

## Stakeholder Comments-January 14<sup>th</sup> 2010

### Category-Height (Height in Residential Districts stakeholder group.-H.I.R.D.)

Recommendation-5:1 height plane, increase side yards and 100' height limit. Measure from the average grade base of structure and street side or property line (highest point).

- Why 5:1 for a height plane?
- 5:1 may be appropriate with the stair step, not side yard increase.
- Height recommendation seems arbitrary.
- Width of the lot needs to be considered.
- Need more controls to prevent 'mansionization'-homes out of scale with area.
- 40' maximum height is too high. Should be 35' for single family.
- Consider the context of the area, adjacent structures.
- Recommendation does not encourage urban infill development.
- What are the cost impacts of this recommendation?
- Need to see more studies/models.
- Houses on other side need to be considered to achieve the intent, punitive conversely.
- Propose step back for highest point, above 40 feet.
- Question of existing house next to new 2 story home.
- Unintended results – Will encourage slab on grade flat room. Dilworth example 10ft purchase 5 for 50ft, 7 for 70ft.
- Suburban model as proposed.
- Keep scale studies that evaluate 5:1 or 2:1 ratio of an angle.
- Support stair step approach, not increasing side yard.
- This will encourage lower profile roofs and flat roofs.
- Increase in side yards is onerous.
- This recommendation will not preserve neighborhoods.
- This is a suburban recommendation.

## **Stakeholder Comments-January 14<sup>th</sup> 2010**

### Category-Setbacks

Recommendation- Allow setback averaging

- Request the reference to deed restrictions in the zoning ordinance.
- What about an extreme setback that could throw off the average. If there is an existing structure is located greater than a % of the established lots – then allow for an exception.
- Consider odd shaped lots/lots affected by unusual physical conditions.

### Category-Side Yards

Recommendation-Disallow the reduction of side yards below 5 feet.

- Side yards is not a stakeholder issue, it's a staff issue.
- Minimum side yards need to be addressed.
- 5' side yard minimum is a good recommendation.
- Will AC units in side yards be allowed?
- How many non-conformities will this create?
- Provide incentives to achieve desired result, more density.
- Fire safety issues with limited access, room for firefighting equipment.
- Allow variances for reductions in certain conditions.
- Side yard reduction will lessen common open space, do not change.
- This is an incentive for tree save.
- 3' side yards are a public safety issue.

## Stakeholder Comments-January 14<sup>th</sup> 2010

### Category-Building Walls

#### Recommendation- Mitigate blank walls facing public rights of way

- Incentivize the applicant/builder providing articulation on walls facing the public right of way, not mandate. Reduce lot size.
- Minimum 10 ft distance for windows increases energy costs.
- Taste police in Charlotte need to focus on more important issues.
- How does requirement affect costs and energy efficiency?
- How does this apply to new construction vs. grandfathering an existing structure?
- Recognize costs of implementation for architectural design time and permitting fees.
- Consider a ratio of building wall to architectural features.
- Provide incentives for corner lot development.
- There are safety issues with adding windows and doors.
- What about homes that face major thoroughfares.
- Is 10' the appropriate distance? Too short.
- Weigh the cost vs. value.
- How will this recommendation be enforced?
- This recommendation is a matter of taste.
- This will negatively affect affordable housing.
- How will this affect remodels?
- Windows=eyes on the street. Improves safety.
- Some plans are pre approved. Developer will have to submit new plans.
- When/how does a house face row? Distance requirement?
- Prefer a blank wall facing certain streets.
- Adding trees would do more than adding windows.
- This recommendation would enhance the streetscape.
- What about houses on a cul-de-sac or houses built on an angle. Which would be the affected side?
- Blank walls facing the street need to be addressed.
- Adds cost and no benefit.
- Restriction on blank walls facing public ROW is a good direction.
- This will be difficult to monitor unless in historic district or conservation overlay district.

## Stakeholder Comments-January 14<sup>th</sup> 2010

### Category-Auto Storage

Recommendation- Reduce the impact of front loading garages facing the street.

- Negative impact will be on affordable housing.
- Will result in the elimination of garages.
- Focus should be infill development.
- Some design standards would be helpful to entire city.
- Will reductions in setbacks be allowed?
- Where there is existing development what is the implication? Amount of non-conformities?
- These standards are intended to sustain the value of the homes.
- Architecture of the house controls the design of the garage, floor plan.
- Neighborhood and sense of community is not a factor of the structure.
- Does this apply to parking pad in front?
- This issue should focus inside Rt. 4 (Central District).
- Recommendation is attempt to hold value over long term. Starter homes are not holding their value.
- This standard is not reasonable for small lots.
- Value depends on the people living in the community.
- Limiting front loading garage width seems to be a good idea.
- Amount of width should be less than 50%.
- This is architecture control contrary to most folk's desires.
- Important design issue from the concept of neighborhood interaction.

## **Stakeholder Comments-January 14<sup>th</sup> 2010**

### Category-Large Utility Structures

Recommendation-Disallow large utility structures/transmission towers in the required setback and established yards.

- What is Duke Power's input? Limit the application to new development.
- Increase the circumference around the tower in lieu of the proposed standard.
- This is a buyer's choice.
- What is the value of preventing this from happening?
- Consider development limitations such as floodplains.
- How would this impact the placement of new lines?
- How many subdivisions has this occurred in? The infrequency of this happening does not warrant time spent on the issue.
- Change radius of required tower easement to a greater distance.
- Utility towers should not be allowed in front yards.
- No house should be allowed to be built near utility structures.
- The lot could be used for community gardens, ball fields, walking trail or other neighborhood amenities.

### Category-Streetscape Flexibility in Urban Residential Zoning District

Recommendation-Allow flexibility in streetscape standards based on neighborhood context.

- No comments

## **Stakeholder Comments-January 14<sup>th</sup> 2010**

### Category-Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District Concept (NCO)

Recommendation-Consider the creation of a new zoning district to address contextual design issues with infill development in certain neighborhoods.

- NCO concept should be explored immediately.
- Is there a possibility to opt out of the overlay?
- NCO needs a separate stakeholder group.
- Need to show how some neighborhoods can benefit more from a local Historic District designation.
- Would like to see historical success of NCO's.
- How would neighborhood boundaries be defined?