Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES AND COMMENTS

As a follow-up to the previous survey in summer 2018, survey participants were asked for their thoughts on specific portions of proposed rule changes under Expanding Housing Choice. Participants chose whether they believed the proposed changes were the right direction or the wrong direction, or if they were uncertain.

Survey participants gave a fuller picture of their thoughts on the proposed changes in their comments. In general, respondents are open to allowing more density and appreciate the added flexibility and options that these changes would provide. However, it is important to them to preserve the aspects of their neighborhoods, like green space and trees, an ability to get around easily, and aesthetic character, that provide a high quality of life and make Durham, Durham.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

In general, the majority of survey respondents are supportive of accessory dwelling units (ADUs); however, there are a variety of opinions on the best way to implement them. In terms of ADU size, there are more respondents who would like to see the maximum allowed size increase than decrease; others are more concerned about site specifics and the size of the ADU relative to the existing home or lot. They see ADUs as a good way to increase density and would like the process of building one to be easier for homeowners. Those who are more skeptical cite concerns about parking, traffic, and other infrastructure, as well as green space, the aesthetic and character of the neighborhood, and context sensitivity; for example, some respondents expressed a preference for ADUs not to be visible from the street. These concerns are echoed in other questions and could be considered proxy concerns for density in general. There are mixed views on the impact of ADUs on housing affordability in Durham; while some think increasing the supply of housing will increase affordability, others expect the benefits to accrue only to homeowners or the wealthy.

Revise the allowable size limit for ADUs from 30% of the primary structure (a house, for example) to a maximum size of 800 square feet.



112 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Allow lots with duplexes to have up to one Accessory Dwelling Unit.



108 respondents

Allow a detached ADU to the side of the house, but only along the back or last 1/4 of the house (see example Area "D" on the diagram) while maintaining required setbacks.



68 respondents

Allow ADUs to be built on existing residential non-conforming lots, so long as all other standards are met.



97 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Duplexes

Respondents are mostly open to the idea of adding more duplexes. Those who support the idea expect that this will increase housing supply and density, although, similar to ADUs, there is uncertainty regarding their potential impact on housing affordability. Respondents are concerned that green space may become less prevalent and accessible, and that more residents in less space will create parking shortages; additional support for public transit is suggested. Where survey participants are less certain is around nonconforming lots and separate duplex structures. Some are concerned that lot sizes are too small, and there is a lack of clarity on how separate-structure duplexes are distinct from two separate houses and why they should be regulated differently.

Allow duplexes in all Residential Urban (RU) zoning districts.



99 respondents

Allow duplexes in all Residential Suburban (RS) zoning districts in the Urban Tier.



97 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Adjust the lot dimensional and setback standards of duplexes to be the same as single-family houses, including a reduced minimum lot area.



95 respondents

Allow duplexes to be built on non-conforming lots that are at least 30 feet wide, and were platted prior to 2006 (the year the zoning ordinance was adopted).



97 respondents

Allow the two units of a duplex to be in separate structures.



66 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Allow duplexes as a housing type within a cluster or conservation subdivision.



66 respondents

Lot Dimensions and Density

Participants are less favorable to these proposed changes. While most are not opposed to density per se, there are concerns about the impacts of increased density on impervious surface and runoff, green space, and trees. Other concerns seen before, like parking shortages, showed up again in this category. However, the majority of respondents stated that this is the right direction, and many support density in and of itself, while others are supportive as long as their concerns are addressed. Some point out that smaller lots were more common at previous points in Durham's history.

Incrementally reduce the minimum lot area across all residential zoning districts (except RS-20) in the Urban Tier.



94 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Adjust minimum lot widths across all residential zoning districts (except RS-20) in the Urban Tier.



90 respondents

Increase maximum densities in residential zoning districts in the Urban Tier.



90 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Small House/Small Lot

Survey respondents are supportive of this option, citing more efficient land use and more flexibility in housing options. The same caveats seen throughout the responses apply here as well. Respondents want to make sure adequate tree canopy and green space are provided, especially with regard to small houses on flag lots.

Create a new Small House housing type, allowable on a small (minimum 2,000 square foot lot) that would be limited in size to 1,200 square feet (with a building footprint of 800 feet), and 25 feet tall.



91 respondents

Allow the Small House/Small Lot housing type in all residential zoning districts in the Urban Tier (with the exception of the RS-20 district) and in the RU zoning districts in the Suburban Tier.



89 respondents

Allow a “Small House” to be built on a flag lot with a minimum flag pole width of 12 feet.



91 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Infill Standards

Participants had more difficulty parsing these questions and in many cases were unsure how to react. Those who commented were principally interested in tree, driveway, and height requirements. Respondents are largely in favor of the proposed tree standards, although some would like to see shifts such as requiring or encouraging more native trees. Some participants suggest removing parking minimum requirements or height limits. Others are concerned about the impact of tall buildings on neighboring homes.

Require at least one tree must be planted or preserved to the rear of the primary structure, in addition to required street trees.



92 respondents

Limit driveways (Vehicle Use Areas) to 12 feet wide, but allow expansion up to 24' wide to accommodate garage access or parking under the following conditions: Limit driveways (Vehicle Use Areas) to 12 feet wide, but allow expansion up to 24' wide to accommodate garage access or parking under the following conditions:

- It is behind the front building line;
- it is further than 20 feet from the front property line, and;
- the parking area does not exceed 400 square feet.



89 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Maintain current height limitations but remove the 25-foot distance exemption.



86 respondents

Remove minimum lot width standards from the Infill section. Default back to base zoning district standards for minimum lot width.



86 respondents

Apply the Infill Standards to property zoned RU in the Suburban Tier.



55 respondents

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

FULL SURVEY COMMENTS

Survey respondents gave a fuller picture of their thoughts on this project in their comments. Comments are presented here as received.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Revise the allowable size limit for ADUs from 30% of the primary structure (a house, for example) to a maximum size of 800 square feet.

- It seems like we'd still need rules about the amount of impermeable surface allowed for stormwater control though.
- ADUs are not a good idea and making them almost as lords as a smaller house is a terrible idea for a neighborhood.
- I think current builders and developers in Durham have been allowed to completely abuse this ADU idea and have been ungoverned by anyone in the city that gives a damn they are tearing houses down to build double occupancy lots etc. It’s not an answer at all for affordable housing. It will mean more AirBNBs and that’s about it.
- As a local REALTOR I think this a super idea and will open up options for many owners and renters!
- Our older neighborhoods have big yards and, sometimes, small houses. I agree with adding more housing should the homeowner so desire
- Allow people to build more!
- Making ADUs easier to fit onto properties in a way that makes them attractive and simpler to develop is a good thing for Durham, particularly in increasing the housing stock and fighting gentrification. Additional actions by the City to reduce fees is also needed.
- We absolutely need more ADUs. They have to be made simpler to build. Those on staff and commissions need to understand all of the challenges to getting these built. Unfortunately those who make and govern the policies don't have any experience with the rules.
- More housing is better!
- This will be a wonderful change. It will make housing in Durham more affordable and provide the density necessary to support neighborhood amenities and public transit.

Allow lots with duplexes to have up to one Accessory Dwelling Unit.

