

David's Design Standards Notes

Document specifically says:

A Certificate of Appropriateness is NOT required for: Remodeling of non-contributing buildings. This is fair.

Document also says

5.4 Standards apply to new construction on contributing and non-contributing properties

This is where I want to make sure we are not putting any undue burden on site feasibility for new construction. Although I do think new construction would make sense having restrictions that make the design aesthetically appropriate. I am mostly trying to flesh out the areas that could be conflicting or unnecessary burden on the new structure especially if it doesn't make the product any more appropriate for the area.

D4-4 allows preservation officer to administratively approve additions under 600sf. This may be good.

D-4.4, 8 Standards Summary: Minimum lot size of 5,750sf. We have lot sizes in at least 3 places by now. This document is going to be very successful at preventing demolition of contributing structures, but I can envision scenarios where smaller homes on smaller sites could be appropriate at non-contributing sites.

5.1.5 This section aims to reduce the impact of front accessibility ramps, I just want to point out that ramps may be required by other code creating the usual impasse.

5.1.7 Same thing, Austin Energy could begin requiring net zero energy uses in the future requiring more leeway here particularly on new construction that will not be grandfathered out of energy code.

5.2.5,6 Height limit on “new construction” may be lower than existing construction. May not allow for zoning tweaks to height for denser products on non-contributing sites should transition zones become a reality.

5.3.2, 3 “do not attach a separate residential unit to primary residence”. Does this block the 60 or older internal adu exemption code allows for if it is a rear addition used as an internal adu?

5.3.3 Recommendations: One story additions to one story houses? Maybe be okay on contributing sites, but on non contributing sites? Maybe this is fine since only a recommendation.

5.4.1 Compatibility only applies to new houses not existing??

5.4.1,1 Houses must front Aldridge place even on through lots that could be subdivided. There is reference to deed restrictions. If it is in the deed restrictions does it even need to be here?

5.4.9 Onerous parking requirements and limits on side yards and tandem parking. I know this is meant to be more aesthetic, but particularly on smaller sites or denser sites, these requirements can shut doors at the permitting stage when preparing a site plan. It can prevent good central products.

5.4.12 Garage apartment limitations

ADU extra parking for each full bathroom? Why?

ADU on 7,000sf or greater?

850 square foot limit? (this may be fine)

5.7. Exclusions

Paint color and house interiors are excluded from any Design Standards. This could be good. One reason why many of New Yorks brownstones were saved is because once they were too expensive for the population, they compartmentalized the interiors allowing for additional residents.

Waiting on refresher from city legal on how NCCD really interacts with historic district.

Should the 18 non contributing structures be allowed more leeway in uses, but still have aesthetic uniformity? These structures will never be historic or eligible for tax abatement as historic landmarks.

Should the historic district include the lots north of 34th. That is not part of Aldridge place subdivision.