

## **\*PRE-HEARING STAFF ANALYSIS\***

### **Rezoning Petition No. 2007-070**

**Petitioner:** Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission

**Request:** Text Amendment to replace the minimum open space provisions for single-family lots and to add new requirements for a maximum building coverage for single-family lots.

### **Background**

The Open Space Stakeholder group has completed its work of reviewing the challenges and concerns associated with the current minimum open space provisions for single family lots. A majority of the stakeholders and staff recommended the replacement of the minimum open space requirements for single-family, detached units with a “maximum building coverage” requirement per lot.

### **Summary**

Currently the Zoning Ordinance requires single-family lots to meet a minimum open space percentage, based upon which zoning district they are located in. This percentage ranges from a minimum of 65% to 30%. The term, “open space” is defined as:

“An area of land or water, which is open and unobstructed, including areas maintained in a natural or undisturbed character or areas improved for active or passive recreation. "Open space" shall not include water below the mean high water line located adjacent to the Catawba River and its impoundments, or areas covered with buildings, structures, streets, or off-street parking areas, but shall include landscaping associated with such parking areas.”

This text amendment proposes to eliminate the requirement for a minimum open space for single family lots located in single-family, multi-family, office, and business districts. New regulations will be added to set a maximum building coverage percent based upon the single-family lot size. In general, larger parcels (those over 15,001 square feet in size) would be required to provide a lower overall percentage of building coverage than that of smaller lots (those under 4,000 square feet in size).

A new definition for “building coverage” will also be added:

“The portion(s) of a lot developed with principal and accessory buildings.”

### **Consistency and Conclusion**

This text amendment is reasonable and in the public interest, and considered consistent with local plans and policies.