- A limit on size here is more appropriate as there are already two dwellings on the lot
- Adding density is the right direction, especially when there are creative options in existing multifamily units.
- Adding duplexes and 2 ADUs is a big increase in density in single family neighborhoods and may not be appropriate on all lots. City Council should continue to vote on these.
- ADUs should be encouraged wherever possible, including on properties with duplexes.
- Again, this is a wonderful change that will make Durham a more delightful and affordable place.
- Also a great idea!
- Duplexes are already “dense” and don’t need more density for those houses. Think about issues with parking on the street for example. But other issues exist.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- Fourplexes city-wide please!
- Generally I would think that duplexes sharing a small property aren't going to benefit from a third residence on that same property especially when considering parking and access to the property. This could be a viable option but public transit would need to be vastly improved before a true benefit would be had.
- I don't know of anywhere in Durham where there are multiple dwelling units that have an abundance of parking. I think this, along with the stress of overburdening our already strained water treatment system need to be addressed PRIOR to opening the floodgates to new, needed and wonderful housing options. We DO need more housing, but these issues MUST be addressed BEFORE allowing all the new growth. Plans for some parking and alterations to that water treatment facility on E. Club absolutely need to get addressed. City council members have been made aware of the water treatment facility issues and the problem persists. The infrastructure cannot handle our population as it stands now. Who wants to smell the sewer 24/7? To continue with this growth push without addressing these issues is irresponsible. Perhaps building a new facility further out into the county would open up enough land space to build a few new high rise buildings to offset both the cost of building the new facility, generating income for the city all while providing a responsibly engineered high density housing area. If you take into a count all the land being used for the landfill AND the wastewater treatment facility off of the E. Club area. It is freeway close, which minimizes road widening/infrastructure concerns. It does require considerable costs, I'm certain, in moving the wastewater treatment facility, but that gets offset by the needed upgrades that exist currently and will inevitably increase with proposed growth. The revenue generated by the sale of those properties and the future tax revenues combine to further offset the costs of moving, expanding and improving the wastewater facilities. If we somehow merge the moving of both the sewage and runoff water facilities into that move further beyond the city limits (into the county) that would open up the area near the golf course for additional housing that could help lure DUMC staff to live close by, further decreasing traffic flow issues on our infrastructure. DUMC staff and Duke students alike could take a DUKE bus to school & work (certainly the university would pay that cost as they are continuously expanding the campus and parking for both staff & students is becoming scarce.

  This population movement might offer new spaces for development & growth in those areas opened by that migration, or at least open those existing units for housing. It ALL hinges on that much needed movement of the wastewater treatment facility which is in a very high need of upgrade/improvement regardless of whether the population of Durham further increases or not (which, by all predictors, it WILL grow substantially.)
- I think parking and traffic would need to be assessed on a more case-by-case basis before putting three units on one lot. I think lot size would make a difference too.
- I think this depends on the neighborhood and the type of duplex. I certainly wouldn't want to see an ADU added to a lot with a duplex if the duplex is non-conforming w/current zoning.
- If a property already has a duplex, the residents are fine with sharing the lot with others already. I think this is a good use of multi-family space.
- If there is space on the lot, it is ok to increase density as long as there other amenities are retained (such as greenspace and trees). What would you do with parking?
- Only if the lot is at least 1/4 acre in size. A major reason many of us want to live in residential neighborhoods (and not apartments or downtown condos) is green space. A duplex (say 2000 sq ft in size) + an ADU of 800 sq ft is a large footprint. I wouldn't want to live in this if it was on less than 1/4 acre (or at least 8000 sq ft) lot.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- People need green space too.
- Right Direction, not far enough. Progressive leaders are looking at Duplexes allowing 2 ADUs.
- Same comment on the importance of making it easier to add units in a way to fit with neighborhoods.
- Sure, why not? Still doesn't help lower income people who want to buy a home though.
- The more housing the cheaper things will get for us all!
- YES! We should encourage, by-right, development of smaller units such as ADU's in each place we can.

Allow a detached ADU to the side of the house, but only along the back or last 1/4 of the house (see example Area "D" on the diagram) while maintaining required setbacks.

- 5.4.2 .B.5 already allows ADU within the primary dwelling.
- ADUs like put up in Trinity Park are great. They are in the back of the property.
- Allowing more design options encourages siting and use of funds, space, and materials that is more efficient and effective.
- Another terrific improvement!
- I don't understand this diagram.
- I like the expansion of design opportunity.
- I think we should also look at the setback requirements. Many times these inhibit building an ADU. We also should remember that the people building these units are the home owners. Rarely does a developer build ADU's in new development.
- I would wonder if this configuration would encourage people to turn the front yard into a parking lot
- If all the affected neighbors sign off on it due to privacy & parking concerns.
- If we go in this direction we'll want to ensure that ADUs on the sides of homes adhere to an aesthetic standard that celebrates the original home's architecture. Carrboro has handled this nicely.
- Keep ADU to the rear. Side x side might impact neighbors' views of a lake, pond, bucolic setting.
- Sure, why not? Still doesn't help lower income people who want to buy a home though.
- The shape of the lot and of the house are a better criteria as to the location of the ADU in relationship of the house.
- This actually helps allow the possibility of more "yard" in the back... often ADUs are built on top of garages, many of which sit to the sides of houses. It would allow open space to the side and rear, vs an ADU that takes up 3/4 of a backyard.
- This will visually change the look of the house from the street. Keeping the rule to have ADUs in the back will hide the ADU
- Wouldn't this be considered an attached ADU?

Allow ADUs to be built on existing residential non-conforming lots, so long as all other standards are met.

- Absolutely the right way to go. Thanks for helping make this happen.
- Again, the setbacks are often times an issue. I don't think we even need setbacks. There are so many examples in Denver, where the ADU is built right on the rear property line where it meets the alley. Nothing wrong in that case.
- Agreed that this is a good step.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- Ah now this is tougher. What I have seen in the past is that if two adjacent, non-conforming (small) lots are owned by the same person, then a third unit can be added, straddling the yards. Because, again, there needs to be room for landscape.
- An absurd number of residential lots and buildings are non-conforming. This is the result of a half-assed overlay of a suburban tool onto an urban grid. The solution is to allow more building on non-conforming lots by right, or revert to earlier zonings that allowed constructions.
- As long as environmental impact and building codes are met I don't see an issue with allowing ADUs to be built anywhere
- It would depend on the degree to which the lot is non-conforming.
- Not sure what you mean about non-conforming lots. If it means a lot that isn't exactly a certain size, that is potentially OK, but how the lot is non-conforming makes a difference.
- Should be a neighborhood or HOA decision.
- Sure, why not? Still doesn't help lower income people who want to buy a home though.
- There are lots of ways that a lot can be non-conforming. I think this would depend on the particulars of why the lot is non-conforming.
- This is another simple way to allow added units in ways that fit the existing residential context

What additional comments do you have regarding Accessory Dwelling Units?

