

Open City Hall topic outcome:

Infill housing opportunities

This topic ran July 11 to Sept. 1, 2016. It had 583 visitors and 413 responses: 220 registered responses and 193 unregistered responses. That's 20.7 hours of public comment @ 3 minutes per response.

Survey questions

Consideration: Reduce minimum lot area and lot width by 20%

| | | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes, this is reasonable | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63.0% | 138 |
| No, I don't like it | <input type="checkbox"/> | 26.9% | 59 |
| Not sure/need more information | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10.0% | 22 |

Do you have a comment about the potential of reducing minimum lot areas and widths by 20%?

Answered

76

Skipped

144

Word Cloud generated by recipient responses:

possible even further like see reduced Some neighborhoods where density infill development lots Street traffic sidewalks being overproperty actually infrastructure cannot than people into smaller spaces character Asheville New

more parking problems allow setbacks adjacent so houses other neighborh
ood s placement from building existing makes Do who live want areas such changes

house was size why build tiny homes just needhousing minimum lot 20

reduction ft frontage all responses through what could think up small higher sizes proposal
had etc idea fill residential now Great Also support flooding area considerations keep Perhaps t issu
e developers very neighbors able off way owners larger only does revenue look too make seem
them feel currentproposed due road access part sure problem create any acreage Urban odd

Responses:

I think it is possible to reduce it even further.

I would like to see it reduced further - maybe to 25-30%

Some neighborhoods where high density infill development have occurred, and infill on otherwise unbuildable lots (Houston Street, for example), have experienced untenable traffic and safety issues (no sidewalks, impossible to walk down street for fear of being run over, unsafe for children). Neighborhoods have been transformed negatively by over-development (Burton Street Community, where property values have actually decreased) and infrastructure (parks, sidewalks, traffic) cannot accommodate, resulting in decreased quality of life and the necessity to drive rather than walk anywhere.

quit cramming people into smaller spaces!

This will totally ruin the character of Asheville. We are not New York City.

Will lead to more congestion and even more parking problems.

Maybe allow staggered, alternating setbacks on adjacent property so each houses' side walls are not directly facing each other.

A neighborhood's character is entirely based on the density, placement and conformity of buildings placed in it. Many neighborhoods already suffer from poor building placement and sloppy conformity with existing zoning. Eroding zoning protections makes neighborhood's less desirable.

Do the people who live here, not the people that want to move here, want Asheville to become like so many other areas where such density dramatically changes the landscape (figuratively and literally). There are plenty of places where people who want to live like that, can. If I bought a house in a neighborhood where one of the selling points was the large size of the lots, why should someone be allowed to alter that?

Let people build tiny homes, even if there are just hipster trailers

NOOOOOO!!!!

We don't need dense housing and the problems it brings with it here in Asheville. I don't want my neighbor subdividing his lawn and building two more houses and then he sells out and retires somewhere else!

Allow some flexibility to allow keeping old trees!

There must be a minimum lot size for this option not just 20% reduction. This is critical on typical intown lots of <3900 sq ft.

This picture is awfully misleading (shamefully misleading). I live in Rm8, (50 ft minimum street frontage) by the provided scaling the depicted structure would be approximately 15 by 20 ft. Not at all representative of "typical" development. The provided responses should be viewed through this biased prism.

I would want trees/vegetation and neighborhood character to guide/limit what kind of building could happen.

I think 25% would not be unreasonable and would open up many more lots to small or tiny building.

In some close-in neighborhoods -- especially walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods where it's possible to live, work and shop without using a car for every errand -- higher density will provide a broader range of rental and for-sale housing choice if minimum lot sizes are even smaller than this proposal.

There was a reason why these lot sizes were set to begin with. Probably had to do with what the city could sustain with regard to infrastructure, etc. Has anyone looked into the original rationale?

Absolutely a good idea. You talk about adding in fill while preserving the character of residential districts as though these are opposing ideas when actually the character of neighborhoods that we appreciate is from a time that did not have the barriers to in fill that we have now. My neighborhood with all the new houses actually had more houses in it 100 years ago.

Great idea. Also, to have homeowners aware of existing and potential pathways through their neighborhood, that may cross near or on their property - and to support that neighborhood, community building amenity.

Steep slopes and potential flooding should be taken into account when permitting lot area reduction. Reduction should not be allowed if slope and/or water considerations would be made worse by the reduction.

Downtown, parking and infrastructure are already struggling to keep up. Perhaps density isn't the solution to housing issue?

Privacy and noise issues are a major concern. If developers are not very cautious you'll have more neighbors able to hear and see in - window placement and sound insulation is vital if you want to crowd in homes.

Before we begin adding more families to neighborhoods, we need to first address the infrastructure problems, such as, no sidewalks, curbs, proper run off drainage, parking

Are there really very many empty lots in Asheville that this new regulation would apply to?

Don't want to see Asheville lose its charm by becoming another Levittown, L.I., NY

There are other factors which could allow for specific lots to be permitted at a smaller size, such as neighbors, other development, landscaping, ect.

Is the reduction 20% reduction for a set minimum size? The way the question is worded "flexibility for property owners of larger lots" implies the reduction is only for larger lots. What does that even mean?

I am in favor of this only if there is strong enforcement of local limitations of short-term rentals. This plan will not increase housing if investors just use the small houses as an AirBnB revenue stream.

Would it be possible to share examples, case studies and statistics backing this proposal?

I personally like it although I said No but, I look at the bigger picture. What will the neighborhood look like if even only 50% people were able to build on these small lots? And parking? Time to grow outside the city areas!

To an extent, I support the reduction in minimum lot area, but I have concerns about whether restrictions should be imposed to avoid creating too much infill and more congestion in certain areas

Perhaps also including maximum sq.ft. for footprint of dwellings; somewhat covered by setbacks of course.

What is the new width? 80% of what linear footage?

I have some pretty unattractive infill going on in my neighborhood (Bryant St, 28806) right now, so holding buyers/ builders responsible to adjacent neighbors would make sense to me. Currently, a new house is going up that completely blocks both adjacent neighbors homes. What was she/ he thinking? More money by squeezing in things, of course!

Yes! To me infill is way better than blazing new roads into the forest.

I would like to see the above graphic drawn to some sort of scale. As it is, it shows a very tiny house, on a very large lot making the 20% reduction appear "reasonable" as you have put it. However, the tiny house on a big lot does not seem to be what our neighborhoods actually look like. What would the above graphic look like with 10 ft, or 6 ft. setbacks where the house occupies the majority of the lot?

nobody wants neighbors on top of them

Would ruin the character of many neighborhoods. People would knock down existing houses to build multiple houses on the same lot or adjoining lots.

I am not a fan of in-fill, it will only result in an ugly neighborhoods in the future.

This and several other proposals would be very good for developers, but not so much for the city's neighborhoods. And what does the City intend to do about infrastructure?

Just do it already

Compact development is essential to sustainable development, promoting of public transit, and walkable-bikable neighborhoods

I purchased a home in Haw Creek because of the amount of space between homes and the almost "country feel" to the neighborhood. It would not be fair to present home owners like myself to change that now.

This reduction cascades across the board for all lot requirement reductions listed below.

what is meant by "larger lots"

Developers squeeze too many houses into an area...I see it happening all over already

I live in Oakely and the infill houses already feel too close together and are changing the character of the area.

Provide actual dimensions of current and reduced lot sizes as proposed.

Some neighborhoods are valuable and attractive due to their landscapes. This rule should be limited to certain areas.

Whats the definition of a larger lot?

fits more house plans and allows for easier road frontage access.

If this passes I will be able to keep my house and stay in Asheville; otherwise, I plan to move out of the city. My industry (and job) left Asheville, and I cannot afford to keep my house unless I can sell part of my lot.

Make sure to lessen the requirement for minimum road frontage as well.

Would allow slight intensification of neighborhoods without a noticeable difference in appearance.

I think it could be reduced more than 20%

The implications are not clear. Does this mean that new lots would be made up from the pieces trimmed off? Or is this a way to squeeze tiny houses into neighborhoods? What would be the impact on the neighbors?

Would make existing residential areas too congested.I live in an RS zoned neighborhood and it is already so crowded I have to wait in line to pull onto Beaverdam Rd.With the influx of new housing flooding is becoming a problem for those who have

never flooding. The streets are narrow and are not maintained enough to handle the additional traffic the changes would create. Perhaps the city should limit these changes to those areas where the most positive responses are collected. Why should existing property owners, who want no part of increased neighborhood density, have to alter their life styles to accommodate a few? Perhaps this whole issue is more a matter of revenue the city. There would be little gain if additional revenue had to go toward higher road maintenance, greater police protection, garbage collection, hiring people to make sure ordinances are enforced (cannot even enforce the ordinances we have now), etc. I can see the residential neighborhoods mushrooming with the proposal, causing Asheville to lose the unique identity and character it has enjoyed through the years, and in fact, the very image that created Asheville as a place where "everyone wants to live and visit" would be destroyed. CAREFUL CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE PROPOSED LOT AMENDMENT. Once done it cannot be undone. The city should undergo demographic studies to determine the cause and effect of similar laws elsewhere, to see if they have proven to solve or compound problem. I appreciate the openness of sharing of the number of responses but it would be helpful knowing FROM WHICH AREA OF THE CITY THE RESPONSES ARE GATHERED.

