical site by either ordinance
- The proposed ordinance allows 1,300 s.f. more floor area (8 units @ 1,219 each [9,752] vs. 8 units @ 1056 each [8,448]).
- > The proposed ordinance would limit impervious surface to 24% of the lot, or 50% with the establishment of a retention basin.
- > Impervious surface is the limiting factor in the proposed ordinance, while livability space is the limiting factor in the existing ordinance.
- > The required recreation area would increase from 1,669 s.f. in the existing ordinance, to 8,000 s.f. (1,000 s.f. per unit) in the proposed ordinance.
- > Required parking would also change from a minimum of 16 spaces (existing ordinance) to a maximum of 16 spaces (proposed ordinance).