

WORKSHOP #1 WORKSHEET

November 29, 2022

THEME A: CODE STRUCTURE

Q. A1. What do you think of using Zone Strings in Atlanta? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | |

Other (write in) Please leave additional comments below:

THEME B: EXISTING PATTERNS

Alternative: Form Patterns: Setbacks

Q. B1. What do you think of creating new setback standards for where it is appropriate to match existing setback patterns, especially where built setbacks are much smaller or larger than the existing requirements? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Please leave additional comments below:

Form Patterns: Lot Size

Q. B2. What do you think of creating lot size standards for where it is appropriate to match existing lot size patterns, especially where existing lots are much smaller or larger than the existing requirement? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Form Patterns: Sliding Scale

Q. B3. What do you think of creating a “sliding scale” for where it is appropriate to provide predefined standards for existing lots that do not meet the minimum lot size? This model is currently used in Poncey Highland due to its large number of historic nonconforming lots. (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Prioritization

Q. B4. How import to you is developing standards that reflect existing FORM (e.g., setbacks, lot sizes) patterns found across Atlanta (even if nonconforming) for future application, where appropriate? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very important | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> Very unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Use Patterns

Q. B5. The following uses are historically found in some neighborhoods but are often nonconforming today. Which, if any, do you think should be allowed again, where it is appropriate to do so? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accessory dwelling units, attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Accessory dwelling units, detached (currently legal in R4, R4A, R5)
<input type="checkbox"/> Corner stores
<input type="checkbox"/> Live-work units
<input type="checkbox"/> Duplexes (2 units per building) | <input type="checkbox"/> Triplexes (3 units per building)
<input type="checkbox"/> Quadrplexes (4 units per building)
<input type="checkbox"/> Cottage housing (2 to 4 units per lot)
<input type="checkbox"/> Walk-ups (5 to 12 units)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |
|---|---|

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Pilot Areas

Q. B6. Can you think of pilot areas where it may be appropriate to test allowing any of the following and where there would be broad support?

	Potential Pilot Area
Accessory dwelling units, detached	
Accessory dwelling units, detached (allowed in R4, R4A, R5)	
Corner stores	
Duplexes (2 units per building; allowed in R5)	
Live-work units	
Triplexes (3 units per building)	
Quadrplexes (4 units per building)	
Cottage cluster (2+ houses per lot)	
Townhouse	
Walk-ups (5 - 12 units per building)	

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

Other (write in)	
------------------	--

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Prioritization

Q. B7. How import to you is developing standards that reflect existing USE patterns found across Atlanta (even if nonconforming) for future application, where appropriate? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very important | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> Very unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

THEME C: FRONTAGES

Alternative: C1. Frontage-Based Approach

Q. C1. How do you feel about continuing to use Frontage Standards in the Zoning Ordinance? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

Alternative: Context-Based Standards

Q. C2. Frontage Standards can be flexible/non-specific or inflexible/specific, depending on where they apply. What do you think is the right amount of regulation in the following places? Use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very flexible/unspecific and 5 means very inflexible/specific.

Rural neighborhoods (e.g., R1, R2)	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Suburban neighborhoods (e.g., R3 today)	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Urban neighborhoods (e.g., R4, R5 today)	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Mixed-use areas (most already have standards)	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Industrial districts (e.g., I1, I2)	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Major corridors	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Transit station areas	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Other (write in)	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: New Frontage Standards

Q. C3. Should there be a way to regulate any of the following, where appropriate? Please do not consider Historic and Cultural Conservation Districts, where these standards usually exist. (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architectural style (e.g., Arts and Crafts, Gothic, Spanish Revival, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Height compatibility (i.e., when existing building heights determines how tall a new building can be) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Building width (e.g., when the widths of existing buildings determine how wide new buildings can be) | <input type="checkbox"/> Porch and stoop compatibility (when the existence or porches or stoops determines if new buildings must have them). Please note, this is already a required in R4, R5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exterior wall materials (e.g., brick, stone, stucco, wood siding, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Roof form compatibility (i.e., when existing roof forms determine permitted new roof forms) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Front setback compatibility (i.e., when existing building setbacks determine the required front setback) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Neighborhood Frontages