- As stated above, this helps landlords and wealthy homeowners rather than lower income aspiring homeowners. It's not bad, it's just not a complete fix and I worry this does nothing to fight gentrification.
- Can we approve plans that would be permitted by-right so small/family contractors could more easily build them?
- Experience in Portland, OR and other places has shown that it is also essential to reduce/eliminate utility connection and other fees, when an existing unit is on the same lot. Also, the City should advertise and create a contact person to advise property owners on ADU development.
- I like their flexibility. It will be interesting to see how Durham residents/owners respond to the opportunity.
- If these were easier to get approved with less strict setback requirements as proposed here, more owners would upgrade them and use as lower cost rental units
- In general they are a good idea. The devil is in the details.
- Increasing density will create parking problems on established residential streets. We have a house that was rehabbed probably illegally- that has an ADU in the house creating a de facto duplex. The owner then added a garage with an apartment above (no kitchen so it doesn't count) that is rented to another tenant. All the units collectively own 5 cars that park on the street taking up other owners' space.
- Keep up with the great improvement in the codes!
- More ADUs is good for Durham and can help bring down housing costs. The council should support any change to increase the number of ADUs.
- Great idea as long as existing neighbors cannot cite a reasonable argument against it. Some areas can handle the parking needs and have little impact on others. Those spaces are ideal. Perhaps mitigation requirements such as tree/shrub planting to blend the area into the existing environment should be included in these plans.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- Unless you have a third or half an acre, 800 sq. ft. is too huge for city lots. Building onto the side of the house is likely better than the back yard if the occupant is a stranger just renting for a few days.
- We need 1000s of them. Every citizen who owns a home and cares about affordable housing should build one.
- Agree with these principles and the idea of making it as easy as possible for people to build ADUs on their property
- Concerns over cost to buyer/renter. Reducing amount of property I can pay for without reducing price.
- Consequence of additional ADU's on street traffic and parking. I'm particularly concerned about increasing street traffic in neighborhoods with a lot of children and few sidewalks.
- I am hopeful that in addition to these good changes, which will allow and hopefully encourage ADUs, Durham can also provide some incentives for homeowners to create and maintain ADUs as affordable housing.
- It's hard to make one ruling for all ADUs all over Durham. There are a lot of factors, such as changes to house numbers on the street. (Do all the numbers change, you add an A to the house number or what?) The size of the property is also important, as is space for parking,, setback space, distance between the ADU and the next house over, etc.
- Would need to ensure that we still retain trees and greenspace, and that these ADUs do not convert lawns and gardens into parking areas.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Duplexes

Allow duplexes in all Residential Urban (RU) zoning districts.

- I don't mind duplexes however I do not feel that duplexes will be cheaper if built in sought after land. This is not making housing more affordable. The zoning laws should not be made easier.
- A gradual increase of density will occur. Good.
- Absolutely. Triplexes should also be considered!
- Allowing more by-right development will result in cheaper homes. The likelihood of more duplexes will also increase. Good job!
- Also include up to quad-plexes.
- Duplexes allow for more aging in place
- Duplexes are ok but converting a house into a duplex is wrong. It should have a hallway dividing it. I lived in two different homes like that for many years. I heard all noise and every comment the people who shared it with me even though we had different entrances and addresses. The illegal immigrants who lived in my house where I was there first. They stalked me. Murdered my showcat. Our attics adjoined so when I wasn't home they came in my house thru my side of the attic and stole things. Neighbors saw them in there because I left my curtains open. They caused noise that I called police every night. They harassed me. Wrecked into me. Had fifty illegals living in the attic. We lived in same house that basically had no hall way dividing it. They wanted me to move so they could bring in their family on my side. I then moved across the street and same scenario. So no houses shouldn't be called a duplex just because there are two different doors and different addresses. It was a nightmare and why would the City of Durham allow a house like that to be called a duplex? That law needs to change and the house declared one house. Calling it a duplex is a money hungry option from a landlord.
- Duplexes should be an option throughout the city. They increase affordability and reduce sprawl.
- Fourplexes all over the Urban Tier (all over the city!)
- How can I even see what that "green" area looks like? Puh-leeze. If Durham zoning allows developers & contractors in--they will have Durhamites living atop each other & they will charge buyers or renters outrageous prices. Some realtors/realty firms are selling single townhomes for $200K+--a more than $60K jump in price.
- I have no issues with duplexes. As long as they are built in an attractive manner, and with some attention to providing adequate privacy for people on both sides of the unit, they can be as attractive as a home. I do feel that parking becomes a bigger issue, especially in an urban environment. I also feel the size lot needed to accommodate a duplex shouldn't be less than 8000 sq feet.
- I have no objection to duplexes, per se. However, in practice duplexes tend to be more renter occupied rather than owner occupied. So I am not sure allowing more duplexes will help neighborhood stability.
- I support duplexes on existing lot sizes only, not if lot dimensions are made smaller.
- If we go in this direction, let's be sure that duplexes have welcoming facades. Karen Parolek's talk on multi-unit housing addressed this well.
- Love duplexes as long as their parking is INCLUDED on the lot and not adding to street congestion.
- Sure, why not? Still doesn't help lower income people who want to buy a home though.
- This is a critical and compatible way of making better use of underused land within residential areas.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- This is the historical form of affordable housing. It's embarrassing we ever banned them. As a preservationist, I thank the city for re-allowing them.
- Triplexes and quadruplexes should also be allowed.
- While I agree creating more affordable home ownership options is important we have to remember that with great population density comes a far greater need for established and effective public transit options. It's not feasible to fit 2 families and their vehicles in every corner of Durham not to mention road quality and maintenance.
- Why not?

Allow duplexes in all Residential Suburban (RS) zoning districts in the Urban Tier.

- Again, if the parking is INCLUDED within the lot boundaries.
- Depends on the size of the property.
- Duplexes are mostly an urban tool, but it wouldn't hurt to allow them elsewhere.
- I support duplexes in existing lot sizes only, not if lot dimensions are made smaller.
- No blanket permissions. Residents should be allowed to oppose urban SPRAWL.
- Sixplexes would be better.
- Sure, why not? Still doesn't help lower income people who want to buy a home though.
- While I agree creating more affordable home ownership options is important we have to remember that with great population density comes a far greater need for established and effective public transit options. It's not feasible to fit 2 families and their vehicles in every corner of Durham not to mention road quality and maintenance.
- With the same qualifiers noted above
- Yes in the Urban Tier. Yes in all tiers.
- Yes! And triplexes!

Adjust the lot dimensional and setback standards of duplexes to be the same as single-family houses, including a reduced minimum lot area.