How does this work with existing homes?

Does 20% seem reasonable in all districts, and is it enough to get the results the City is looking for?

the town is already chaos...might as well complete the devastation.

Depending on the area I feel even more width reduction is acceptable

This will allow more single-family housing opportunities, unless the development model changes away from spec builders.

Already I see a problem with smaller lot and off street parking. Streets are already flooded with cars parking. Smaller lots may end up being parking/house and no yard. This does not seem aesthetically pleasing or in any way enhancing neighborhood.

This is a great idea strictly from the density perspective. But there are other considerations. Stormwater runoff/catchment is a huge issue in some places already. Rainwater codes and BMP's need to be brought up to a different standard already. With more density, this becomes an even bigger issue. Also, there need to be considerations of house orientation and placement on the site for all new construction. This is in part because of the absolute global need for reduction in energy consumption by any means necessary - including required solar orientation and passive solar siting and design.

Great Idea. This will help with non conforming lots and help create higher density.

Wholesale reduction of density is a bad idea. The impact on individual neighborhoods must be considered. Neighborhoods that are stressed with lack of parking and infrastructure should not have more density added. Also, minimum frontages and setbacks need to be considered, not just a blanket reduction of minimum acreage.

I think this is okay. That way we can add more housing

It sure would enable the city to increase living density

The "other standards" that would still be required need to be emphasized within this discussion. In particular, the provision of adequate parking space. The original study presentation showed that most of the residential neighborhoods are developed less densely than the proposed standard, yet parking is already a problem in all of them.

Urban density, and the ability to access current un useable acreage prevents urban sprawl and makes smaller, affordable housing in central asheville accessible.

Urban density, and the ability to access current un useable acreage prevents urban sprawl and makes smaller, affordable housing in central asheville accessible.

I support.

With a minimum allowable size? Perhaps neighborhood dependent? A blanket 20% reduction seems like one-size fits all approach.

City hall is behind the 8 ball on development. Too many neighborhoods damaged by over zealous developers and city hall unable to act due to current UCO. Thus, I won't support any further reductions in lot size. Should city council and city government support more neighborhood green spaces, that changes the calculus. As it is, developers are buying up all the green spaces in wierdly shaped odd lots and filling them up, rather than them being preserved due to odd shape, near streams, noise buffers, etc.

You need to keep in mind that many older neighborhoods are already platted and some have odd shaped lots that not nice rectangles. Don't want to encourage speculative tear-downs to create more lots. This seems to be best for totally new subdivisions. Also many lots that have not been built on are often also have natural drainage areas running through them.

Consideration: Establish lot area averaging

| | | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Yes, this is reasonable | <input type="checkbox"/> | 65.0% | 143 |
| I don't like it | <input type="checkbox"/> | 26.8% | 59 |
| Not sure/need more information | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8.2% | 18 |

Would you like to make a comment about the potential for establishing lot area averages?

Answered

56

Skipped

164

Word Cloud generated by recipient responses:

idea home **lot** like less than more 30 smaller minimum homes lots areas residential neighborhoods why do neighborhood zoning being property other comment building houses **size** all used single See response question where Perhaps space from Density affordable **housing** better only existing potential create too small reduction allowed parking issues might What impact above neighbors AirBnB which think poor allow family house place trees character traffic land allows very case dwellings rather

Responses:

this is a wonderful idea

My home's lot is 6000 and it feels like enough room with the footprint of our home. I would be in favor of lot sizes less than 7000 or more than 30% smaller than the minimum standard.

Mini-homes on tiny lots in otherwise areas with larger homes and lots decrease the residential feel of the original neighborhoods.

why why why?

Traditional neighborhoods need to be preserved. I do not want a beehive

Homeowners have purchased in a neighborhood with the zoning being a primary consideration. This breaks a fundamental contract with property owners.

As i said in my other comment. I dont want my neighbor subdividing his lawn and building two more houses and then selling out and moving away.

The one size fits all changes may not be appropriate. Particularly when a not representative, less dense zoning size is used as an example.

A minimum lot size should be required and usage guidelines otherwise there will be single wides in inappropriate areas.

great idea

See response to previous question. Minimum lot size should be smaller in key areas where higher densities serve affordability goals.

Squeezing in homes results in squeezing in people. Perhaps there is another use for this space from the neighborhood perspective.

A great step. Density is the most affordable tool you have to help foster more affordable housing. Even better to offer it to all of us instead of only to Neighborhood Housing, Mountain Housing and HUD.

To have homeowners aware of existing and potential pathways through their neighborhood, that may cross near or on their property - to support neighborliness by allowing folks to continue using an existing pathway, or look to create new ones.

30% smaller is too small. Perhaps 10% or 20% would be more reasonable. Again, any reduction should only be allowed if any steep slopes and/or potential flooding conditions would not be made worse by the reduction.

Downtown, parking and infrastructure are already struggling to keep up. Perhaps density isn't the solution to housing issue?

The smaller lot would be cramped and there would be privacy, open space and noise issues to contend with. This might be useful for making money for the original lot owner, but the infill could be taken advantage of if the orig. owner is not cautious.

As long as the subdivided lot is used to provide permanent housing and not as a vacation rental.

What would the impact be on the over-all appeal to a small city wanting to maintain nothing more than just that?

Again with the same provisos mentioned above: "such as neighbors, other development, landscaping, ect."

Same as above. I like this plan as a way to create more affordable housing, but it also provides a potential for AirBnB-type investors, which creates an even greater housing problem.

I think this might result in congestion and awkward access. I support demolition of older homes in poor condition.

See comment in response to above question.

SEE MY COMMENT, ABOVE

Excellent idea. This would allow people to build homes on their property for family members.

I guess I am concerned with the idea of "in filling" neighborhoods in general. If a developer or homeowner can build a house in their side yard, what requirements are in

place for that dwelling to be affordable? How will these new buildings impact the neighbors? Is there a concern that the infilling will lead to fewer trees and more high end real estate?

The potential increase in housing density will decrease the value of my house. Where will the extra parking spaces come from my street is busy enough as it is...

What size building would be permitted on these small remnant lots? Could damage adjoining property values or neighborhood character. What about incentives that work the other way for certain types of properties that have historic significance, old trees or provide special scenic character?

Do it

This wouldn't substantially alter the character of our neighborhoods

This would work if housing size is proportional to lot size

There are two main roads in Haw Creek which have heavy traffic and no sidewalks. By increasing the number of residents in this area, it would be a traffic and pedestrian nightmare.

If you are reducing the overall required lot size, the 30% reduction for lot averaging would permit a parcel as small as 5600 square foot.

There are houses being built in back yards of other existing homes, etc. Too many houses squeezed into small spaces.

The question is biased in that a negative response automatically suggests one is not in favor of saving homes and efficient land use.

There is no certainty of the distance to the neighboring structures on the next lots.

Fits existing infield housing location better

This also applies to my situation--it would allow me to stay in the city.

This is logical because it allows up to the allowed density and overcomes the limit that homes on large lots from decades ago places on neighborhoods.

I think this would crowd neighborhoods. It would probably reduce green space, ie. trees. What about parking and traffic?

Sounds like plans to assure rampant and ongoing exceptions to orderly zoning.

Have already seen subdivision of lots in Montford with very poor outcomes. Too small lot, too big house!

the place is chaos might as well sink the entire ship . the faster the better.

Will this impact many lots?

Would the minimum setbacks be adjusted as well? I do see this encouraging a lot of building, but the building will likely be rental income for folks which I do not see as keeping with the fabric of the neighborhoods.

This should only be used if it is a hardship case to place a home on an odd shaped lot
Excellent idea for land areas where house was built in wrong location.

Averages are good

If allowed, house design and placement would be very important

This approach would create a large loophole to the basic regulations for lot width and size, which makes no sense. It would allow individual property owners to unilaterally impose very dense development on their neighbors within guidelines that are too vague. This has potential to greatly degrade the livability and character of older neighborhoods. If this approach is considered, then at a minimum it must be ensured that all other zoning standards are applied, especially setbacks and parking space.

