Community Engagement Report: Housing Now Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Committee of the Whole Meeting
Tuesday, October 9, 2018, 9:30am
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Commissioners Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Presentation to Committee of the Whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Contract Work Began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun/Jul</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Community Listening Engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Report Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT SCOPE: THREE FOLD

- Analyze Prior Engagements
- Design, Prototype, and Test Engagement Structure
- Facilitate Community Engagement Sessions around Housing Now Amendments 3, 6, 8 and 9 as put forth by the Planning Commission.
Analyze Prior Engagements

Meet with neighborhood associations, non-profit developers, and other stakeholders to understand the pain points of past engagements, their experience with the Housing NOW! Amendments, and to surface nuances that need extra clarity.
ENGAGEMENT ANALYSIS: INITIAL STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

- Neighborhood Associations
- Nonprofit developers
- Community Advocacy Groups
- Community Catalysts (a network of equity-minded professionals using innovation to affect change)
- City Planning Department
Digging into what has made for good and bad engagements with neighborhood associations.
Understanding the perspectives of not-for-profit developers
Working with equity minded neighbors to surface blind spots.
SWOT-ing an analogous experience to improve engagements
PRINCIPLES: IDENTIFIED + PRIORITIZED

- Avoid “insider language”
  - Language needs to be accessible
  - Descriptions need to be clearly written
  - No acronyms left unexplained
- Emphasis on listening and allowing time for processing
  - Hold space for questions and dialogue
- Content needs to be visual
  - Descriptive and accurate
PRINCIPLES: IDENTIFIED + PRIORITIZED

- Events should be accessible and low friction
  - A variety of timing options
  - Consider meals and childcare
  - Materials should be translated to Spanish
- Marketing needs to be easy to spread through networks
- Facilitation should be impartial
Design, Prototype and Test Engagement Structure

Hosted a “Prototype Engagement” with stakeholders and collected feedback on the structure, usefulness of group processing mechanisms, and content clarity.
All stakeholders were invited to give feedback and shape the final form of the engagement.
Debriefing the experience afterwards to surface what works and what needs to be tweaked.
Facilitate Community Engagement Sessions

Refined concept and facilitated four community engagement sessions to meet the stated goals of gathering community feedback on Zoning Amendments 3, 6, 8 and 9.
**MARKETING**

**Bilingual Flyers**
Canvassed around impacted spaces
Presence at 5 National Night Out events

**Educational Video**
Leveraged networks to share out
17,000+ Views
250+ Shares

**Other Outlets**
Robocall w/ GRPS +
311 Hold Line
Four Community Listening Sessions

- One session in every ward
- Three evening sessions: Tues, Wed, Thur
- One daytime session: Sat
- Childcare provided at first session at Other Way
- Meals were provided at every session
- Bilingual facilitators, slides, and workbooks available
SESSION STRUCTURE ROOTED IN PRINCIPLES

- All voices present were to have an equal say
- Small groups facilitated by a “Table Host”
- Large groups were led through instruction
- Table Hosts surfaced large group questions
- City planning team was onsite to help answer q’s, as well as subject matter experts in attendance.
- Forms were submitted via Table Host and through online surveys
SESSION STRUCTURE

CONTEXT
Zoning 101
15 mins

AMENDMENT 3
Missing Middle
25 mins

AMENDMENT 6
Density Bonus
25 mins

AMENDMENT 8
ADUs
25 mins

AMENDMENT 9
Row Houses
25 mins
Each session was framed with this big question: Whether or not the community supports moving these amendments from special land use to administrative approval.
Each session was framed with this big question: Whether or not the community supports moving these amendments from special land use to administrative approval.

These meetings are to find out if the community supports moving these four amendments from Special Land Use to Administrative Approval.
Each session was framed with this big question: Whether or not the community supports moving these amendments from special land use to administrative approval.
For Every Amendment
LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (LDR)

500 FT ALONG THE ROAD

MIXED USE COMMERCIAL TRADITIONAL BUSINESS AREA (TBA)
For Every Amendment

5 MIN  Examples

7 MIN  Table Talk
Table Hosts

They are not zoning experts.

Their goal is to help your table identify the big questions.
The zoning article tweaks needed to make it happen.

The big picture of what it looks like.
EXAMPLE

For Every Amendment

5 MIN
Examples

7 MIN
Table Talk

13 MIN
Large Group Q&A
PARTICIPATION BY ZIP CODE

216
Total Participants

126
Property Owners

40
Renters

DEVELOPER, LANDLORD, OR PROPERTY MANAGER?