- A way to build a lot of cheap dense housing so low income people can still live in Durham. I'm for it!
- As long as the same scale is kept as for single family homes this seems like a good idea
- I don't even know why we have setbacks. Again, we can look at much older cities to see homes built on the lot line (or very close). People have lived in those homes for many decades.
- I find the wording on this change unclear. We should encourage the construction of duplexes if the proposed rules increase the number of places where duplexes can be built than they should be supported.
- I support duplexes in existing lot sizes only, not if lot dimensions are made smaller.
- I think that the builder should have the opportunity to build a larger duplex then single family home as a way to encourage this type of build
- It is more important to focus on form based regulations rather than use. This is in the right direction.
- Larger setbacks may just happen through design as a result of access decks, exterior stairs and so on. But let it happen out of function, not regulation.
- Leave as is.
- Marginally reduce them

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- Need space for both families to be able to access and enjoy the outdoors. If this is not done within each property, then it should be done by the developer giving park space to the community
- Seems like there might need to be some nuance here, such as taking into account space for parking and traffic impacts, as well as access to greenspaces. If the lot is smaller, but you have twice as many people, folks are going to park in the yard/make the whole lot paved, which affects stormwater runoff and space for outdoor play for kids.
- The more duplexes the better!
- This seems OK. The building structure would still allow for a 25 ft back yard. I do wonder how many people would be interested in living in a 750 sq foot duplex (1/2 the 1500 sq foot one) for more than a few years. I don't think duplexes on lots of this size, should be allowed to have an ADU.
- Yes, good move.

Allow duplexes to be built on non-conforming lots that are at least 30 feet wide, and were platted prior to 2006 (the year the zoning ordinance was adopted).

- I support duplexes in existing lot sizes only, not if lot dimensions are smaller. Some lots are too small to support an ADU.
- It is important to respect development rights and historic context of lots in order to promote infill and fight gentrification.
- More!
- This is too small for a duplex. You are potentially doubling the number of cars and people in this space.
- Yes, by even narrower lots should be allowed. Look at the new neighborhood, Pinewood Forest, south of Atlanta across from Pinewood movie studios. Many of their best-selling houses are on lots less than 30 ft. wide.
- Yes. Stop banning housing. Start allowing housing. That seems like a good idea in a housing crisis.

Allow the two units of a duplex to be in separate structures.

- A lot with 2 separate duplexes and an ADU is a lot that has 3 separate houses on it. That would not look visually appealing in most neighborhoods. No information was provided about the maximum size of these 2 separate duplex houses. If each can be 1200 sq feet plus an 800 sq ft ADU on a typical 7500 sq ft lot, that is too dense.
- Allowing flexibility in infill to respect the context and wishes of property owners is a good thing.
- As long as there is adequate garden space. There ALWAYS has to be green space.
- Current rules OK.
- Depends a lot on how this is built. Can something like this be built both affordably and in a manner that allows separate space. It also means that yet again, the lot size needs to be big enough. An 1/8 acre lot shouldn't have 2 houses on it--that's what you're essentially creating. Also, how large would each unit be? How is this different from 2 small houses?
- Don't think this is the best choice. Takes up more of the lot, leads to more impervious surfaces, less energy efficient. But if designed right, could work well and I do not think it should be prohibited.
- How is this a duplex if there are separate structures?
- How is this different from a primary house with an ADU? Would this enable two GIANT houses on one lot? If so, I'm not in favor...

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- I like this idea. It can lead to more appealing housing options that fit well in certain neighborhoods. However, I don't see how it improves affordability.
- More housing is a good thing. It helps everyone. Diversity in housing is what makes a city so cool. There's no reason why this can't happen
- Of course, why not?
- The more homes the better!
- This is fine but all of these proposals seem to benefit landlords and wealthy homeowners. Don't we want lower income households to be able to buy a home too?
- Two 20x44 Townhouses take up identical impervious surfaces whether they are attached or detached. You are right that the design is what makes these great (which is the true of Single Family homes as well).
- With adequate code requirements that take impervious surfaces and efficient design into account this would be a step in the right direction
- Would this just make it two different houses built on one lot?; This would be two different houses instead of a duplex and should be regulated as such

Allow duplexes as a housing type within a cluster or conservation subdivision.

- Only attached and not detached duplexes for this type of subdivision.
- Definitely. Look at Ross Chapin's book Pocket Neighborhoods. Duplexes would fit in perfectly.
- Yes. Until we have some, we won’t have the knowledge to know what works and what doesn't. Are there currently any duplexes in conservation districts? Why would we ban something prior to having any positive or negative experience with it?

What additional comments do you have regarding duplexes?

- All the same initiatives should be adopted for triplexes!
- Duplexes are a great way to start to provide more affordable, diverse options. We should also encourage triplexes, quadruplexes and other shared living situations.
- Duplexes are an important part of the mix. Many of our historic neighborhoods were developed organically with all of these housing types sprinkled among single family houses, and it makes for a healthier, more diverse and more interesting community. I think it's silly that in many places where these housing types currently exist, they would not be allowed to be rebuilt if they were destroyed. I think we do have to be careful though about the incentives created in a booming market economy when we allow everything everywhere. Every smallish/oldish house outside of existing local historic districts will be in the crosshairs for demolition and speculative redevelopment with as many units as can fit. This is incredibly wasteful and will hasten the erosion of character that makes many of Durham's urban neighborhoods so desirable. Older smaller single family houses are a needed and desired part of the mix too.
- I live in East Durham, one of the areas where duplexes are currently allowed. It feels stigmatizing that they aren't allowed in more affluent neighborhoods. I think the option should be available in all neighborhoods, and people who live in duplexes shouldn't feel like that is a lower class option. At the same time, I do think we need careful attention to ensuring traffic and parking is planned for and that stormwater runoff is considered. In my neighborhood, a lot of duplexes have their whole yard paved to allow for parking, since there's no room in the

driveway for both houses, or people park in the grass and it turns into a mudpit. Either way, the duplexes often end up looking run down (and the slum lord owners don't keep up with the property anyway), all of which furthers the bad image of the duplex.

- I think it's a great start! Could be four or six-plexes though and that would be better because we need MORE HOMES in Durham!
- I think it's time Durham adopts a variety of housing options, as we grow as must adapt to what other larger cities use without losing our character
- This is a huge concern. If this results in more pavement and more flooding, then it is an issue
- Agree with having a larger variety of housing choices and more shared open spaces
- While I agree allowing more and more affordable housing options is important they would need to be offset by greater availability and access to green spaces and means to access those green spaces by means of and effective public transit.
- Allowing duplexes everywhere is great. I also would love to see triplexes, quadplexes and multiunit apartment buildings throughout all Durham's neighborhoods. I don't feel these types of buildings negatively affect neighborhood character (I also don't think preserving "neighborhood character" is a top priority when inadequate housing leading to displacement is a social justice issue, and these multi-unit buildings should be prioritized even when there are concerns about change to neighborhood character). There are plenty of very nice apartment buildings among single-family homes in historic Durham neighborhoods.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Lot Dimensions and Density

Incrementally reduce the minimum lot area across all residential zoning districts (except RS-20) in the Urban Tier.