This allows land to be developed further for single family dwellings rather than accessory units that cause loan appraisal issues and encourage "Airbnb" rather than residential dwellings

This allows land to be developed further for single family dwellings rather than accessory units that cause loan appraisal issues and encourage "Airbnb" rather than residential dwellings

Seems reasonable unless lot is assymetrical shape. Pie shaped? Needs some flexibility on case by case basis.

your graphic greatly improves my understanding of the issue. Thanks. Perhaps no more than 25% is less drastic.

damages neighborhood character

I think we need to ban flag lots being created if do this - creates poor neighborhood continuity

Consideration: Incentivize duplexes

| | | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Yes, this is reasonable | <input type="checkbox"/> | 66.4% | 144 |

| | | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| No, I don't like it | <input type="checkbox"/> | 26.7% | 58 |
| Not sure/need more information | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6.9% | 15 |

Would you like to make a comment about the potential to incentivize duplexes?

Answered

60

Skipped

160

Word Cloud generated by recipient responses:

idea minimum 000 adequate parking space great homes additional off street family
house They designed do lot increase housing community character density changes which
neighborhoods does existing don t think duplex small feel amount people size way on
e all example sense like development Duplexes better from providing could 4 more cars per
just option building only units So 2 build unit 7 sf neighborhood where single require
potential s ADU rental change traffic smaller property see make sq ft built Makes same also home
want incentivize attached any

Responses

wonderful idea!

minimum of 10,000 to give adequate room for parking; consideration must be given to the total number of occupants for parking space requirements.

Duplexing is a great idea, minimizing the footprint of homes and reducing their environmental impact. As long as additional adequate off-street parking is provided, I have no problem with multi-family homes - preferable to ADUs or additional house structures. They can be well designed, attractive, and do a lot to increase housing stock.

no no no

The value of a community is in its character. These density changes encourage speculative developers and landlords which are in opposition to cohesive neighborhoods.

As long as this does not apply to existing neighborhoods.

I don't think a duplex this small benefits the residents

I feel the city streets already cant handle the amount of people here.

Still need a minimum size, possibly allow a streamlines way to apply for exceptions?

The one size fits all changes may not be appropriate. Particularly when less dense zoning size is used as an example.

The graphic is extremely helpful in demonstrating this common sense solution.

this feels like a big opportunity for needed duplex development

Duplexes are probably better than ADUs from the point of view of providing housing.

Parking is already limited. This could lead to 4 or more cars per lot.

It almost has to be this way since a new construction fourplex requires water sprinklers which is just not a viable option when building only 4 units. So you ask is 2+2 vs 4 but really 4 is not a reasonable option and certainly not affordable of you build with sprinklers.

Yes, this would encourage more density. Developers would be more likely to build duplexes and/or existing landowners more able to add a unit.

7,000 sf is small for a duplex in a neighborhood where single family houses require 7,000 sf. Try 10,000 sf. Reduction should only be allowed if steep slopes or potential flooding would not be adversely affected.

Parking could be problematic

Excellent opportunity for increasing housing!

It really depends. If it's already a characteristic of a neighborhood, then fine.

Provided ADU's are not ultimately included within the short-term rental allowances.

good idea

This will change the look of my community. I would encourage an ADU instead of this. When you start building duplexes the look of the house build changes and the community loses its historic feel

Restrictions/limitation should be in place to ensure that certain areas do not become too congested, resulting in more traffic and parking problems, noise etc.

A viable option given that a dwelling and ADU can be on a smaller lot.

Another brilliant idea. 7,000 SF is more than adequate for a duplex, and even smaller would be fine.

I grew up in a sweet little two-family house, one unit above the other. I think they can be done well, if appropriately sited and designed.

Are you kidding me, more over building to come and no recourse for neighbors in loss property values. They will sell and the cycle will continue until some neighborhoods will be ruined.

Just do it already

I would like to see more duplex, triplex and quad options for people to rent and own.

If you're talking about two flats (like they have in Chicago), that would work; side by side, not so much

Usually 4 cars would be needed. I like incentivizing duplexes, but the small lot could make parking overflow into street.

Lot size should always be considered when building homes.

There should be a minimum lot size for the duplex, say 5,000 to 7,000 sq. ft.

If you put all all these proposed changes together, you can have a duplex built on a minuscule lot via lot averaging.

require off street parking spaces (2 per unit) for new duplexes

This would twice the cars for the lot size. City council has admitted that they don't know how to deal with Asheville's increasing traffic conjection.

Makes sense, building size would be very similar while allowing greater density

This allows us to go back to the traditional neighborhoods where duplexes were a way to increase density within the same scale as single family. Current lot requirement makes no sense because why would you build a duplex on the same lot size that you could build 2 single family houses. Therefore, it removes a great building type from being practically built. It would also bring it into alignment with the ADU min. lot size.

With strict architectural control so as not to damage character of neighborhood.

Putting a duplex on the same amount of space as a single-family home would impact the neighborhood's traffic and parking and could also strain water and sewer lines. It also tends to reduce neighboring property values.

Great idea!

our corrupt government will do exactly what the money people will tell them to do so go for it it's futile to say anything

Duplexes detract from predominantly single family neighborhoods

Again, I see this incentivizing rental property. We already have few who own many rental properties in Asheville. I just see this supplying the demand for rental home owners increase their income and no significant change in potential home ownership.

I would like the increased density to not eliminate greenspace, i.e. if a duplex is placed on a lot where normally a 2,000 sq.ft. single-family house would be, the duplex should not be 4,000 sq.ft. Emphasis should be on building smaller-footprint, efficiently-designed homes.

This makes a lot of sense!

lot should be large enough so housing is not crammed together. neighborhoods do not want increased density which doesn't work when human beings live extremely close to each other. for instance: hillcrest, pishah view, etc. Even the Federal Government finally learned this.

I like a separate ADU- for example a cottage or garage apt vs. a standard looking duplex if it is to be located in a neighborhood, or make it appear to be a single family home but it is a duplex.

This proposed change alone will not incentivize duplexes. The current infill residential development pattern is to construct one large single-family residence in the middle of a lot, with no provision for an attached ADU and leaving no space on the lot for a detached ADU. This pattern will continue for any additional subdivisions. The only way to incentivize duplexes is to dis-incentivize single-family development. For example, only allow reduced standards for subdivision if a duplex or home+ADU is built.

Again, I think you should require green construction, passive solar orientation, and considerations of stormwater perhaps including adequate room for a rainwater catchment garden. All these things should be REQUIRED before allowing a "duplex" or more to be built.

Why do we want more duplexes? Is it to increase the amount of overall rentals?

First of all, your example does not match your statement. The example implies that a lot must meet the minimum standard for a single-family home +ADU but the proposal says a duplex would be allowed on any lot regardless of size. I would conditionally support the option implied by the example. The condition is that a comprehensive review of multifamily zoning districts be undertaken by the City, with neighborhoods/areas that have a predominantly single-family character rezoned to single-family, with any existing multi-family units being grandfathered.

Duplexes make things more crowded. I don't want to share my home with someone else

This approach has good potential to increase permanent housing supply without adverse impacts on neighbors or neighborhoods.

Intangible feel of single family units providing better quality of life versus duplex.
Attached ADU needs addressing

Intangible feel of single family units providing better quality of life versus duplex.
Attached ADU needs addressing

Cars are as much a consideration as human count per household. Will you require off-street parking per unit? Does it fit

people need space for gardens and play, damages neighborhood character

Only with some design/massing criteria to have the fit in the neighborhood context

Consideration: Incentivize multifamily

| | | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes, this is reasonable | <input type="checkbox"/> | 49.3% | 108 |
| No, I don't like it | <input type="checkbox"/> | 32.9% | 72 |
| Not sure/need more information | <input type="checkbox"/> | 17.8% | 39 |

Would you like to make a comment about the potential to incentivize multifamily?

Answered

66

Skipped

154

Word Cloud generated by recipient responses:

idea t Incentivize Then **lot** sizes could buildings family housing units do require size
great increase reduce impact **More parking** triplexes greater infrastructure street
where Again long existing single neighborhoods prefer Asheville too like see than 000 sq
each additional unit 2 per big building people which enough own 8 some 3 ft land build

multifamily owners add small Lots **sf** such space **developers** current residents want property
How **neighborhood** house **they** near **area** good market requirements sure **Design** all **off** green
types allotting first box **need** what incentives Builders only from development other two cars any new
between **Also** costs scale character think proposal commercial s reality standards plan comment

Responses

This is an excellent idea.

wonderful idea!

Why isn't duplex same as above (in Incentivize Duplexes), i.e. 7000sf? Then the lot sizes could be 7000sf, 8500sf, 10,000sf.

The little diagram of the buildings are not proportional to the lot sizes

Extra multi-family housing units do not require loads proportionate increases in lot size. This is a great way to increase housing stock and reduce environmental impact.

keep integrity of privacy

More congestion and parking issues.