No: 136

RACE/ETHNICITY

Caucasian: 64.35%
PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

OWN VS. RENT

- Did Not Disclose: 19.5%
- Other: 3.3%
- Rent: 19.0%
- Own: 57.8%

DEVELOPER / LANDLORD

- Did Not Disclose: 21.3%
- Not a Developer / Owner: 62.6%
- Developer / Landlord: 16.1%
A pattern of 20–28% of participants not responding is found throughout the amendments.
What We Tested

The recommendations from the Planning Commission that the City Commission had a public hearing on March 27, 2018.
What We Tested

We weren’t trying to validate or sell these ideas, but to take the temperature of the community.
**What The Pie Charts Mean**

**Total Participants**

- **Solid Green**: I feel confident enough to make a decision, and I support the amendment as is
- **Light Green**: Not confident, support
- **Grey**: No response
- **Light Red**: Not confident, uncomfortable as is, and recommend...
- **Solid Red**: Confident, uncomfortable recommend...

**Voting Participants**

- **Solid Green**: I feel confident enough to make a decision, and I support the amendment as is
- **Light Green**: Not confident, support
- **Grey**: No response
- **Light Red**: Not confident, uncomfortable as is, and recommend...
- **Solid Red**: Confident, uncomfortable recommend...
AMENDMENT 3

Missing Middle Housing

“Missing Middle” housing is one way to infill density and build more walkable neighborhoods. These are small scale developments that are the size of a large house — like duplexes, fourplexes, bungalow courts and mansion apartments.

Amendment 3 makes it possible to build or convert to this type of housing with administrative approval on any corner lot in a Low Density Residential District and any lot inside of 500 ft of a Mixed-Use Commercial District.

WHAT THESE HOUSING TYPES MIGHT LOOK LIKE IN A NEIGHBORHOOD
**MISSISSIPPI AMENDMENT 3**

**HOW IT DOES IT**

Reduce minimum dwelling unit width from 18 feet to 14 feet. This will also decrease building costs by eliminating the need for additional load-bearing walls that are legally required above 14’.

- I feel confident enough to make a decision: ☐ Yes  ☐ No
- ☐ I support this amendment as is.
- ☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Eliminate minimum lot area requirement (20,000 sq. ft.) for multi-family residential developments. This is about 1/3 of a football field. Waivers for this requirement have been granted to allow for new “missing middle” housing types.

- I feel confident enough to make a decision: ☐ Yes  ☐ No
- ☐ I support this amendment as is.
- ☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

On any corner lot in a Low Density Residential zone district, this allows two-family residential development through either new construction or the conversion of existing structures with administrative approval.

- I feel confident enough to make a decision: ☐ Yes  ☐ No
- ☐ I support this amendment as is.
- ☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

For any lot within five hundred (500) feet of a Mixed-Use Commercial zone districts, this would allow the construction of (or conversion, existing to) a multi-family development on what was previously a single-family lot with administrative approval when all of the following criteria is met:

- No more than 4 units per building
- Complies with maximum building width and footprint
- No more than 150% of the average home size on the block
- Development complies with existing form standards

- I feel confident enough to make a decision: ☐ Yes  ☐ No
- ☐ I support this amendment as is.
- ☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

---

**57.2%**

**50.3%**

**58%**

**68.4%**
Duplexes

Converted Multi-Family
500 FT ALONG THE ROAD

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (LDR)

MIXED USE COMMERCIAL TRADITIONAL BUSINESS AREA (TBA)
Traditional Business Area

500 FT
Corner Lots
## 14” Minimum Dwelling Width

### Total Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in line with Area Specific Plans and should vary by neighborhood</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Safety / Overcrowding</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Small</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Voting Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in line with Area Specific Plans and should vary by neighborhood</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Safety / Overcrowding</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Small</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations to consider from those not in support**

Not in line with Area Specific Plans and should vary by neighborhood

Issues of Safety / Overcrowding

Too Small
Reduce Min Lot Width for Two Family

Total Participants

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

Greenspace Implications

Neighborhood Specific Implementation

Voting Participants
Corner Lot w/ Admin Approval

**Total Participants**

- Yes: 31.0%
- No: 34.3%
- No (n...): 11.1%
- Did N...: 1.9%

**Voting Participants**

- Yes: 39.6%
- No: 43.8%
- Yes (n...): 2.4%
- No (n...): 14.2%

**Recommendations to consider from those not in support**

- Should be neighborhood specific and in line with ASP’s
- Lack of strict or updated design standards
- Eliminates neighbor voice
500 ft with Administrative Approval

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

500ft arbitrary number; start with 100 ft. or one block.