- And why would you suddenly protect those zoned RS-20?
- You can add alternative housing units without changing lot sizes.
- Durham used to build homes on smaller lot. In recent years, there has been a steady increase in minimum lot sizes not necessary for healthy neighborhoods. Limited reductions to current lot minimums is good move and a return to earlier views and wisdom.
- If on you similarly reduced the housing foot print, allowing for more vertical expansion. Increased flooding in this area is already predicted from climate change. This proposal could increase flooding even more if we continue to increase the proportion of impervious surface in urban areas.
- If we are allowing more dwelling units on a lot, we should not also decrease the size of a lot since that would be too much density with hardly any grass / yard space and too many roof tops and driveways that would increase runoff and further flood the overtaxed storm drain system. In addition water and sewer lines would need to be increased in size to handle additional capacity, and street parking may become even more over-crowded than it already is. Increasing density from 1 DU in RU-5 for example on a typical 7500 sq ft lot to 3 DU with a duplex and ADU is already tripling density. If a 7500 sq ft lot divided into 2 lots each of which is now allowed up to 3 DU (duplex and ADU on each subdivided lot) we have now increased density by a factor of 6 --going from 1 DU per 7500 sq ft to 6 DU per 7500 sq ft. Since six 7500 sq ft lots are approx 1 acre, under this scenario, the maximum DUs per acres goes from 6 DU per acre (each lot with 1 DU) to 36 DU per acre (each lot subdivided and a duplex and ADU one each new lot). This is too extreme for increasing density in urban neighborhoods -- especially with the new design districts adjacent that will allow new apartment buildings to tower over traditional mill house neighborhoods that contribute to the charm and draw of Durham.
- If we do this we'll want to do it carefully but it seems like a nice idea for creative infill and more urban density. Things I'd like to pay attention to: protecting and planting big trees; preserving and restoring as many historic structures as possible; pairing denser development with a focus on walkable neighborhood business districts.
- It's not clear why the minimum lot area is not being reduced for RS-20 zoning districts, which have such a large minimum lot area.
- Minimum lots are silly and constrain choice.
- More Housing!
- Our huge minimum lot sizes are an artifact of a bygone era, one Durham has outgrown. They were part of a way to keep lower income people away. Today many people aren't fixated on having a "manor in a park" or a "cabin in the woods." When we did the Trinity Heights neighborhood, minimum lot sizes were 7,500 SF with deep setbacks from the streets. The easy solution would have been to close the alleys, which we would not do. The only way we succeeded in building that neighborhood was to seek and obtain 12 text amendments to the code and even that wasn't enough--we also had to have the whole project declared a suburban cluster subdivision entirely surrounded by a "buffer." (We called the streets the buffer.) Our codes need to make doing the right thing easy. As it is now large-lot sprawl is the easy way out.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- Taking into account environmental impact and population density in regards to transit this is seems like an step in the right direction
- Use vacant buildings, former strip malls like Lakewood. Currently seeing building of the business of storage units. Trees are being cut down, cleared. The environment is impacted.
- Why is RS-20 exempt from changes? RS-20 zoning is absurdly large lots. Forest Hills is so close to downtown, this neighborhood could and should accommodate new denser development.
- Yes, Karen Parolek said a lot of good, affordable, Missing Middle housing mathematically shakes out to 40 houses to the acre. Durham is mostly 4-8 units to the acre. If we're serious about affordability, we have more work to do. This is the right direction, but these density standards are still a threat to affordability.

Adjust minimum lot widths across all residential zoning districts (except RS-20) in the Urban Tier.

- Great idea. This will allow citizens to develop their homes. More local owners = stronger community.
- If we are allowing more dwelling units on a lot, we should not also decrease the size of a lot since that would be too much density with hardly any grass / yard space and too many roof tops and driveways that would increase runoff and further flood the overtaxed storm drain system. In addition water and sewer lines would need to be increased in size to handle additional capacity, and street parking may become even more over-crowded than it already is. Increasing density from 1 DU in RU-5 for example on a typical 7500 sq ft lot to 3 DU with a duplex and ADU is already tripling density. If a 7500 sq ft lot divided into 2 lots each of which is now allowed up to 3 DU (duplex and ADU on each subdivided lot) we have now increased density by a factor of 6 --going from 1 DU per 7500 sq ft to 6 DU per 7500 sq ft. Since six 7500 sq ft lots are approx 1 acre, under this scenario, the maximum DUs per acres goes from 6 DU per acre (each lot with 1 DU) to 36 DU per acre (each lot subdivided and a duplex and ADU one each new lot). This is too extreme for increasing density in urban neighborhoods -- especially with the new design districts adjacent that will allow new apartment buildings to tower over traditional mill house neighborhoods that contribute to the charm and draw of Durham.
- It seems like this could potentially lead to/speed up patterns of excessive teardowns in neighborhoods like Old East Durham. Also worry about impacts on parking/traffic/stormwater/tree canopy. Needs to be paired with infill standards to make sure new structures are not hideous and/or poorly built
- More homes for more neighbors!
- Please avoid "McMansions." Please avoid changing the zoning districts to point of over-densification.
- Taking into account environmental impact and population density in regards to transit this is seems like an step in the right direction
- The urban tier has strong infrastructure and is able to and appropriate for more density and walkability, regardless of underlying zoning categories. This is a good move.
- Yes! Two of my favorite streets in America, Alexandria's Oronoco St. and Queen Streets have lots that are seven to twelve feet wide and they are incredibly charming.

Increase maximum densities in residential zoning districts in the Urban Tier.

- Density = Diversity! We should be welcoming to all kinds of communities and family structures!
- Infill with modestly higher residential density should also be possible in urban tier RS-20 districts.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- It is so wonderful to have our planners start thinking in terms of creative infill opportunities. This is a major turning point as Durham becomes a better and better place to live.
- Taking into account environmental impact and population density in regards to transit this is seems like an step in the right direction
- They are not high enough for the more advance forms of Missing Middle. Some cities are density maximums in RU-M, RC, which would effectively then be regulated by parking, setbacks and height.
- This chart is deceptive since property owners in RU5 will be allowed by right to subdivide a typical 7500 sq ft (50ft x 100ft) lot into 2 lots. Since approx six 7500 sq ft lots = 1 acre. That subdivision alone goes from 6 DU per acre to 12 DU per acre if each new parcel only has 1 SFH on it. If by right each new parcel can convert a SFH to a duplex then we now have a maximum of 24 DU per acre. Now add in the 800 sq ft. ADU that to each of these parcels and we have a maximum of 36 DU per acre. So if six contiguous property owners each maxed out the number of DU's on their 7500 sq ft lot from 1 DU to 6 DU, then we have 36 DU per acres which is triple the proposed 12 DU per acre for RU 5 in this chart. This will strain the infrastructure for storm water, water, sewer, and street parking, reduce green space in yards and decrease quality of life with too much extreme density. The new Expanding House Choice rules by right for property owners and reducing lot sizes do not match the maximums in this chart. This discrepancy needs to be addressed and real density numbers and implications considered. It would be nice to see engineering design plans to support the infrastructure needs going from 6 DU per acre to 36 DU per acre to see if the systems can handle it. Additional fire, police, and garbage collection will also be needed. What are the plans to provide these extra services? At what cost? Is it even feasible?
- This is appropriate. The urban tier has the most infrastructure and walkability to support this change.
- YES! Glad to see this come around. If we truly want a walkable city, this is critical!
- You don't need to change lot sizes to increase density. All this does is carve up lots and creates a lot of small structures that people aren't interested in living in for more than a year or 2.

What additional comments do you have regarding lot dimensions and density?