I would limit it to duplexes and triplexes.

This effort to increase densities places greater strain on poorly maintained infrastructure and encourages greater use of on street parking where no sidewalk or storm water infrastructure exists.

Again, as long as this does not apply to existing single family neighborhoods.

I prefer free standing units

You will ruin the vib of Asheville if it becomes too densely populated.

Would like to see more than 1,000 sq with each additional unit....maybe minimum of 2,000 per additional unit

That seems too extreme, especially for quad-plex. That is a big building, or a cramped quarters building we could be encouraging.

This begins to push the issue of increased burden on our infrastructure and increase in the sheer numbers of people, the implications of which is not being adequately acknowledged or addressed here.

This would not provide sufficient parking.

Not even a big enough step taken in the right direction. I own an 8 unit building in Montford and each apartment is large and 2 bed rooms + dining rooms in some and the tenants have room to garden in the yard and the entire lot is .08 acre (3,484 sq ft).

Requiring less land to build a multifamily certainly would incentivize building of multifamily, and/or existing owners to add to their existing structures accordingly.

These lot sizes are too small. Lots would be too crowded. Try 3,000 sf per extra unit.

If that many families are on such smaller lots, there is not enough outdoor space, and you feel crowded. If occupancy is maxed in each unit, this might be an acceptable idea for infill

I am concerned that this will incentivize outside investors and developers more so than current residents who want to add units onto their existing property. How can the city encourage this type of building by local residents rather than big businesses?

Require some yard space on lots. Limit number of storeys in keeping with the neighborhood.

How would parking be accommodated for multifamily units?

To me, multifamily dwellings should be limited to typical apartment house units and they should be built/kept near to the central downtown area of Asheville. There is a good market for housing, but that doesn't appear to address for low income folks and their requirements. I don't see that we'd be doing the area a good deed by minimizing lot sizes in order to build mini multifamily complexes.

parking could be problematic

This rewards developers over home owners.

But please make sure they are used as long-term rentals!

Again the build will be out of proportion where I live and change the feel of the neighborhood.

May be appropriate for certain areas/neighborhoods.

Combined with the Design Regs suggestion below this would be great, to a point. Not sure an 8-plex on a 12K sq.ft. lot would work in all instances for off-street parking, green space, buffers, etc.

i would add a unit for every 2,000 additional feet instead of 1,000

Would like to see a cap on this, depending on the zone. Like, RM8 max is a triplex.

I am really digging the overall idea of allowing for smaller units of all types!!! Who needs a giant house anyway?

You are allotting 5,000 SF for each building now but you want to shrink it to 3,000 in the first box & second box you are allotting 2,333 SF Third box you are allotting 2,000 SF .The bigger the complex the more room they need more people more parking .Its not right

Stop this insanity....require off street parking and then there would be no green space. The city will start to look bad and there is no going back.....look what happened to Lowell MA

These incentives are too much at once. In the already overheated Asheville real estate market they risk creating a glut. Builders will build for the market demand. Incentives to build more should come only with protections for existing property owners such as impact fees for infrastructure, prks, and the enforcement of design guidelines. Residents and the City itself need more protection from insensitive development by speculative developers

Do it do it do it

I would like to see more duplex, triplex and quad options for people to rent and own.

Only if other off street parking options were available. Such small lots would not accomodate two adults w two cars per unit, with off-street parking.

Concerned about how many of these happen in any given neighborhood.

This would not be reasonable in an area such as Haw Creek. I would suggest this type of housing in an area where there is more open land to build.

Asheville citizens are not sardines.

For new building, require off street parking - two spaces per unit.

prefer something between existing and proposed, e.g. additional unit for each +2500 sq ft

No, no ,no. Developers in Asheville do not need any more incentive to build mulit-family units. Also, a bigger lot can mean more trees.

Impact on neighbors should be considered. People have bought homes with the understanding of current zoning rules.

Great idea, reduces infrastructure costs.

These are the building types that many great, low-scale cities and towns were created with, but they don't make any financial sense to build within the current min. lot sizes. Since land cost is the biggest variable in creating affordable housing, this would greatly reduce that barrier and open up more viable, and neighborhood friendly building types. Missing middle building types are the answer to our housing crisis because it increases density without destroying the small scale character of our neighborhoods!

I think the amount of sf should be greater for triplexes and quads, especially given the likely impact on traffic, parking, and strains on old water and sewer lines. This should not be done in older residential areas. It also would reduce property values for near-by properties.

What are other city/community precedents that would lead to a Yes? This should be presented.

Not in RM8 zones. This proposal would not promote stable neighborhoods. Only near commercial zones

Developers are not going to build multifamily until they have to. Complexities and costs of ownership, commercial building code, etc. are too intimidating (and costly) for the City's homebuilders.

Again, the reality of this situation is a.)likely not an image like what is shown. For obvious reasons (this house resides on larger lot and has some character). The likelihood of this replication is slim to none. Unless you incentivize this multifamily concept along with a stringent design review process, I believe we will end up with a lot of plain jain box rental units with concrete/gravel lots to accommodate all the cars parking required for the multiple units.

This also makes a lot of sense. Are there other incentives the city can provide to increase small multifamily? Perhaps training builders for small scale multifamily needed.

I think multi family housing, if it is done with design standards will go a long way in providing housing in Asheville without sprawl.

This proposed change sounds good on paper, but simply will not work to incentivize triplexes and four-plexes because those development will be considered a commercial project with significant additional requirements and significant additional costs. Why would builders even bother? Only if they can build enough units to assimilate the additional costs. The choice is not between 2 units or 3 units, rather between 2 units and 8 or 12 or 16 units.

We need to start REQUIRING energy efficiency and green construction for all new buildings. This is not just a lark, it is a matter of reducing the need for mountaintop removal, fracking, and warfare, while protecting our very river from coal ash and our air from harmful compounds. We need to REQUIRE all new buildings/structures to have passive solar design, solar orientation, a rainwater plan, an so forth. ON A LARGER SCALE OF CONSIDERATION, we need to be sure that there is a certain amount of required neighborhood greenspace/gardenspace for every "x" number of units. We also need to have requirements for affordable housing per "x" many units in a neighborhood or area. This is social and environmental justice. It's also in DIRECT keeping with the City Council's Strategic Operating Plan and we should implement them at the first opportunity and become the city we wish to become - clean, independent, healthy, resilient, and thriving.

My comment here is a combination of my comment on the first proposal (blanket density increase is inappropriate) and my comment on the preceeding proposal (must undertake comprehensive review of mulit-family zoning).

I think the size of the building in relation to the lot is important. If what you are showing here is in relation to the lot then it's fine, if the buildings double in size it is not fine.

Critical to ensure that standards for parking space and setbacks are enforced.

Prefer a focus on single family dwellings - where a house sits on its own lot, and is therefore more accessible to individual home buyers/owners

I think the general urban direction of Asheville as a place of quality living is better served by single family development (which ADU also serves)

If off street parking and neighborhood infrastructure is updated

As long as design compatibility is also a component of the plan. I think we need to be careful about letting developers build ugly rental units that would take away from the character of our neighborhoods.

Damages character and culture of the town. Roads can't handle the traffic.

My concern is that the reduction does not take into consideration the reality of how many cars there will - reality is at least two per unit which takes about 800 sf per additional unit to accommodate. The reduction in area and the increase in units begins to fill a site and leaves it with a lot of pervious surface. I would also want to see units stacked not spread out with one shared and visible entry. Max 6 units - example above is as big as I'd see in most neighborhoods and with design standards

Consideration: Require design compatibility for all multifamily

| | | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes, this is reasonable | <input type="checkbox"/> | 71.9% | 156 |
| No, I don't like it | <input type="checkbox"/> | 12.4% | 27 |
| Not sure/need more information | <input type="checkbox"/> | 15.7% | 34 |

Would you like to make a comment about the potential to require design compatibility for all multifamily?

Answered: 69

Skipped: 151

Word Cloud generated by recipient responses:

think s **design** multi family homes Asheville **parking** lots t property owners new
could must much see character sure **street trees** does lot building most too Requiring front Setbacks
like reasonable elements just good do who Montford **standards** all more what compatibility etc
housing Historic review compatible agree requirements style buildings standard entrances **very** single
roof **neighborhoods** neighborhood need important require requirement case development some
other essential Please existing look make any

Responses:

In general, I think it's best not to impose overly rigid design guidelines on multi-family homes here in Asheville. This includes parking for tenants. Many of the lots in Asheville, including many of the remaining open lots, are irregularly shaped and can't accommodate a parking area for tenants at the back of the property. Current owners looking to add rentable units to their lots or individuals hoping to build new multi-family homes could be stymied by regulations/laws that dictate that parking lots/areas must only be behind the dwelling. I'd much prefer to see a variety of parking options allowed for multi-family homes here in Asheville.