Lack of strict design standards

Consider limiting number of units available.
Missing Middle Housing

How It Does It

Reduce minimum dwelling unit width from 18 feet to 14 feet.
This will also decrease building costs by eliminating the need for additional load-bearing walls that are legally required above 14'.

I feel confident enough to make a decision.  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

[ ] I support this amendment as is.
[ ] I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________.

Eliminate minimum lot area requirement (20,000 sq. ft.) for multi-family residential developments. This is about 1/3 of a football field. Waivers for this requirement have been granted to allow for new “missing middle” housing types.

I feel confident enough to make a decision.  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

[ ] I support this amendment as is.
[ ] I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________.

On any corner lot in a Low Density Residential zone district, this allows two-family residential development through either new construction or the conversion of existing structures with administrative approval.

I feel confident enough to make a decision.  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

[ ] I support this amendment as is.
[ ] I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________.

For any lot within five-hundred (500) feet of a Mixed-Use Commercial zone district, this would allow the construction of (or conversion, existing to) a multi-family development on what was previously a single-family lot with administrative approval when all of the following criteria is met:

- No more than 4 units per building
- Complies with maximum building width and footprint
- No more than 150% of the average home size on the block
- Development complies with existing form standards

I feel confident enough to make a decision.  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

[ ] I support the amendment as is.
[ ] I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________.
This density bonus would, under certain circumstances, allow the space required for land or units to be smaller than usual so that more housing can be made available.

If this proposal passes, developers would be allowed to build the same number of units on a smaller lot, or more units on the same sized lot, than current requirements only if:

1. 30% of the units are affordable at 60% AMI
2. A failure to perform clause is added with penalties for non-compliance
Density Bonus for Affordable Housing

A M E N D M E N T  6

64.5%

AMI = AREA MEDIAN INCOME

For a family of four in Grand Rapids, the AMI is around $65,900/yr.

HUD uses family size to determine their affordable housing subsidies. Below are estimates for 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>50% of AMI</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>$29,480</td>
<td>$735/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>$33,680</td>
<td>$840/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>$37,880</td>
<td>$945/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 people</td>
<td>$41,980</td>
<td>$1,048/mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW IT DOES IT

This adds an Affordable Housing Bonus within Residential Zones Districts and Mixed-Commercial Zone Districts with requirements that a project must:

☑ Include affordable housing in 50% of the units (Affordable = 60% AMI for both rentals and owner occupied units)

☑ Add a failure to perform clause and recording of agreement with deed

I feel confident enough to make a decision: □ Yes □ No

☐ I support this amendment as is.

☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city: ____________________________
LOT NEEDED PER DWELLING

2,000 sqft

1,500 sqft
Affordable Density Bonus

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

60% AMI is still not affordable and should consider having some units at a lower % AMI.

Consider a regional AMI.

Extend 15 year commitment to life of building.

Increase the percentage of affordable units to more than 30%.

Failure to perform clause needs to have “teeth.” Do we have the staff to monitor and enforce compliance?
Density Bonus for Affordable Housing

**AMENDMENT 6**

64.5%

**AMI = AREA MEDIAN INCOME**

For a family of four in Grand Rapids, the AMI is around $59,900/yr.

HUD uses family size to determine their affordable housing subsidies. Below are estimates for 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>60% of AMI</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$735/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>$840/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>$43,800</td>
<td>$945/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 people</td>
<td>$41,940</td>
<td>$1,048/mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW IT DOES IT**

This adds an Affordable Housing Bonus within Residential Zone Districts and Mixed-Commercial Zone Districts with requirements that a project must:

- Include affordable housing in 50% of the units (Affordable = 60% AMI for both rental and owner occupied units)
- Add a failure to perform clause and recording of agreement with deed

I feel confident enough to make a decision: □ Yes □ No

□ I support this amendment as is.
□ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city _________________
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are small apartments with a design consistent to the main dwelling. These are either attached to the main house or as a separate building—usually in a backyard. ADUs are currently legal, but only when approved through Special Land Use procedures.