- I don't think there's any reason to change the lot dimensions. You can increase density by allowing duplexes and larger ADUs on current lot sizes.
- Putting in a small tiny house is ok. A duplex adds to more cars and people in duplexes argue too much re hearing noise inside. Leading to arguments. Police calls.
- Adding density to the urban tier while providing some setbacks and protections between properties both preserves property owner rights while allowing property owners options to provide more infill units and fight rising housing costs for the benefit of the entire community
- Density = Diversity! Additionally, we are facing a climate crisis and we need more Durhamites to give up their cars and live in multi-family buildings if we are going to meet our Paris Climate Agreement goals which the mayor wants to honor! Density is green!
- Growth can't happen in a vacuum, more business more residents moving from metropolitan areas will want and expect more relevant modern options like these

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- I don't mind the idea of having more housing density, but we also need to protect natural areas for wildlife and recreation. Maybe at the same time as increasing density possibilities, we could also make it illegal for HOAs to require a standard lawn so that more outdoor space can be used for native plants and wildlife or for gardening.
- I think there is a flaw in the logic that says increasing density will lead to more affordable housing. Higher densities may lead to some minor reduction in housing costs due to increased supply, but if lots of the people moving to Durham like in-town living and have lots of money to spend, then developers will just build more high-end homes at these higher densities. Rather than an across the board increase in densities, a better approach would be to allow higher densities only if a significant (i.e., 20-30%) number of units are affordable housing. For example, current R-8 zoning allows 5 units. I would propose that a developer could be approved to build 9 units only if 2 or 3 of those units were some form of affordable housing (what qualifies as affordable could be any number of things from rental units that accept Section 8 vouchers to more modest homes relative to the neighborhood, to lots sold to Habitat for Humanity to build on.)
- I worry about three things resulting from increased density.
    1) Destroying the visual character of neighborhoods
    2) Reducing the tree canopy to accommodate more houses on an existing lot.
    3) Parking will become a nightmare on the street because there won't be off-street parking or garages.
- I'm wondering why RS-20 zoned neighborhoods are not having any change to the density rules, when all other RS/RU zoning districts will have changes made to allow for increased density. RS-20 districts should become denser. Forest Hills is an RS-20 district extremely close to downtown that should absolutely allow smaller lot sizes, duplexes and more increased density. I know there is a lot of resistance to zoning change and increased density from this neighborhood and other exclusionary wealthy neighborhoods in the name of "neighborhood character". We need new housing and denser development to be equitably distributed throughout Durham's neighborhoods, and that must include (and arguably should prioritize) denser development in the wealthiest neighborhoods of Durham.
- Increased density has more benefits that costs. If we don't allow higher density in our urban core, we will encourage more sprawl which has so many negatives.
- It would be nice if these adjustments enabled filling the space between two existing houses with a third house that goes from building to building. Example: https://www.lloydkahn.com/2011/01/tiny-house-in-toronto. This would require flexibility with the lot line but with cooperation between both neighbors, this could make for some creative small houses!
- Look for a small district to experiment with pink zones: As a pilot, see what effect no minimum dimensional standards or density maximums has on affordability.
- Lot dimensions should not change if we are allowing new duplexes in areas previously not allowed and we are allowing 800 sq ft. ADUs as well. These changes alone will triple density. We do not need to further increase density by sub-dividing lots to allow 6-fold more density in urban residential neighborhoods. All the new apartment buildings that will be allowed in the new design districts will also increase density and affordable housing choices that are right next to traditional mill house neighborhoods in Durham. Allowing duplexes and ADUs on current lot sizes is sufficient density. Reducing lot sizes is not necessary in addition to these changes.
- My biggest concern is huge, tall structures, whether single family or duplex. I live at 1409 Alabama. To reduce our fossil fuel imprint, we have installed solar hot water panels and solar photovoltaic panels on the roof of our single

story house. These face south, which is toward our neighbor's house at 1407. Two doors down from us, a developer recently tore down a very small single story house and built a huge, tall McMansion. Single family. Had this been built next door to us, it would have blocked sunlight access to the expensive solar equipment (including a storage battery) at our house. If you are adjusting these regulations, you must include protection for access to sunlight. Humanity's future depends on this type of protection as we move more aggressively into fossil fuel alternatives. Don't address housing supply and ignore and probably make worse the solar alternatives we need. Maybe use grandfathering to solve this, as is the case with nonconforming lot sizes in our neighborhood.

- Taking into account environmental impact and population density in regards to transit. Efficiency comes with density but if people dont have the means to travel in these denser areas then solving one problem will only cause more. And effective and accessible public transit will need to come along with development efforts
- We should increase density, and also look at where we are going to retain greenspaces. These green spaces reduce flooding, clean our air, provide wildlife benefits, and lower temperatures. Balancing density within neighborhoods with additional park space, low impervious surface rations, or ensuring landscapes compensate for more impervious (through testing water infiltration into the landscape, requiring plants survive two years, etc.) will help Durham continue to be livable.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Small House/Small Lot

Create a new Small House housing type, allowable on a small (minimum 2,000 square foot lot) that would be limited in size to 1,200 square feet (with a building footprint of 800 feet), and 25 feet tall.

- Brilliant. Habitat has started the small home revolution in Durham. Support them. Allow more. Yes.
- Excellent plan for "infill."
- I like the idea for infill development. However, I would not like to see existing residential lots subdivided into multiple "small lots", but if an existing lot can be subdivided to create a "small lot" while the remainder of the lot still meets current zoning, that would be fine. I have mixed feelings about entirely new neighborhoods of small house/small lot units.
- I like the idea of small houses on small lots for infill development. I am less enthusiastic about new subdivision where everything is subdivided into smaller lots.
- I think it makes sense to allow more housing on small lots but I'm not sure why the house then needs to be limited in size. i.e. why limit size to 1,200sqft?
- Small homes and lots (alongside larger ones) were a regular part of development in many Durham neighborhoods. It is good for regulations to provide that flexibility and lot and house size mixing again.
- Unless we have data and information on how this has successfully been done in existing residential neighborhoods, I don't think they're a great way to begin.
- Using land efficiently is one of the best ways Durham can meet its climate and equity goals.
- What about parking?
- Yes! Love this!
- Yes, but don't require them to be in the middle of the lot.

Allow the Small House/Small Lot housing type in all residential zoning districts in the Urban Tier (with the exception of the RS-20 district) and in the RU zoning districts in the Suburban Tier.

- Again, why is RS-20 exempt?
- Allow it everywhere!
- Not just the urban tier, all tiers.
- Small houses on small lots would make sense for all areas in the urban tier.
- The urban tier can best accommodate such mixing of lot and home sizes. This is a return to how many urban Durham neighborhoods were built.
- Yes!

Allow a “Small House” to be built on a flag lot with a minimum flag pole width of 12 feet.

- Efficient use of land is necessary for Durham to meet both equity and climate goals.
- Flag lots (along with narrow lots) are a wonderful way to create charming and affordable infill.
- Is there a reason the pole couldn't be 10'?
- Parts of Durham have large unused backyards. This allows a more functional yet compatible way of making use of our valuable land resource.

