



CURRENT REGULATION

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

COMMUNITY COMMENTS from October 20th

1 entrance placement:
may not have an entrance within 10 feet of a lot line

entrance placement:
allow an entrance within 10 feet of a lot line

window placement:
no windows on a second story other than clerestory windows on walls within 10 feet of a lot line that adjoins an SF-5 or more restrictive zone or use.

Like high window requirement; revised entrance requirement ok. Why? If this were one house, there would be no requirement. What about grandfathered structure w/ existing windows? This should be compatible as there are already flats within 10' that were not permitted in the Northfield neighborhood. Probably not necessary but seems fine. I don't think the window amendment is a good idea. There are other design solutions for privacy.

2 building separation:
at least 15 feet to the rear of the primary structure

building separation:
at least 10 feet **from** the primary structure

owner occupancy requirement:
may not be used as a Type 2 short term rental

Why 10'; why not 5'?
Why can't this be connected?
This is a good amendment - ADUs up front are often better for character preservation of neighborhoods.
Like the flexibility of siting while preserving neighborhood character.
Yes, 10' is what fire code says anyway.
Need more flexibility to accommodate all setbacks. Why is any separation required if it would help ADU placement within odd shaped lots. Not a safety issue (street access the same at existing houses).
Would love to see attached or internal units available to rent out. 10' is an improvement, but internals add some flexibility.
SF-3: no requirement for preserving trees under 19" caliper.
Why not (allow Type 2 STR)?
What about existing use as a short term rental?
A property with no alley means traffic between houses any time of day or night - if short term rental, increased noise and person traffic.

3 parking regulation:
2 off street spaces per dwelling unit (urban core reduction: 0.2 of full requirement)

parking regulation:
off street parking requirement for primary house per current code
accessory dwelling unit 550 square feet or less: 0 spaces
accessory dwelling unit > 550 square feet: 1 off street parking space

This is a positive step. How about removing parking for ADU of all sizes within 1/2 mile of TOD, core transit corridors or future CTC?
Determine parking spaces by Walkscore; more walkable=less spaces.
What about residential permit parking? Now we have 2 permits only per household.
Parking capacity analysis should be done on urban streets.
Square footage of an ADU is irrelevant. What matters is that occupant of ADU does not own a car, otherwise a space for the ADU occupant's car should be required.
Parking reduction should be a neighborhood opt in option.
Existing alleys in the avenues between Hyde Park and Northfield neighborhood have managed to park cars on the side of the alley with little difficulty. I support this amendment.

4 driveway regulation:
unless the second dwelling unit has vehicular access from a rear alley, it must be served by a paved driveway, and the portion of the driveway that crosses the front yard must be at least 9 feet and not more than 12 feet wide

driveway regulation:
eliminate driveway requirement, see parking requirement

The current driveway requirement disqualifies far too many lots, especially when trees are in the way.
Step in the right direction.
Yes, please! This is a good suggestion.
How does this work with driveway cut limits?
"Paved" driveway - change to pervious pavement.

other than in a driveway, parking is prohibited in the front yard