Amendment 8 would allow any homeowner to build a small ADU on their lot with administrative approval (subject to zoning requirements including parking and greenspace) in any residential zone district.

This amendment would require the following:
1. The ADU must not be larger than 40% of the size of the primary home
2. Must have owner-occupancy of one unit
3. Sized between 400-800 sq.ft.
**HOW IT WORKS**

Removes the 5,000 sq. ft. lot area requirement for an ADU so long as lot meet the established area for the applicable zone district.

I feel confident enough to make a decision:  □ Yes  □ No

□ I support this amendment as is.
□ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Regulate maximum building height for detached ADUs. This makes it possible to build a unit on top of a garage.

I feel confident enough to make a decision:  □ Yes  □ No

□ I support this amendment as is.
□ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Permits two-story detached ADUs. This makes it possible to build a unit on top of a garage.

I feel confident enough to make a decision:  □ Yes  □ No

□ I support this amendment as is.
□ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Increase the Floor Area Ratio from 25% to 40% between primary structure and ADU.

I feel confident enough to make a decision:  □ Yes  □ No

□ I support this amendment as is.
□ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Eliminates the maximum occupancy and number of bedrooms limit for ADUs.

I feel confident enough to make a decision:  □ Yes  □ No

□ I support this amendment as is.
□ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________
What is an Accessory Dwelling Unit?

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is a second small dwelling right on the same grounds (or attached to) and consistent in design your regular single-family house.

**Examples**

- A tiny house (on a foundation) in the backyard
- A basement or attic apartment
- A garage conversion
Amendment #8:

Allow ADU’s by right in any LDR where certain conditions
Lot Area Requirement

Total Participants

- Yes: 47.2%
- No: 23.1%
- Did Not Participate: 21.8%

Voting Participants

- Yes: 60.4%
- No: 29.6%
- No: 8.3%
- Did Not Participate: 1.8%

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

- Revize the 5,000 sqft
- Implications on neighborhood character
- Develop specific design standards for ADUs to preserve neighborhood character
Max Detached Building Height

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

Concerns regarding height compared to main dwelling
Neighborhood specific
Design standards
**Permit 2-Story Detached ADU**

### Total Participants

- No: 19.9%
- No: (n) 6.9%
- Did N: 22.7%
- Yes: 48.6%
- Yes: (n) 1.9%

### Voting Participants

- No: 25.7%
- No: (n) 9.0%
- Yes: (n) 2.4%
- Yes: 62.9%

---

**Recommendations to consider from those not in support**

- Will change the character
- Not strict design standards - concerns regarding height compared to main dwelling
- Enforcement
Increase Floor Area Ratio Between Primary Residence and ADU

**Total Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No (n...)</th>
<th>Did N...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voting Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No (n...)</th>
<th>Yes (n...)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations to consider from those not in support**

Design Standards
Consider varying by neighborhood
Eliminate Maximum Occupancy of an ADU

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

Some limit should exist (via bedrooms or number of persons)

Do we have the capacity to regulate and enforce this?
HOW IT WORKS

Removes the 5,000 sq. ft. lot area requirement for an ADU so long as lot meets the established area for the applicable zone district.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: [ ] Yes [ ] No
[ ] I support this amendment as is.
[ ] I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________

Regulate maximum building height for detached ADUs. This makes it possible to build a unit on top of a garage.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: [ ] Yes [ ] No
[ ] I support this amendment as is.
[ ] I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________

Permits two-story detached ADUs. This makes it possible to build a unit on top of a garage.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: [ ] Yes [ ] No
[ ] I support this amendment as is.
[ ] I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________
AMENDMENT 9

Non-Condo Zero-Lot Line

This amendment would allow non-condo zero lot line development—row house style homes—to be built with administrative approval inside a Low Density Residential district.

Grand Rapids currently allows this type of development in Mixed Density Residential districts.

WHAT “NON-CONDO ZERO LOT LINE” LOOKS LIKE IN A NEIGHBORHOOD

What does “non-condo” mean? These housing types can be built without being owned or maintained by a home owners association.

What does “zero lot line” mean? When homes are placed right on the edge(s) of their lot with at least one shared wall with their neighbor.

HOW IT WORKS

Remove the requirement for minimum lot width.
This would allow houses to occupy a more narrow lot.
What does “non-condo” mean? These housing types can be built without being owned or maintained by a homeowner association.