It shouldn't have to be cookie-cutter design, though; there are ways to have "character" without being hodge-podge in design.

not sure about the parking and driveways

Funny that you would include a picture of the Ontario as an example of planting of street trees when this unit does not have anyone parking in the back of the lot due to inadequate parking lot definition and adverse conditions

There are already many different building styles in most areas.

Dictating too much of the design would be stifling to developers/home owners. Requiring where the parking is to be located is too restrictive. Requiring that there must be a front porch is too restrictive. Setbacks and building mass seem like reasonable design elements.

Absolutely reasonable. Most design accommodations can be accomplished without a large increase in cost - just good design. I do not know who would decide on individual projects (groups like the Montford Historical Association are notoriously inconsistent), but reasonable standards could be developed and applied fairly.

Where multifamily is permitted and appropriate, there should not be added barriers put in place.

If in Montford must follow all HRC guidelines

Additional building necessarily results in more impervious surfaces which impacts our groundwater. Consider requiring pervious asphalt or similar driveway material to facilitate natural run-off and prevent storm water overloads on drainage systems.

I think this is an absolute necessity.

While preserving community character seems a worthwhile goal in theory, getting a workable consensus on what does and does not achieve "design compatibility" will be a challenge. Metrics related to height, setbacks, frontages, etc. can be accommodated in a zoning code.

See comments about strain on infrastructure that needs to be addressed before we worry about this.

I thought this discussion was about removing barriers to small in fill housing and not adding obstructions. Yes in Historic Districts review and approval is needed.

I think people who live in the city generally like more density, as long as it's attractive and compatible with what already is there.

I agree there should be requirements for aesthetics such as plantings to block view of parking areas and garbage receptacles, however AVL is a creative, inventive city and it would be preferable to allow that to be reflected in its architecture rather than cookie cutters of "bungalow" style houses.

While I agree in principle with more thoughtfully designed buildings of all types, I do not generally trust the ability of design standards to establish compatibility. Far too often they are used as an exclusionary zoning tool rather than a standard that facilitates compatible infill housing. Compatibility does not mean homogeneity, but sensible diversity. I have seen plenty of buildings with multiple front entrances that are very compatible with surrounding historic single-family houses, as well as buildings with alternate roof styles that are compatible. It seems much more a factor of the individual site constraints and immediately adjacent neighbors. Maybe the city could offer a non-binding design review process instead of setting design standards that will just incentivize builders to find loopholes. I think most builders will want their small scale multifamily projects to be as compatible as possible with surrounding single-family neighborhoods and would utilize a service to help do that.

Aesthetics must match the neighborhood!

No need to regulate... Allow all designs

height restrictions are very important or multi unit structures can block the sun for surrounding homes, planting is great but not if required to be larger due to cost

This is excellent!

Definitely require off-street parking. Perhaps material requirements -- no one wants a bunch of cinderblock buildings in their neighborhood. I would not recommend a front porch requirement, as it can increase the noise in neighborhoods (many renters are young and childless and therefore keep later outdoor hours).

Parking requirement should be handled on a case-by-case basis, and subject to lot configuration & access. Staff should be flexible, but onsite parking should be strongly encouraged for all in-fill development.

I like some of the compatibility ideas, but would support other ideas, such as lower level garage parking or possibly underground parking

In conjunction with the above suggestion.

This is essential.

Let the market dictate. Don't limit creativity

I'm not sure requiring parking in the back is necessary. Some sites might be fine for parking on the side for example and then adding shrubs or trees so neighbors aren't looking at a parking lot.

Should be reasonable

Some designs standards seems very reasonable.

Please please remember that trees take many years to mature! I think that all new building should be subject to some design consideration. I also would love to see a tree ordinance that protects trees of a certain age or size.

How boring

Design elements should be in keeping with existing structures--massing and height very important

Things like planting and trees are a good idea, but turn out to be empty promises (see the grove in Montford - a few sad trees that mostly died). the actual scale and character of the project needs to fit.

An absolute necessity to protect existing property owners from cheap, speculative development with the potential to destabilize neighborhoods and damage existing property values.

Whatever Joe Minicozzi says, do it

Both of these sound like a very good idea.

Design compatibility should be case by case. I am not comfortable with generic rules.

This is reasonable, as it makes a neighborhood look better, which would make the residents more likely to keep up their property.

must include trees or tree plantings covering 20% of the lot.

In the older neighborhoods of Asheville, new infill must match the character of the existing construction. Asheville's older housing stock should not feel like a throwback when infill comes to the neighborhood.

okay for parking, setbacks, trees, etc; not for design of building itself

I would love to see a standard requiring a minimum number of trees to be planted. Infilling is taking out many stands of trees.

New structures should be compatible with existing homes: scale, materials, setbacks, parking, etc.

This must be a requirement in single family neighborhoods

requiring parking behind reduces buildable street level access and just makes the project more costly for very minor aesthetics improvement.

Absolutely! Require (as much as the state law allows) parking in the rear, primary entrances on the street, windows and entrances facing the street, no blank walls on the street frontage, Built-to-lines to create a consistent street frontage, etc. The interface between the public and private realms is the key to great neighborhoods.

Very important to have and enforce stringent design requirements

It's not clear what this means. Does it mean a standard design for new construction or requirements for modifying existing housing?

Require passive solar and other smart, easy green building techniques, and require only low maintenance, no- water yards -- or require rainwater systems for yards that need water. Please don't require or encourage faux Arts and Crafts style or faux Victorian any other faux styles; they just look sad and second-rate--no matter how much they cost to build.

This is an essential component of this proposed series of changes.

I agree that there should be some design standards, particularly related to parking, plantings, size and objective (e.i easily measurable) considerations. However, I am strongly against the standards including any design requirements (such as front porch, roof style, location of entrances, or any other subjective standards). Asheville is known for its creativity and uniqueness and instituting any restrictions on new designs would hurt this reputation. Homes in historic neighborhoods are already under design protection, and additional reviews would make multifamily development less appealing to potential owners/developers.

I would not suggest an insurmountable number of restrictions, but a reasonable amount so that curb appeal is maintained and there is off-street parking

Certain design elements could create unwarranted costs for construction...especially for sites challenged by topography

Agree that site plan review is beneficial (entrance location, parking location, street trees, etc). Architectural style is subjective and will be a barrier to projects getting built.

Would need very clearly defined design guidelines. Too much room for interpretation depending on who is sitting on review at the time. Can already see this in Montford

where one home can use vinyl snap in windows in historic district with no historic detailing and have no offstreet parking even though the homes are clearly more than a mile from city edge... all up to who is looking at what and when...no standard.

Would want to make sure that "design elements" don't restrict architectural expression. Buildings should have leeway to explore different architectural expressions to enrich the tapestry of the downtown area.

Quantifiable and consistently applied design standards make a lot of sense on multi-family. "Roof style" and other aesthetic design requirements are very subjective and should not be city's role.

Being too stylistically specific could end up enforcing awkward or inappropriate design elements, and limit good design diversity within the city.

Very limited design standards can improve appearance, but too many will only result in significant additional costs that will dis-incentivize multi-family developments.

This is a GREAT idea and should be used FIRST AND FOREMOST on environmental, ecological, and social justice issues. I mean, to make sure it "looks pretty" even while it rots our culture from the inside would be immoral and antithetical to the SOP, not to mention ecological needs. Again, we need REQUIRED DESIGN COMPATIBILITY FOR STRONG ECOLOGICAL DESIGN STANDARDS. This means passive solar design, solar orientation, stormwater/rainwater/runoff catchment, garden and greenspace, and healthy building materials.

Design standards should be tailored to the character of each neighborhood and not blanket throughout the City.

Design compatibility will vary depending on the neighborhood. For example, development in designated historic neighborhoods should have stringent requirements to preserve existing character.

Parking is essential for multi family, design elements to blend with single family look and feel is important to maintain the character of Asheville

Parking is essential for multi family, design elements to blend with single family look and feel is important to maintain the character of Asheville

yes, but how qualified are the city departments to make aesthetic determinations? Ask local architects too please.

I do think this is needed, but it is a bit tricky in regards to who determines what roof style, etc. is desirable/undesirable.

I think standards for parking make sense, less so the aesthetics of the building.

fit standards to the neighborhood context...not all neighborhoods are the same in Asheville. Parking to rear but again we need to look at the reality of our topography...some multi family units might not work on sloped sites. Also get rid of the no onsite parking requirement within a mile of CBD. In today's Asheville most have cars

and guests. In town neighborhoods have particularly narrow streets and few sidewalks. We can't accommodate on-street parking.

Are there other considerations you would like to suggest?

