Hi Mayor Fligor and Members of City Council,

It's remarkable how quickly the city has put together solid standards for sb 9 projects. There are not enough "thanks" to go around to all involved.

To go into the weeds,

1. Here is section 2 ("SB 9 – Development Standards"), paragraph D, sub-paragraph (a):
    "The maximum coverage for all structures in excess of six feet in height shall be thirty-five (35) percent of the total area of the site where the height of one-story development does not exceed twenty (20) feet."

I find the above paragraph hard to parse, and I hope it can be clarified.

2. Here is section 2 ("SB 9 – Development Standards"), paragraph F, subparagraph (c):
    "When two primary single-family residential units are proposed on one parcel, the two units shall be attached and designed subject to Section 2 of this policy."

I share Anne's concern about this provision. For one, duplexes can often be quite cute as cottages. For two, forcing families to share a wall is inconsistent with the city's longstanding concern for privacy and quality of life.

3. It's unclear to me why duplexes are referred to as two single family units in this resolution; it might be clearer to refer to duplexes as two primary dwelling units. But I'm not a lawyer, so perhaps I'm missing the rationale here

4. There's a typo in "balconies" – spelled "balcones" – in Section 3 ("SB 9 – Objective Design Standards," paragraph C, subparagraph (a).

5. For consistency's sake, Section 3 ("SB 9 - Objective Design Standards" ) should apply to all single family homes regardless of whether SB 9 is used. Why would we require privacy mitigation & improved landscaping for single family homes that pull SB 9 permits, but not for single family homes that don't pull an SB 9 permit? This seems arbitrary.

Anyways, it's incredible staff & DRC turned this around so quickly. It's great work

Thanks,
Salim