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

- These flag lots will allow too much density in RU5 since a 7500 sq ft lot with 1 DU can become 2 lots each of which has 3 DU in form of duplex and ADU for total of 6 DU. This maximum by right then becomes 36 DU per acre instead of 6-12 DU per acres which already exists with current RU5 and RU5-2 zoning. In addition with the 12 foot driveway flag to get to the rear lot, the occupants of front lot have to park in the street since they cannot block the driveway to the rear lot. This will add a lot of pressure for on street parking which is already crowded - even more so if the front lot is Duplex with ADU. Allowing these flag lots is too much density. Instead, just allow the SFH to be converted to a duplex and allow and ADU in the back, which does not require the flag driveway. This is sufficient density for now and will not detract from quality and character of neighborhoods.
- These look like a parking nightmare. The house in the back is essentially trapped. There is no place for a storage building. On the other hand, if a lot is deep enough, it would be an option.

What additional comments do you have regarding the proposed new Small House/Small Lot option?

- In general, I don't feel we have enough information about how these small houses fit into the current mix. I would prefer to try other options first. If something like a flat lot were tried, given a large enough initial lot, there would have to be regulations re: parking and the small house should not be a duplex.
- Making it easier to build small houses is a great direction for Durham to go!
- This is fantastic and needed!
- This is great! This is the direction other cities in the Triangle need to follow. Good work Durham!
- This is not a good idea. If you changed specs to only allow a tiny house of 440 sq ft maximum on a small lot of 2000 sq ft then that might be OK since room for a yard and tree then. There are plenty of 1200 sq ft and under mill houses in Durham neighborhoods now and these require more than 2000 sq ft lot size to have adequate green space and tree.
- Very glad to see this additional flexibility!
- Very good ideas and flexibility are proposed, that Durham needs!
- What happens to the tree canopy?
- Parking problems
- Whatever we can do to make more homes for more neighbors!

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Infill Standards

Require at least one tree must be planted or preserved to the rear of the primary structure, in addition to required street trees.

- Trees are vital. As the biggest plants on the planet, they give us oxygen, store carbon, stabilize the soil and give life to the world's wildlife. They also provide us with the materials for tools and shelter.
- A rear tree is nice, but smaller trees should be allowed such as crepe myrtle or dogwood and not the larger oaks and similar species required in the OWD NPO. It is nice to have a small tree and also a sunny spot for a garden. The taller canopy trees in back create all shade and no opportunities to garden. Any tree regardless of species should be allowed.
- Common sense, to provide added trees to offset the increasing infill densities being proposed.
- How about adding bushes as an alternative? Not everyone wants trees.
- I like having trees around, but I don't know if it ought to be required. I would like to see planting of native, non-weedy trees encouraged, but tall trees can also make home solar power generation more difficult. I would like to see street tree requirements, as well as any rear tree requirements, stop requiring particular non-native species. A street lined with a variety of native species is much more attractive and better for supporting wildlife!
- I think 1 tree is a small, inexpensive ask.
- I'm all for trees and for incentives to plant them, but they should not be required or we'll just get the cheapest or fastest growing specimens. Remember the thousands of Bradford Pears that were planted in Durham and proceeded to disintegrate quickly, or the Leland Cypress that grows fast then dies fast. Also, the last time I checked it was difficult to plant street trees where they belong--in the planting strip between the sidewalk and the curb. We had to get a text amendment to allow it in Trinity Heights, but it still could only be done in a historic district.
- My neighborhood is fairly new and the builder planted almost no trees. Having backyard trees in every yard would add a lot of character and increase privacy!
- There's a slippery slope here to regulating things that the city has neither the knowledge nor capacity to regulate. Adding the requirement to new homes, but forgoing existing homes will have unpredictable effects. If tree canopy is the goal, then make a tree canopy plan. Expecting a tree canopy goal to be realized via small scale infill housing, which is scattered size by nature, seems rather hopeful. We often do sidewalks and stormwater in the same fashion, and it's not exactly efficient or successful. Create a neighborhood or regional plan, then execute it.
- This should be a minimum.
- Trees are good and efforts to limit impervious surfaces are important , however this seems like it will add to building costs and is not the most parsimonious way to achieve the stated goal.
- Very important!
- We need strong tree planting/preservation rules for all types of development.
- Why only require one? Require more if they exist on the lot!
- Will this reduce the number of housing units built?

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Limit driveways (Vehicle Use Areas) to 12 feet wide, but allow expansion up to 24' wide to accommodate garage access or parking under the following conditions: Limit driveways (Vehicle Use Areas) to 12 feet wide, but allow expansion up to 24' wide to accommodate garage access or parking under the following conditions:

- It is behind the front building line;
- it is further than 20 feet from the front property line, and;
- the parking area does not exceed 400 square feet.

- All parking minimums should be eliminated.
- If we're going to make it harder for people to park cars at their homes, we really need truly robust public transportation so there are alternatives to driving.
- Just eliminate off street parking minimums all together, as other progressive cities are doing.
- Removing the parking minimums would also help in limiting the visual and environmental impacts of driveways and parking areas.
- Some limited context-appropriate ways to add parking areas off street seems to make sense.
- The one caveat is how many people in the urban tier have shared driveways-- how will these be accommodated. They are usually 14-15 feet wide.
- This looks reasonable for people who want a detached garage. Most houses in mill house neighborhoods only have a gravel driveway and not a garage. These driveways should only be allowed to be gravel and not concrete so that they do not contribute to runoff and further burden on storm water system that is already at capacity and floods regularly during heavy rain. Gravel allows the water to drain into the ground whereas concrete runs down the street and could flood out the house at the bottom of a steep hill. These considerations should be taken into account for planning rules.
- This sounds a bit prescriptive. What about credit for shared drives. I'm not sure that we should worry a whole lot about how much parking area people have in their back yards. A half-court basketball court is around 2,100 SF and a nice hoops play area doubling as parking would be well over 400 SF.
- Why not look into the type of residential parking/driveways that utilize a "lattice-work" style of concrete, allowing grass to grow and mitigates water runoff while maintaining a more solid surface on which to park?

Maintain current height limitations but remove the 25-foot distance exemption.

- Confusing. As lots get smaller, houses get taller. At what point is 35' not tall enough?
- I guess I don't understand why there is a need for Infill regulation. So the less the better?
- I really don't understand why we regulate height on SF homes. Doesn't make any sense.
- I'd like to see raising height limitations for buildings that would be multi-family units
- I've yet to hear a convincing rationale for height restrictions. Look at the towers of Bologna, Italy, or Seaside, Florida, or Cheshire in Black Mountain, NC or even Dorothea Street in Boylan Heights Raleigh. Tower elements or even tower houses can be amazingly cool. What are we worried about?
- More flexibility on location and size of infill development makes sense, particularly in less visible backyards.
- My biggest concern is huge, tall structures, whether single family or duplex. I live at 1409 Alabama. To reduce our fossil fuel imprint, we have installed solar hot water panels and solar photovoltaic panels on the roof of our single story house. These face south, which is toward our neighbor's house at 1407. Two doors down from us, a developer

recently tore down a very small single story house and built a huge, tall mcmansion. Single family. Had this been built next door to us, it would have blocked sunlight access to the expensive solar equipment (including a storage battery) at our house. If you are adjusting these regulations, you must include protection for access to sunlight. Humanity's future depends on this type of protection as we move more aggressively into fossil fuel alternatives. Don't address housing supply and ignore and probably make worse the solar alternatives we need. Maybe use grandfathering to solve this, as is the case with nonconforming lot sizes in our neighborhood.

- Need diagrams to be able to follow this
- There needs to be 25 feet separation.
- This explanation is confusing. I think it is saying that the max height is 35 feet or 14 feet taller than its neighbor whichever is shorter. I think allowing neighboring structures to have too much influence makes development more complicated, and should be avoided.
- This sounds reasonable.
- Watch out for shadowing nearby dwellings, though.

Remove minimum lot width standards from the Infill section. Default back to base zoning district standards for minimum lot width.

- I'm less concerned with "inadvertent suppression of development". You don't need to alter minimum lot width standards. If there is truly an irregular pattern that would not allow something to be built then a case-by-case consideration should be needed.
- Mimicking the pattern would make more sense if we had more patterns worth mimicking.
- Need diagrams to be able to follow this
- This is confusing. Concrete examples needed to illustrate better. In general, keep the current lot dimensions in place and do not reduce minimum width and total lot size as proposed in this document. Current lot sizes with allowing SFH to become a duplex and add an 800 ft. ADU is enough density -- triples what we have now.
- Will encourage a mix of housing and lot types and make neighborhoods more diverse. Infill standards will still be helping to preserve compatibility. It is also a return to how many urban neighborhoods in Durham were developed.

Apply the Infill Standards to property zoned RU in the Suburban Tier.

- Depends on what areas this would include...
- Don't quite understand this one.
- I would want to look at actual examples of problems this is trying to address.
- Need diagrams to be able to follow this.
- Need to provide concrete examples for this.
- Upzone the Suburbs! We have a climate and equity crisis, let's do it!
- What? Huh?

What additional comments do you have regarding Residential Infill standards?

- All of these are going in the right direction!

- Corner lot standards are punitive, and have hurt affordable home builders in the past. Allow for more flexibility on street frontages when they prevent housing, as they have done recently.
- Do not allow typical 7500 sq ft (50 x 100) lot to be subdivided into 2 lots each of which can then have a duplex and ADU so that density increases 6-fold from 6 DU per acre to 36 DU per acre. Infill by converting a SFH to a duplex and adding 800 sq ft ADU for 3 DU on typical 7500 sq ft lot which adds up to 18 DU per acre is sufficient density and is already over the stated maximum of 12 DU per acre in chart provided earlier in this document.
- I think encouraging infill is a great way for Durham to increase housing stock without expanding the city's footprint. Any changes that make development in these areas easier, cheaper and faster should be encouraged.
- I think these are all great changes, but would encourage the city to consider removing parking minimums or at least reduce it to parking for one vehicle.
- I'll be honest some of this is still confusing to me, but I have a grasp of what you're saying and trust that what we need are more options in larger areas for more income levels
- Thank you to our city council for eliminating parking minimums, an arcane relic of 20th century planning! (thanks in advance, that is)
- Would be interested in allowing fourplexes to by built by-right or with limited permitting. I believe if we can simplify the process for small building construction, we could provide more robust housing options for low and middle income Durhamites.
- Wouldn't this make "sub-urban" more "urbanized," which, I assume is the reason one might move into suburbia?

Expanding Housing Choice

Exploring ways to provide a wider variety of housing options

Additional Comments

How do you feel about these proposed changes (please feel free to add any commentary on specific items)?

- 6.4.1B I'm not a big believer in density bonuses because there is a built in implication that the default preference is low density. Maybe we should reverse the whole equation and make higher density the default and charge impact fees for low density. 6.4.1D, I would need to see examples that describe the problem this rule is trying to solve. 6.7 Seems reasonable. 6.12 OK, but methods of calculating density already vary greatly. Do you only measure within lot lines, or for raw land include future public rights of way. Would that encourage elimination of sidewalks, trails, and parks? What about flood plains and conservation areas. People who have experienced wonderful walkable places such as Georgetown, Nantucket, or Seaside understand the wonder of density when combined with great design.
- Allowing increased freedom and flexibility in the use of land/arrangement of housing is necessary and fair. Maintaining the character and patterns of Durham's neighborhoods is important; the rate of change is also important. People get disoriented if their home area changes too fast. Maybe a mechanism to limit the number of permitted changes in a given block per year? That may not be possible under current law.
- Do not allow town homes and apartment buildings in RU neighborhoods. These multiplex structures should be reserved for the design districts that allow really tall apartment buildings downtown and then step down to smaller apartment buildings in the deisgn districts adjacent to RU neighborhoods. We should not allow townhomes, triplexes, quads, and apartment buildings into neighborhood boundaries and restrict only to design districts.
- Durham needs more homes. We will displace all of our working class residents if we do not densify and add to the housing supply. Permitting and design review should also be looked at, especially for ADU and Duplex construction. Also four/sixplexes city-wide would be great!
- I particularly like the added infill flexibility for double fronting lots, non-conforming lots and along major thoroughfares and boulevards. They all respect the context of these situations to encourage appropriate infill.
- I think each proposed building plan must be looked at and adjudicated on its own merits. Minimize the rules and increase flexibility.
- I would suggest that the proposed changes occur in incremental fashion to see how they affect both the increase of housing options and the effect on a neighborhood, on green space, on parking, etc.
    - Drop the option of small houses for the initial phase
    - Limit duplexes to 1/lot, regardless of lot size, unless frontage exceeds 90 feet, in which case dividing it into 2 lots, with 45 ft frontage would approximate current small lots. We have no data on whether people who might be interested in a duplex would want to live in one on 2500-3500 sq feet.
    - Set a time limit to allow re-evaluation in 3-5 years to determine if in fact the goal of more affordable housing has been attained and what the changes have done to the neighborhoods.
    - Add a green space requirement and spell out what this needs to include
    - Provide options re: parking-- do duplexes, for ex., have to be built such that there are is at least a parking pad on each side of the lot?
    - My overall sense is that some changes are needed. However, the proposals seem to me to be too many all recommended at the same time.
- Just like other zoning rules, these will have unintended consequences. They will be exploited by people who build housing professionally for profit. Just because these zoning changes might allow people to build affordable or

workforce housing units in Trinity Park or Forest Hills doesn't mean that's what they will build there. They will find the one affordable house or duplex on a block, put it in a dumpster, and pack the lot with as many high end units as they legally are able. I'm for the added density where it's appropriate, but my concern is that some of these could actually hurt the population that they are intended to help, and could hasten the homogenization of older urban neighborhoods.

- These are consistent with what other progressive communities are doing. Those who need housing, or want to provide housing for others, will love it. Those who hate housing, or hate the idea of people joining our community, will hate it. Thank you for such a professional presentation and all your leadership!
- These housing choices should be viewed in relationship to open space preservation. Allowing for denser neighborhoods puts a premium on public space. Is the city taking any initiatives to provide more parks and access routes? I am all in favor of density if it preserves the livability of a neighborhood. I am proponent of building up rather than increasing footprints to preserve green space in residential neighborhoods so people can have garden and private outdoor space.
- We need a bit more information about how these changes will impact impervious surface and access to green space