Answered: 78

Skipped: 142

Word Cloud generated by recipient responses:

current ADU standards must dwelling size What ability build two homes lot than large home small smaller example see more tiny communities Asheville going housing people h ouses increase They all out one short term then take them minimum RESIDENTS DEVELOPER S who neighborhood S long need being over built money were from time any fire parking cars does water limits area per code trees infill other cities while having reduce just side lower unit density single family areas costs tax character development provide maintain infrastructure street s utilities needs further neighborhoods support required such local Allow properties like do want h ouse new before green open space every some available land additional even requirements Pleas e consider could changes only change make use made building lots require order community how well t urban accommodate etc where too impact so living within off street 1 allowed add units way a ffordable also think programs own into Based using help less Families 2 great create which traffic low multi Better existing property buildings look project develop plan flag enough much Different might ve ry residential SIMPLE styles compatibility really

Responses:

With the current ADU standards, there must be a main dwelling with an ADU a percentage of the size of the primary dwelling. What if we offered the ability for someone to build two equally sized homes on a lot? Rather than a large home and a small ADU, what about two smaller homes at, for example, 500 square feet each?

I would love to see more tiny homes and zero lot line communities in Asheville.

Incentivize tiny homes.

This is not going to alleviate the housing shortage, this is going to let people build mini hotels next to their houses to increase their income. They will all be rented out on one of multiple short term rental sites. People list their homes on Thursday then take them down during the week. The description is for a one month minimum rental, but they point out there is no penalty to break the lease.

Thank you for considering public input on this important matter. RESIDENTS' input on these issues is far more important than that of DEVELOPERS - who have ulterior motives (generally, short term profit), not necessarily in line with the neighborhood's long term existence or environment. And City Council is accountable to the City's voting citizens, for the long term.

I realize the need for housing, however being a native of a state that over built all in the name of housing and money, towns were destroyed, communities were destroyed and more importantly the state was destroyed. I worked 15 miles from my home - my commute time 45 minutes! This or worse is what you will bring to Asheville if you proceed with these plans.

Have you given any thought to the need for more infrastructure, services, the added burden to our schools, police, fire, EMS? What about parking for the added cars. Roads in Haw Creek are substandard at best and adding more cars is a recipe for disaster.

My main concern is that Asheville does not have any regulations in place for the following: storm water reduction policies including limits on maximum impervious surface area per plot, a code to protect trees, codes to insure that infill does not flood surrounding area. As other cities have found, encouraging infill while not having codes to reduce or eliminate stormwater pollution or flooding is dangerous.

Incentivize vertical duplexes, not just side-by-side duplexes, with the provision that flooring be designed to minimize noise to the lower unit.

Seeking greater density in single family areas to reduce housing costs is a flawed approach. This seems from all indications to be a scheme to gain short term tax base increases while damaging the character of Asheville neighborhoods. Growth and greater development is not a money grab. It comes with the responsibility to provide and maintain appropriate infrastructure in streets, sanitation, utilities, and public safety. The city is not meeting those needs adequately now, further density at the expense of neighborhoods further leverages an inferior support structure. State legislative action may be required to prevent such poor stewardship by local government.

I am not a proponent of intensifying the density of housing in this fashion. Allow those limited properties that would like to do apply for exception, rather than allowing blanket approval for pop up housing.

I enjoy seeing trees and greenery when looking out the window I don't want to see house and concrete and house and concrete. The electrical utilities are having problems servicing the current number of houses that's why they wanted to bring in that new power line from the Oconee Nuke plant. We already need a restriction that a house needs to be removed from the grid before a new one is built.

Requirement of green/open space per every 10th lot or certain infill...remember to preserve some space, keep an eye on the future and control group

Put sidewalks and bike lanes on Old Haw Creek Road and on New Haw Creek Road.

Not every available piece of land is a candidate for additional housing even if the lot size meets the requirements. Please consider the lay of the land, soil types and elevations. We could be solving one problem while creating another.

If we do this, we have to include some guidelines to discourage predatory behavior from investors and developers who may not have the interests of the neighborhood or of lower/middle income folks at heart. Displacing people should be avoided at all costs.

Neighborhoods that already meet current density requirements should be handled more carefully or they may be lost altogether. They should not bear the brunt of these changes because they are full of middle class folks rather than wealthier people whose neighborhoods are not meeting current density as it is. The responsibility for creating housing cannot fall on only some neighborhoods.

If approved, this change will probably lead to felling of many trees, some large. Provide incentives to keep trees of larger sizes.

If approved, this change will increase our stormwater runoff and flooding. Provide incentives to keep stormwater on site.

If approved, this change will increase strain on aging infrastructure. Please make sure to use the additional tax revenue for infrastructure maintenance.

In Asheville topography has always made home building challenging. As everywhere, the easiest, most straightforward lots were built on earliest, leaving problematic lots, whether because of topography, geometry or drainage, to the future. Many of these lots we now have have such problems. Please require surveys for these lots in order to prevent trouble for builders, buyers or the community.

Overall, this discussion is a crucial one. And staff should be congratulated on how well they've organized background info and how hard they're working to invite community engagement. My only nitpick is that there doesn't seem to be recognition that, historically, urban neighborhoods accommodate a range of metrics (including setbacks, building heights, lot sizes, etc.), often depending on where they fit in a continuum from the densest urban core to the farther-out 'burbs, (The Transect, in New Urbanist terms). A lot of this discussion feels too focused on one-size-fits-all approaches for all city neighborhoods, regardless of where they fall in that urban-to-suburban continuum. Am I overstating that impression?

Again, discussions about the strain on infrastructure and social impact of so many people living within the city limits is the first point of discussion. Can and how will the City of Asheville handle this type of influx? We've seen too many examples of development within city limits with inadequate infrastructure considerations. Moving ahead like this is crazy.

The picture that you have shown (above right) shows required off street parking at 124 Montford Ave. It is within 1 mile of the CBD so no off street parking is required. It has a

huge flat open field next to it that the City of Asheville prevents any use of. They are not allowed to even remove a unit from the building and add one on the big empty wasted space and can not add a unit because it already exceeds zoning for allowed units. It is such a waste that big flat empty lot with all utilities available just blocks from down town can not be used in any way.

First, I highly recommend supporting more progressive kinds of housing - such as dorm-like living and co-operatively owned housing projects. These are inherently more affordable. Housing co-ops are quite common in NYC and dorm-living is becoming increasingly popular in places like SF and the bay area of California. Dorms could be designed with today's lifestyles in mind - many more people are single and childless (in part because their kids are grown and gone) and enjoy having the company of others around in shared common areas while also having ample private space.

I also strongly urge you to think more in terms of overall community development, versus just housing units. Most everyone agrees, "It takes a village to raise a child." Well how about creating small village centers within every larger neighborhood? Each village center could have small businesses (such as a cafe, grocery store, hardware store, sitting park, etc.) plus a community center - for neighborhood meetings and clubs, a day care, after school programs, senior programs, senior-student mentor programs, a library, etc. and a nearby community garden for people to grow their own food. It takes a village for people of every age, stage and ability to thrive.

Going beyond housing and into overall community development, please, please, please study and use Assets-Based-Community-Development (ABCD) strategies to support projects within neighborhoods. It has been shown that using city funds to help people improve their neighborhoods actually costs the city less, because it can leverage funds. Please read these two books. 1) *The Abundant Community: Awakening the Power of Families and Neighborhoods* by John McKnight and Peter Block (2010). 2) *Neighbor Power: Building Community the Seattle Way* by Jim Diers (2004). Both are about ABCD.

In addition to ABCD, it would be great to help each neighborhood (whether they currently have an HMO or not) to implement sociocracy aka Dynamic Self Governance - an organizational structure that would allow them to make decisions with lots of participation and equality. There are excellent local trainers for that, notably Diana Leafe Christian (diana.leafchristian@gmail.com). Using these two tools over time, just a few people within each neighborhood can be empowered to catalyze their neighborhoods of mostly strangers into caring, collaborative communities.

Once a neighborhood is organized and empowered by these two tools, it can co-create solutions to all kinds of local issues, from feeding families (via community gardens) to educating youth (via community-based learning programs that engage seniors), supporting seniors to stay in their homes longer, enhancing local economy, making life more walkable for all which increases health and reduces pollution as well as traffic, creating sharing solutions (sharing cars, having a tool-lending library, etc.). As the great systems thinker Margaret Wheatley said, "Whatever the problem, community is the answer."

Last, please consider contacting me about the group I volunteer for, Culture Change for Aging Network (CCAN-WNC) which is exploring how elders can Age in Community - by using these two tools (ABCD and Dynamic Self Governance) in such a way as to benefit all the generations. We are teaching a course this fall (for the 2nd time) at the UNCA Reuter Center (via the Osher Life-long Learning Institute or OLLI) called Aging in Community. While it's geared for older people, we see these folks as the "low hanging fruit" of potential catalyzers within their neighborhoods. While they are motivated to organize their multi-generational neighborhoods for their own benefit, clearly doing so would benefit everyone living there - for generations to come; truly a legacy worth giving.

