

## Brookhaven Zoning Update

### Meeting Notes

January 21, 2016 Public Meeting

<b>Beginning discussion RE increasing range of housing options</b>
Difficult to consider additional housing options without addressing our traffic concerns
Support increasing housing options but only with sophisticated restrictions/standards
Minimum dwelling size should not be eliminated but could be more context-sensitive
We are concerned about density and traffic
The city seems to grant too many variances
Housing options and choice are good, but where?
Not concerned about dwelling size; market will dictate. We are concerned about any attempts to limit maximum size, however.
The housing options presented (townhouses, accessory dwelling units, cottage courts) are too ambiguous; need more information---what about green space, trees, traffic, density?
No support for eliminating minimum dwelling size regulations
Need project impact statements for traffic, schools, stormwater, trees

<b>Notes from comment cards and hand-written annotations on issue sheets</b>
Have you looked at current inventory of property types and how new zoning types would fit? If so, what? Where?
Changing acreage minimum to better fit the small parcel sizes in some zoning classifications, such as OCR.
Allowing detached garages with zero side and rear setbacks
Bed & breakfasts and small scale lodging.
How would eliminating minimum standards improve an area?
Assisted living in residential areas
I prefer mixed-use in main areas but more parking is needed and more infrastructure
Defining in the ordinance where in-law suites are allowed and if they are allowed under what criteria?
I would like the ordinance to address walkable city issues [such as connecting sidewalks; setbacks and pedestrian street lights, not just vehicular
Concerned the extra options would make dwelling density increase. In favor of the new options IF the transition idea is applied to the industrial side of the transition area not the neighborhood side.
No mobile homes
Work-live office
Process-public input/petition/appeals
Removing dwelling unit size restriction needs to be context sensitive (design overlay) to ensure that tiny houses are built in areas with much larger houses
TRAFFIC!!!!
We need an NPC system in place before approving any new housing options
Minimum dwelling size restrictions should be flexible based on the neighborhood context and green space
Green space, infrastructure, tree ordinances should be instrumental in zoning regulations
Zoning and development must work together

Please stop cookie cutter houses; houses should conform to site
Native vegetation-use certified arborist-ISA certified!
I would support any reasonable change to the zoning code
No do entirely support elimination of min. dwelling size restrictions
Need green space requirements for higher density housing to ensure parks and open space
Columbus has done good things
Should measure infill building height from predevelopment grade like DeKalb
Should have contextual infill standards (fit existing pattern)
Should require replace side setbacks with building separation requirements
Need minimum area standards for development, so that things are crammed in
How can we appeal building permits and other as of right matters within required time-frames when we don't know approval has been given? Feel like deck is stacked against us.

<b>End of Meeting Discussion RE Top 3 desires for this (zoning update) process</b>
TOP NEEDS: 1. Less Density 2. Less Variances 3. Less indifference to citizen desires
TOP NEEDS: 1. Deal with land development regulations/tree preservation before zoning 2. Impact statements for tree canopy and green space 3. Infrastructure planning 4. GIS of tree canopy
TOP NEEDS: 1. Embrace opportunities that come with increased density 2. Smart approach to growth and development
TOP NEEDS: 1. More process (with clear standards and criteria) 2. More urban means need for more urban [amenities] and relief 3. Should be able to add conditions
TOP NEEDS: 1. Deal with traffic 2. Preserve neighborhood character 3. Better communication
TOP NEEDS: 1. Less Density 2. Less Variances 3. Less indifference to citizen desires
TOP NEEDS: 1. Less Density 2. Less Variances 3. Less indifference to citizen desires