Q. C4. Are there unique Frontage types in your neighborhood that you think the Zoning Ordinance should protect or require with new development? Please tell us your neighborhood and the unique feature. (optional)

Frontage Prioritization

Q. C5. How import to you are frontage standards? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very important | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> Very unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

THEME D: PARKING DECK FORM

Alternative: Active Ground Floor Uses

Q. D1.A. What do you think of active ground floor uses in parking decks? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Require this | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage this with incentives | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither require nor encourage this | |

Please leave additional thoughts on the alternative below:

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

Q. D1.B. Where do you think requirements or incentives for active ground floor uses in parking decks should apply? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nowhere (I do not support the concept) | <input type="checkbox"/> In suburban commercial and multifamily areas (e.g., like Northside Parkway near the Chattahoochee River, Jonesboro Road near I-285, or Campbellton Road outside the Perimeter) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Everywhere | <input type="checkbox"/> Near transit stations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> On major streets | <input type="checkbox"/> Along trails and paths (e.g., the Atlanta BeltLine) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> On all streets | <input type="checkbox"/> Along public parks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> In urban mixed-use, commercial, and multifamily areas (e.g., like Howell Mill Road @ 14 th Street or Metropolitan Parkway) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Active Upper Story Uses

Q. D2.A. What do you think of active upper story uses in parking decks? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Require this | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Encouraged this with incentives | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither require nor encourage this | |

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. D2.B. How high do you think active upper story use standards should apply? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> The first two floors (typically 35 ft.) | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The first three floors (typically 50 ft) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The entire height of the parking deck | |

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. D2.C. Where do you think requirements or incentives for active upper story uses in parking decks should apply? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nowhere (I do not support the concept) | <input type="checkbox"/> In suburban commercial and multifamily areas (e.g., like Northside Parkway near the Chattahoochee River, Jonesboro Road near I-285, or Campbellton Road outside the Perimeter) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Everywhere | <input type="checkbox"/> Near transit stations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> On major streets | <input type="checkbox"/> Along trails and paths (e.g., the Atlanta BeltLine) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> On all streets | <input type="checkbox"/> Along public parks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> In urban mixed-use, commercial, and multifamily areas (e.g., like Howell Mill Road @ 14 th Street or Metropolitan Parkway) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Adaptable Parking

Q. D3.A. What do you think of parking decks designed to convert to other uses in the future? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Require this | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage this with incentives | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither require nor encourage this | |

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. D3.B. Where do you think requirements or incentives for parking decks that can convert to other uses should apply? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nowhere (I do not support the concept) | <input type="checkbox"/> On all streets |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Everywhere | <input type="checkbox"/> In urban mixed-use, commercial, and multifamily areas (e.g., like Howell Mill Road @ 14 th Street or Metropolitan Parkway) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> On major streets | |

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

- In suburban commercial and multifamily areas (e.g., like Northside Parkway near the Chattahoochee River, Jonesboro Road near I-285, or Campbellton Road outside the Perimeter)

- Near transit stations
- Along trails and paths (e.g., the Atlanta BeltLine)
- Along public parks
- Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Buried Parking

Q. D4.A. What do you think of buried parking? (select one)

- Require this
- Encouraged this with incentives
- Neither require nor encourage this
- No opinion
- Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. D4.B. Where do you think requirements or incentives for buried parking should apply? (you may select multiple)

- Nowhere (I do not support the concept)
- Everywhere
- On major streets
- On all streets
- In urban mixed-use, commercial, and multifamily areas
- In suburban commercial and multifamily areas.
- Near transit stations
- Along trails and paths (e.g., the Atlanta BeltLine)
- Along public parks
- Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Context-Based Standards

Q. D5.A. What do you think of updating existing citywide parking deck screening and height standards to better reflect their context while still protecting adjacent properties from negative impacts? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Parking Deck Design Prioritization

Q. D6. How important to you is regulating the form of parking decks? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very important | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> Very unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

THEME E: FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR)