What does “zero lot line” mean? When homes are placed right on the edge(s) of their lot with at least one shared wall with their neighbor.

HOW IT WORKS

Permits attached single-family residential dwelling units by administrative approval within the LDR zone districts where the following criteria is met:

☐ Eight (8) or less attached units per structure are proposed.
☐ The parcel is within five hundred (500) linear feet of a TBA, TOD, TCC or C zone district as measured from the closest point of the parcel along the public right-of-way.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ I support this amendment as is.
☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________

Reduce minimum dwelling unit width from eighteen (18) feet to fourteen (14) feet. This change saves cost in construction by removing the need for a central load-bearing wall.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ I support this amendment as is.
☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________

Reduce minimum lot area from 3,000 square feet to 1,500 square feet in LDRs and from 2,750 square feet in MDRs. Thinner lots would require deeper lots to meet the existing minimum square footage requirements. Almost all lots like this exist in the city. This change would allow current lot depths to accommodate updated widths.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ I support this amendment as is.
☐ I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ________________________________
LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (LDR)

500 FT ALONG THE ROAD

MIXED USE COMMERCIAL TRADITIONAL BUSINESS AREA (TBA)
500 FT

Traditional Business Area
500 ft., 8 Units, Admin Approval

Total Participants

- Yes (n=...): 27.3%
- Yes: 0.9%
- No: 38.0%
- Did N...: 9.7%

Voting Participants

- Yes: 36.0%
- Yes (n...): 1.2%
- No: 12.8%
- No (n...): 50.0%

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

- 500 ft is too much and arbitrary
- Either 100 ft or neighborhood specific
- Design standards
- Concerns about demolition and displacement
14’ Minimum Dwelling Width

Total Participants

Voting Participants

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

Not in line with Area Specific Plans
Consider varying by low density residential neighborhood type
Green space implications
Remove Minimum Lot Width

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

- Lack of design standards
- Density and displacement concerns
- Potential conflicts with ASP’s
Reduce Minimum Lot Area

Recommendations to consider from those not in support

Density, demolition, and displacement concerns

Lack of design standards

Impact on neighborhood character

Green space and setbacks
What does “non-condo” mean? These housing types can be built without being owned or maintained by a homeowners association.

What does “zero lot line” mean? When homes are placed right on the edge(s) of their lot with at least one shared wall with their neighbor.

What is the percentage increase in the percentage of respondents who support the amendment and the percentage of respondents who oppose the amendment? 53.2% for support vs. 51.3% for opposition.

How it works

Permits attached single-family residential dwelling units by administrative approval within the LDR zone districts where the following criteria is met:

- Eight (8) or less attached units per structure are proposed.
- The parcel is within five-hundred (500) linear feet of a TBA, TOD, TCC, or C zone district as measured from the closest point of the parcel along the public right-of-way.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: Yes / No

- I support this amendment as is.
- I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Reduce minimum dwelling unit width from eighteen (18) feet to fourteen (14) feet. This change saves cost in construction by removing the need for a central load-bearing wall.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: Yes / No

- I support this amendment as is.
- I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Remove the requirement for minimum lot width.

This would allow houses to occupy a more narrow lot.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: Yes / No

- I support this amendment as is.
- I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________

Reduce minimum lot area from 3,000 square feet to 1,500 square feet in LDR’s and from 2,750 square feet in MDR’s. Thinner lots would require deeper lots to meet the existing minimum frontage requirements. Almost no lots like this exist in the city.

This change would allow current lot depths to accommodate updated widths.

I feel confident enough to make a decision: Yes / No

- I support this amendment as is.
- I am uncomfortable with this amendment as is and recommend the city ____________________________
"By Right," “Neighbor Voice/Input,” and “Push to the Master Plan” were the most repeated expressions of frustration with these proposed changes.

- "By Right" - 108 Instances, 27 People
- "Neighbor Voice/Input" - 103 Instances, 35 People
- "Push to Master Plan" - 34 Instances, 13 People
Considerations

- Public Testimony from March 27
- Written material from Residents
- Housing Compendium
- Quantifiable feedback from 216 Residents via online forms and in person.
- Those who expressed concern and voted no tended to focus on three issues: Administrative Approval, Neighborhood Voice / Input, and a deeper master plan engagement.
SPACE FOR QUESTIONS

ADAM WEILER
adam@publicagency.org