Please require surveys of entire lots upon sale or subdivision. Locating the four corners of a lot is not sufficient. Surveys should locate slopes, water courses, culverts, trees over a certain size that should be flagged for preservation if possible.

Incentivize moving outside of the already full areas. Better, more reliable transport to outlying areas, it would ease the burden on utilities - which are already stretched in many places, more green space - which is at a premium in some areas and is too easily ignored by developers and cities in need of income.

Not only do we need better infrastructure, we also need regulation oversight. I live in a fairly new neighborhood in west asheville where residences aren't being built safely and there is no one to stop them.

The city needs to consider how homeowners can finance adding additional small units and multi-family units onto their existing property. It's not easy to get financing for small units, and many people don't have the funding to pay for it themselves, or to finance a duplex or triplex. Only big developers have that money. If the city is able to financially encourage (tax breaks) or provide financing for residents to add infill housing onto their property this will prevent AVL land from being eaten up by outside investors.

My biggest concern is making sure that these developments fit into the neighborhood and are not cheap, pre-fab buildings that will lower the property value. Will there be a department or group that will monitor and approve plans? I feel like the guidelines on the type and look of buildings need to be better explained for me to understand the benefits/disadvantages of this project.

smaller homes in general

Existing Planned Communities need to be grandfathered and need to be exempt from any new urban develop plan/ordinance change. Families made investments and relocated to these communities under an existing urban develop plan and existing planned community standards. This needs to be preserved.

Do not give our tax money to developers- they will build if it is profitable. We are growing as is.

The biggest item missing on your list has to do with lots where the placement of the primary residence on the lot limits further development. I would love to place two affordable homes on the back side of my lot, and there's sufficient space and access to

utilities. However, because my home is in the front of the lot in the middle of the property on the short dimension, there is no room to develop a "flag", "shotgun", or "pin" lot. I would need to be able to build a driveway that borders my neighbor to access the back side of my lot in order to provide access. If I granted that driveway to the city, then I wouldn't have enough property left to develop two homes.

They must all have porch swings and distribute ham sandwiches on Sunday

Yes! Especially in the chestnut hills and surrounding areas. Streets are tight with vehicles parked on both sides on many of them. And some streets have parking only on one side do to their size. I'm concerned if in these areas we allow for larger building and duplexes etc.. Not only does the building height/size effect the look of the neighborhood, there is just not enough room for more vehicles.

Rather than encouraging so much infill and subdividing of other properties, I would like to see the city take advantage of properties that are already available. For example, the Lee Walker Heights development should be redesigned to accommodate more housing units. Different types of buildings could be available including a multistory condominium building which would use less land. The development could further be distinguished by housing for seniors, housing for single people, and housing for families so that different structures are available to meet the needs of different people. For example, families might need more space around their homes for children to play while seniors might prefer peace and quiet and require less outdoor space for activity. The current Lee Walker Heights project is a poor use of valuable property.

Set up a trust fund for low-income | elderly | disabled existing homeowners to allow them to remain in their homes by providing low or no-cost loans for repairs & maintenance.

These are great bandaids but seem to miss the point that there is housing to be had...just not at rental prices that regular, working families can afford. It doesn't matter if my neighbor builds an extra 2br house on his land if he's going to charge \$1800/MO for it.

More detail needed. Who approves. Excessive detail like HRC requirements is too controlling

Thank you for considering all these different ways to allow people to build smaller homes on smaller lots. I strongly believe that urban infill is a much better option than developing open or wild lands. Thanks!

Again, I am not exactly clear on the correlation between neighborhood in filling and affordable housing. I would hate to see hastily built units constructed throughout our neighborhoods in order to cash in on Asheville's popularity, while ignoring the very real issues of affordability and environmental destruction. I am concerned that this plan might be opening doors to development that might later be regretted.

Move to anywhere USA if you want cookie cutter homes on postage stamp lots.

Shrinking lots reduce ability to buffer stream edges and maintain tree cover

Do these allow for the use/placement/development of tiny homes in Asheville? Allowing some tiny homes to be set up permanently would increase housing for a small segment of the population as well...

When the lot size reductions are considered for all cases listed above an additional consideration that should be applied to all the options is to require the homes and residential units meet green build energy reduction standards with HERS ratings of 60 or possibly a max of 70. This would be an inducement for property owners to minimize overall energy consumption even with the increased density. Check with the WNC Green Building Council they have great programs that reduce energy consumption.

If the city could offer incentives for maintaining mature tree canopy cover that would help mitigate the impact of increased density.

It would be great if the city could add some additional requirements in exchange for any of these allowances. For example, Greenbuilt NC silver level certification or better would be one way to make sure that the living units are going above the bare minimum in terms of environmental footprint, site sustainability, and liveability. If we're going to build more densely (and I think we should because it involves a lot of inherent efficiencies), making sure that building stock is sitting more efficiently on the site is important.

Raise taxes

Asheville needs more affordable housing, but it must come with some protections for existing neighborhoods and property owners. An onslaught of cheap, speculative development can destabilize neighborhoods and hurt the City's tax base. Providing code requirements to compensate for lost green space by adding neighborhood pocket parks financed with impact fees for developers or set asides in the city budget and non-voluntary design guidelines are provisions that would give residents more confidence that this magnitude of development can be properly managed. Other cities have these things. Why not us? How about building a trigger into the zoning code revisions that requires individually funded neighborhood infrastructure improvement funds be in place before the new code can be applied in a particular neighborhood. It can be funded by developers, the city, residents or any combination of the above.

Until the city becomes an investor in buying property like Kmart on Patton and building affordable housing at genuinely affordable levels, the crisis will continue. Use the bond money, and for God's sake make the stimulus big enough to make a meaningful difference. Market-based solutions by themselves aren't good enough. Asheville needs to be a model city for innovative solutions, not another mono-economy vulnerable to recessions.

I hope you are also discussing limiting tear downs to replace with multi family housing. Lots that currently hold one house may not have the municipal infrastructure to accommodate multiple units and there are traffic and parking considerations as well.

In fill is a great way to take advantage of existing infrastructure such as water, sewer, roads, schools, instead of having to extend these further out into undeveloped land. All in favor of this. Also in favor of smaller houses being built where possible as infill.

More residential concentration within Asheville is better than spreading out houses into land that should be orchards and farmland.

Of the many attractions that Asheville offers homeowners is the unique character that green space provides. Why is it that reducing that space is even being considered? Perhaps this is good for the developers and real estate businesses but for current property owners, who are interested in the long-term quality of life that they have purchased and are paying taxes to maintain, the continued trend of incrementally developing green spaces is certainly not what they have invested in nor are interested in perpetuating.

While reductions in lot requirements are a good idea, I feel the proposed changes are extreme.

The residential roads that have to bear the extra traffic because of the in-fill residences must be wide enough (not single lane, like many are) and well maintained.

I realize that Asheville's population is growing. The job of the City of Asheville's government should be to control that growth. The increase in housing density should not out pace the ability of our streets to comfortably handle the subsequent increase in traffic. I know that every new home built means more tax dollars for the city, and that probably trumps any other consideration, but cramming houses into any available space does not improve the quality of life here. No, I don't want the regulations changed to increase housing density even more.

New plans in Local historic districts should continue to be approved by the HRC. Asheville's historic districts need the context of the original designs and should not be compromised by density which alters architectural character. Open space in the landscape is also a design element.

Check into the ROI for infrastructure like sewerage, fire hydrants and water extensions. The increase in taxable base would in most cases payback the city for the installation in 1 year or less. We own property in City of Asheville limits that we plan to develop. The costs of these extensions cancelled a 6 unit townhomes project we had planned due to fixed costs/building costs exceeding market value for what the properties could be sold for.

Provide cash or in kind incentives (lower development and permitting fees) for builders/developers to build within lower price ranges, not reimbursements after completion.

FEE SIMPLE TOWNHOUSES!!! There seem to be limited opportunities for fee simple, attached dwelling types. Therefore, any duplex, triplex, quad, etc. is limited in it's marketability to investors purchasing a whole building, someone buying a condo (with limited self determination in maintaining/using the lot, exterior), or renters. The current situation (if I'm reading it correctly) cuts out anyone who would like to buy a townhouse on a piece of land they own. This is a very appealing option for people who want to buy, but either can't afford or don't want to maintain a large yard (i.e. empty nesters, millennials, those with more urban preferences, etc.). Buying a condo townhouse is

appealing to a much smaller percentage of people than a fee simple townhouse. In order to do this, the min. lot widths need to suit this building type (20-30 feet width) and the minimum lot size needs to be allowed to be parceled off into smaller sellable sizes: for example an 8,000 sf lot with a Quad to be divided into four 2,000 sf lots.