Alternative: FAR Reform

Q. E1. What do you think of reviewing each zoning district's maximum FAR and consolidating similar FARs, when possible? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Mixed-Use Floor Area

Q. E2. What do you think of not differentiating between residential and non-residential floor area in mixed-use developments? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Elements of Floor Area

Q. E3.A. Which of the following things, which are not consistently counted towards floor area, do you think should be? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None of these should count. | <input type="checkbox"/> Buried parking decks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accessory dwelling units | <input type="checkbox"/> Common areas in multifamily developments (i.e., gyms, clubhouses, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accessory structures, such as gazebos or private garages | <input type="checkbox"/> Porches |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Above ground parking decks | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. E3.B. Which of the following things, which are not counted towards floor area today, do you think should continue to not be counted? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> These should all count | <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accessory dwelling units | <input type="checkbox"/> All historic buildings, regardless of designation/protection |

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: FAR Bonuses

E4. Should any of the following allow more density on a site? (you may select multiple)

<i>Please note that most of these already provide FAR bonuses somewhere in the City today. These could be incorporated into zone strings</i>	In Growth Areas	In Conservation Areas	
Affordable housing			No opinion
Being close to a transit station			No opinion
Environmental best practices			No opinion
Parking management strategies (i.e., public parking, unbundled parking, etc.)			No opinion
Public open space			No opinion
Shared driveways/inter-parcel access			No opinion
Space for small businesses			No opinion
Tree preservation (above minimum required by Tree Ordinance)			No opinion
Voluntary historic preservation			No opinion
Other (write in)			No opinion

Alternative: Prioritization

Q. E5. How important to you is updating FAR standards? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very important | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> Very unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

THEME F: BUILDING HEIGHT

Alternative: Height Standard Reform

Q. FI. What do you think of reviewing each zoning districts standards and consolidating similar heights, when possible? (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

I fully oppose the concept.

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Viable Floor to Ceiling Heights

Q. F2.A. What do you think of requiring minimum floor to ceiling heights for **GROUND FLOORS? (select one)**

I fully support the concept.

I somewhat oppose the concept.

I somewhat support the concept.

I fully oppose the concept.

I'm neutral

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. F2.B. What do you think of requiring minimum floor to ceiling heights for **UPPER FLOORS? (select one)**

I fully support the concept.

I somewhat oppose the concept.

I somewhat support the concept.

I fully oppose the concept.

I'm neutral

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Height and Topography

Q. F3. What do you think of requiring building height to be periodically recalculated on sites with extreme topography? (select one)

I fully support the concept.

I'm neutral

I somewhat support the concept.

I somewhat oppose the concept.

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

I fully oppose the concept.

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Height Bonuses

Q. F4. Should any of the following allow taller buildings to be built? (you may select multiple)

Affordable housing

Public open space

Being close to a transit station
(Growth Areas)

Space for small businesses

Being close to a transit station
(Conservation Areas)

Tree preservation (above minimum
required by Tree Ordinance)

Green buildings/green sites

Voluntary preservation of historic
sites that are not otherwise protected

Parking management strategies (i.e.,
public parking, unbundled parking,
etc.)

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Height Standard Prioritization

Q. F5. How important is updating height standards to you? (select one)

Very important

Somewhat unimportant

Somewhat important

Very unimportant

Neutral

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

THEME G: TRANSITIONAL STANDARDS

Alternative: Buffer Transitions

Q. G1. Which of the following ways to BUFFER between higher and lower intensity areas found in some neighborhoods do you think should be incorporated into Zone Strings for use in the higher intensity area, as appropriate? (you may select multiple)

- No buffer
- Alley with no additional requirement
- Alley + modest landscape strip
- Existing tree preservation priority
- Transitional buildings (i.e. buildings that conform to adjacent less intense zoning)
- Visual screening with no additional requirement
- Visual screening + modest landscaped strip
- Visual screening + wide landscaped strip
- Wide landscape strip (i.e. existing 20 ft. transitional yard)
- Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Height Transitions

