

Single-Family Amendments

The following amendments intend to restore the current Comprehensive Plan's treatment of single-family neighborhoods, to

- Generally affirm the value of single-family residential
- Retain its conventional definition as a type where density is integral to its character. This doesn't prescribe a specific density, as lot sizes vary in different neighborhood, but it rejects the notion that single-family character is adequately captured by building size.
- Adhere to a general notion of single-family that means what it says – one household, on a lot.
- Allow single-family to remain unmolested within urban villages. Upzones may occur, where indicated by neighborhood plans, but initial urban village boundaries in many cases included large areas of single-family, and general “one size fits all” urban village upzones without reference to neighborhood plans comes at the expense of significant compromise to the character of these neighborhoods.

Amendment	Discussion
<p>1. Amend goal LU G7 LU G7 Provide opportunities for detached single family and other compatible housing options that have low height, bulk, and scale in order to serve a broad array of households and incomes and to maintain an intensity of development that is appropriate for areas with limited access to services, infrastructure constraints, fragile environmental conditions, or that are otherwise not conducive to more intensive development.</p> <p><u>Preserve and protect low-density, single-family neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious surface can be limited.</u></p>	<p>Restore current plan LUG8 and LUG9. The current language better expresses majority public opinion regarding single-family.</p>

Amendment	Discussion
<p><u>Preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences and displacement of residents, in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing opportunities throughout the city. The character of single-family areas includes use, development, and density characteristics.</u></p>	
<p>2. Amend LU 7.1 LU 7.1 Designate as single-family residential areas those portions of the city that are predominantly developed with single-family houses and that are large enough to maintain a consistent residential character of low height, bulk, and scale over several blocks <u>low-density development pattern.</u></p>	<p>Restore current plan's concept of single-family.</p>
<p>3. Amend LU 7.2 LU 7.2 Use a range of single-family zones to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintain the current low height and low bulk character <u>density and character</u> of designated single-family areas; • protect designated single family areas <u>protect areas of the lowest intensity of development</u> that are predominantly in single-family residential use or that have environmental or infrastructure constraints; • ... 	<p>Restore current plan's concept of single-family.</p>
<p>4. Delete LU 7.3 LU 7.3 Consider allowing redevelopment or infill development of single family areas inside urban centers and villages, where new development would maintain the low height and bulk that characterize the single family area, while allowing a wider range of housing types.</p>	<p>Urban village boundaries were not initially drawn with the publicly stated intention to fill them with increased density. Rezones to higher density uses should follow the same process whether inside urban villages or outside.</p>
<p>5. Amend LU 7.5 LU 7.5 Encourage <u>Permit</u> accessory dwelling units and other housing types that are attractive and affordable to a broad range of households and incomes and that are</p>	<p>LU 7.5 addresses accessory dwelling units, as an exception allowed within single-family standards. That exception should not be the rule, and it should not be extended to an unspecified assortment of other housing types.</p>

Amendment	Discussion
<p>compatible with the development pattern and building scale in single-family areas.</p>	
<p>6. Add new policy LU 7.13 <u>LU 7.13 Permit rezones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when all of the following conditions are met:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.</u> • <u>the rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.</u> • <u>the rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas.</u> • <u>the rezone procedures are followed.</u> 	<p>Restore LU59 from current plan, requiring conformance with Neighborhood Plans.</p>
<p>7. Amend LU 8.1 LU 8.1 Designate as multifamily residential areas those places that either are predominantly occupied by multifamily development, or are within urban centers or urban villages <u>where an adopted neighborhood plan indicates that a multifamily zone is more appropriate.</u></p>	<p>Restore sense of policy LU75 from current plan. Refer to neighborhood plans rather than call for blanket upzone of lower density uses in urban villages.</p>
<p>8. Delete H 3.5 Allow additional housing types in areas that are currently zoned for single-family development inside urban villages; respect general height and bulk development limits currently allowed while giving households access to transit hubs and the diversity of goods and services that those areas provide.</p>	<p>While it is a foregone conclusion that some currently single-family areas within urban village boundaries will be changed to accommodate higher density, this should be done by normal rezones, not by changing single-family standards within urban villages.</p>