For sale, fee simple townhouses are the urban fabric of many great cities!

I own 12 rental properties in upstate SC. Smallest is 900 sq. ft. 2 BR / 2 bath. Rents for \$650 / mo. Could probably get more but have a good, long term tenant. Tenant would have to pay \$1,000 or more per month to rent the same property in Asheville. High housing cost coupled with low wages for service jobs will eventually kill the Asheville economy. How many hotel / restaurant workers does it take to rent a home in Asheville? Answer = too many!

I think this survey omits possible impact on green space, landscaping, trees, and wildlife. Also, there is little consideration of traffic, roads -- particularly where slopes, vegetation, and existing buildings often create blind spots. Adding more people and cars to an area will increase noise and pollution. The city should consider improving public transportation, so that people can easily commute from less crowded areas. If you add in off-street parking, then the lots will not have much green space.

Require passive solar and other smart, easy green building techniques, and require only low maintenance, no- water yards -- or require rainwater systems for yards that need water. Please don't require or encourage faux Arts and Crafts style or faux Victorian any other faux styles; they just look sad and second-rate--no matter how much they cost to build.

WHAT IS AN ASHEVILLE "FAMILY" ...? ? In North Asheville, we have homes not in compliance with Chapter 78, Code of Ordinances, Buncombe County: "Family means one or more persons occupying a single dwelling unit, provided that unless all members are related by blood or marriage,"

City of Asheville is somewhat more open...

+ Dwelling, single-family means a building arranged or designed to be occupied by one family.

+ Family: One or more persons living together and having common housekeeping facilities.

Infill housing and increased density is a great goal, but it will further burden an already strained infrastructure system. Sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes are simple things that will enhance pedestrian activity and safety. Mass-transit, shuttles, and other multi-modal transportation opportunities are essential - especially after increasing the number of houses in the City.

This city is overwhelmed with cars, with streets too narrow already to accommodate all of the off street parking that is occurring currently. Perhaps focus could be on ways to remedy this, improve infrastructure to allow safe biking, walking and some transit that might alleviate the need for cars. Be realistic. A unit in multifamily by code should require 2-3 parking spaces, not one... Until our City has a way to manage growth, traffic and parking, it seems it would be wise to pause before trying to infill and alter City lots.

Take a look at the majority of poorly constructed and poorly detailed homes being built in the City and multiply this with these changes...

I think new buildings should fit into the look and feel of an established neighborhood in terms of size and height, but we shouldn't limit a builder's ability to innovate and adopt more efficient practices like the use of alternative materials and energy infrastructure just because they haven't been done before. Planning for a more sustainable city is going to require questioning what's been done before. For example, parking is typically tucked behind a building to have it out of view, but this arrangement necessitates a driveway, which equates to hundreds of additional square feet of pavement per residence. Impermeable surfaces mean that groundwater isn't recharged at the natural rate and the city's wastewater systems are made to deal with storm water run-off. Reducing paved surfaces by allowing parking in front of residences, designing for shared driveways, or using permeable surfaces for parking would reduce the strain on city water infrastructure. Allowing (or requiring) smaller setbacks, front porches, and more diverse uses like home-based business uses could lead to more friendly communities as people spend more time outdoors and have more reasons to cross paths with their neighbors. Asheville should not let compatibility with historic norms get in the way of embracing the new green urbanism.

"Design" compatibility maybe misleading. Perhaps "Form" or "Scale" compatibility is more appropriate terminology. Compatibility for multifamily should be based on requirements that can be consistently enforceable - perhaps similar to form based code standards. Design compatibility for multifamily should not try to regulate more specific aesthetic standards or limit architectural styles. Unless in a historic district, roof styles, materials, traditional vs. modern architecture should not be regulated. A mix of styles in a neighborhood can add richness and character. Old and new architectural styles help tell the on going story of Asheville's development over the decades and generations. There are legal challenges to this in NC too:

<http://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/counties/wake-county/article10209266.html>

no increased density was one of the top things that neighborhoods that did Plan on a Page did not want, so we need to not allow short term and Adu's to be short term either. We also must think about using the Housing Trust fund to be used by residents that cannot afford to maintain the upkeep on their houses. What is happening in some neighborhoods close to town is that they are being forced to sell, the new owners are tearing down the old home and replacing it with over \$400,000 houses and gentrifying the older neighborhoods. WE must get creative without doing damage to the community we all cherish.

I believe garage apts and stand alone ADU's should be allowed in all residential districts in addition to attached basement apartments.

1. City staff indicated that the Flexible Development Ordinance would be eliminated in conjunction with these proposed changes. I believe some form of flexible development standards will still be needed to address unique situations. One example is to define how to allow subdivision of lots that front public streets on opposite ends (i.e., "through-lots"). Another example is how to address triangular-shaped lots that only contain three

sides.

2. The proposed changes are better than nothing. However, the net result will be subdivided lots developed almost exclusively with one, large single-family home per lot. I'll bet the proposed changes will result in zero new multi-family projects and fewer than 5 ADUs or duplexes (of which I intend to build 1 or 2 if reduced lot area allows me to subdivide my oversized lots).

3. The City loves to create yet another zoning change de jour, yet never creates a mechanism to assess if the changes made a difference. If you cannot tell if a change works, then you're just faking it, and wasting time and taxpayers' money in the process. Incorporate an assessment mechanism.

4. If the City really wants to incentivize multi-family development of the "missing-middle" type, then development of one single-family home per new subdivided lot must concurrently be dis-incentivized.

5. It makes sense that more than 2 residential units in a single building is classified as a multi-family development subject to commercial building code standards. But it does not make sense that more than 2 detached single-family residences on one parcel is interpreted as also being a commercial multi-family project, especially if they meet the minimum fire separation distances required for conventional one and two-family dwelling construction. For example, why must three tiny houses on a large lot be required to contain fire sprinkling systems just because three units on one parcel is considered a commercial project. That's just stupid! I encourage the City's Chief Building Code Official to request, or at least support, a formal interpretation from the North Carolina Department of Insurance on this topic.

There is so much development wealth and gentrification coming into this city at this very moment. It will not be a "burden" to build green, clean, and lean - it will be an opportunity that will still be very accessible to the wealth that is coming through. This is a time to *really step forward* to create - actually create, here and now - the incredible, progressive city that we really need ALL CITIES TO BECOME in order to move through the ecological crisis we are in.

I invite you to have the will to CREATE HERE AND NOW a new style where all new buildings are required to be ready for green grid access or environmental considerations.

Please consider making the Steep Slope Areas more development friendly.

The one size fits all guideline is very limiting.

Even if steep slopes guidelines were 20% more forgiving it would help.

Thank you

Reduce flag lot requirements in line with 20% reduction in area/frontage. Include flag area in the size of the lot to make it viable, along with reduced frontage width. This will make currently "land locked" lots more accessible for development.

Address the width dimensions for flag lots pro rata with the 20% reduction in lot size/frontage. Consider eliminating the size of the "flag" being eliminated from the lot size to encourage density.

I would need to study zoning categories, but the infill becomes a problem when homeowners are suddenly unexpectedly living amidst dwellers who are less grounded and more irresponsible about property and neighborliness. It's not the buildings as much as the tenants who create friction.

Entrances on separate facades of the building?

Had city hall not been asleep the last 3 years and had not allowed the city character to be overrun by developers, and actively preserved green spaces by modifying the UDO in areas where certain density criteria were met, things would be different. I suggest city hall support Asheville culture and character and stop over filling the city with development and road congestion with appropriate changes to the UDO. I suggest city council reconsider the current UDO and make new development slightly more difficult in areas with heavy density. I suggest city hall consider the impact of more density on road traffic. I suggest city hall reconsider the impact Asheville's recent stewards have made on our current culture, aka Julian Price, and ask themselves if they want it to be ruined by out of town developers looking for a buck versus locals looking to preserve and protect. Asheville will thrive with slow growth. Fast development leads to overheat and bad long term choices. Pull your heads into alignment with your heart and base.

I wholeheartedly support these proposals. My only recommended tweak, admittedly an esoteric one, would be to list the minimum lot sizes rounded to hundredths of an acre (not square feet) in the UDO, so as to be consistent with the way that Buncombe County Land Records lists lot size. In my opinion, this would reduce confusion and make the math, and hence the customer experience, simpler for those hoping to pursue infill.

We really really need to assess our ability to accommodate added density - look at streets, parking, water, trash pickup (and cart storage - lots of apts keep them on the street blocking traffic all week) stormwater (huge and growing problem) schools, police, fire, etc. etc.