Q. G2. Which of the following ways to transition HEIGHT between higher and lower intensity areas do you think should be incorporated into Zone Strings for future is in the higher intensity area, as appropriate? (you may select multiple)

- No height transition requirement (i.e., zone controls height)
- Numeric height limit within a certain distance
- Existing transitional height plane
- Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Use Transitions

Q. G3. Which of the following ways to transition USE between higher and lower intensity areas do you think should be incorporated into Zone Strings for future, as appropriate? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No use transition requirement (i.e. zone controls use) | <input type="checkbox"/> Use allowances in the lower intensity area, such as allowing additional types of housing or small commercial uses, but maintaining height standards. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Use prohibitions in the higher intensity area, such as existing limitations on gas stations, drive-thoughts, etc. | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Outdoor Lighting

Q. G4. Which of the following ways to reduce light trespass? (you may select multiple)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No new outdoor lighting requirement | <input type="checkbox"/> Light trespass limits onto any residential use, regardless of zoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Light trespass limits from higher intensity areas into lower intensity areas | <input type="checkbox"/> Light trespass limits from any parking lot, regardless of zoning. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Light trespass limits within lower intensity areas (i.e., from a neighbor) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Transitional Standard Prioritization

Q. G5. How important is updating transitional standards to you? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very important | <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unimportant |

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

Very unimportant

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

THEME H: OPEN SPACE

Alternative: Elimination of TOSR

Q. H1. Should parking lots and loading areas be considered a type of open space? They currently are. (select one)

No

No opinion

Maybe

Other (write in)

Yes

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Context-Based Standards

Q. H2. What do you think of having different standard for the amount and type of open space depending on how rural, suburban, or urban an area is? (select one)

I fully support the concept.

I somewhat oppose the concept.

I somewhat support the concept.

I fully oppose the concept.

I'm neutral

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Amount of Open Space

Q. H3A. What do you think of requiring a consistent amount of open space that doesn't vary by density? (select one)

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. H3B. What do you think of requiring a set amount of COMMON open space for each new residential unit, regardless of lot size? An example would be a shared courtyard, pool area, or rooftop deck. (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. H3C. What do you think of requiring a set amount of PRIVATE open space for each new residential unit, regardless of lot size? An example would be a private balcony or patio. (select one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I fully oppose the concept. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I'm neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below:

Q. H3D. What do you think of having different standard for the amount and type of open space depending on lot size? (select one)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I fully support the concept. | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat support the concept. |
|---|--|

**PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND**

I'm neutral

I fully oppose the concept.

I somewhat oppose the concept.

Other (write in)

Please leave additional comments below:

Alternative: Open Space Incentives

**H4. Are there types of open spaces that you think should be encouraged in certain areas?
(you may select multiple)**

<i>Please note that wetlands, stream buffers, and protected Historic and Cultural Conservation Districts, are excluded because they are already protected by City, State, or federal law.</i>	Encourage in Growth Areas	Encourage In Conservation Areas	No opinion
<input type="checkbox"/> Areas of mature trees			
<input type="checkbox"/> Artificial water features, such as ponds or fountains			
<input type="checkbox"/> Consolidated open space (where one large open space is provided versus several small ones)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Covered open spaces (e.g., gazebos, patios, open pavilions)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Farms and vegetable gardens			
<input type="checkbox"/> Green roofs			
<input type="checkbox"/> Historic sites that are not otherwise protected			
<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape stormwater facilities			
<input type="checkbox"/> Living walls			
<input type="checkbox"/> New public streets			
<input type="checkbox"/> Outdoor dining			

PLEASE USE THIS WORKSHEET TO REVIEW QUESTIONS ONLY.
USE THE [ONLINE SURVEY](#) TO SURVEY TO RESPOND

<input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian streets			
<input type="checkbox"/> Public art			
<input type="checkbox"/> Public gathering spots			
<input type="checkbox"/> Shade structures			
<input type="checkbox"/> Trails and paths			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (written in)			

Alternative: Open Space Prioritization

Q. H5. How important is updating open space standards to you? (select one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very important | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> Very unimportant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (write in) |

Please leave additional comments below: