

Summary of Favorite/Least Favorite Examples of Residential Development

	Favorite Examples	Least Favorite Examples
Rebecca Call	<u>El Dorado Hills, CA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Notice a lack of cul-de-sacs. 'Organic grid' street network responds to topography 	<u>Craughwell Village</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nice project overall, but poorly integrated to nearby Perimeter Center
	<u>Killilea-Cardinal</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good relationship between adjacent land uses. 	<u>Most Neighborhoods along Hyland-Croy Road</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What specifically about these neighborhoods?
Warren Fishman	<u>Upper Arlington</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smaller homes, but with brick look great 	<u>None Specified</u>
Jane Fox	<u>Muirfield Village</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Curvilinear streets ▪ Buildings and materials mutually enhance each other ▪ Variety of housing types ▪ Golf course is the placemaking piece, along with country club 	<u>Cottages at Ballantrae</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Houses too close together ▪ No outdoor space ▪ Higher density would be okay with useable open spaces nearby.
	<u>Edwards Neighborhood Launch at Gay Street</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Walk-up project with stoops connecting right to the street ▪ Visually beautiful architecture ▪ Planting beds adjacent to brick sidewalks 	
	<u>Robert A.M. Stern</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kiawah Island, SC Residence. Timeless architecture (<i>Shingle Style</i>) ▪ NYC--Affordable Housing Concept 	
	<u>Pocket Neighborhoods/Empty Nester Homes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site plan is important ▪ Co-housing concept with different age groups ▪ Shared maker space and support amenities 	
	<u>Villas at Ballantrae</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall layout with alleys with entry features ▪ Close together homes (<i>too close?</i>) 	
Leo Grimes	<u>Greystone Mews</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Twin singles with rear loaded, alley accessed garages 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>Village at Coffman Park</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SF Detached 1-story to 1.5 story homes 	
Lance Schneier	<u>Bungalow Heaven, Pasadena, CA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historic district of turn of century craftsman-style bungalow homes ▪ Centrally located park within a gridded street network 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>Modern Home Neighborhoods--Nashville, TN</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrow lots with tall, narrow, and deep 2-story homes. ▪ Facades composed of Intersecting 'boxes' with flat or shed roofs and deep overhangs 	
	<u>Pocket Neighborhoods</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See book for examples 	
Mark Supelak	<u>Windsor—New Albany, OH</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No garages, homes close to street 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>Bristol Commons—Dublin, OH</u>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wide yards (lots?) with few front facing garages ▪ Most garages are side loaded ▪ High quality driveway materials 	
	<u>Rosemary Beach—Seaside, FL</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dense, intense, close to street, high lot coverage ▪ Context of green space matters 	
	<u>Asherton of Dublin</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Green space around fingers of development as a conservation-ish design to buffer from single-family development ▪ Lots of lakes and paths, mounds at perimeter 	
Kim Way	<u>Village at Coffman Park</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Units front onto open space ▪ Pond, porches, detached garages, adjacent to mixed uses (school, park, work) ▪ <i>SF Detached 1-story to 1.5 story homes</i> 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>New Albany, OH</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Common open spaces ▪ Good examples overall ▪ Denser portions controlled by development company 	
Christine Amorose-Groomes	<u>Muirfield</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall density is good ▪ High quality materials and architecture—garage doors are managed well 	<u>None Expressed</u>

Common Characteristics of Favorite and Least Favorite Residential Developments	
Favorite Examples	Least Favorite Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Variety of unit types within the development ▪ Few cul-de-sacs. Street networks are gently curvilinear interconnected 'organic grid' ▪ Neighborhoods integrated with nearby schools, parks, workplaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-family poorly integrated with nearby complementary commercial uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Garages side-loaded or rear located and often accessed via alleys ▪ Front elevations feature large useable porches and stoops connected to the streetscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Front loaded garages dominate front elevation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smaller units and higher densities are okay ONLY IF high quality site plans, unit design and materials 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Useable, common open space integrated into the development with units facing open space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Un-useable open spaces in residual, undevelopable portions of site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrow lots but with taller units close to street and garages at rear of lot accessed via alley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrow lots with little space between units and front yard dominated by driveway, garage doors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cohousing concept with shared community house and other facilities 	

Summary of Residential Development Concerns and Potential Solutions

Overall Concerns	Stakeholder/Interviewee									
	BZA	R.C.	W.F.	J.F.	L.G.	L.S.	M.S.	K.W.	C.A-G.	TOTAL
▪ Small Sideyards , no room even for AC Units, Side Windows adjacent to side windows			X				X	X		3
▪ Streetscape character and place-making suffers when dominated by Garage Doors —put them on side or in back		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
▪ Quality of Building Materials & architectural details		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
▪ Narrow Lots result in Garage and Driveway comprising majority of house frontage, developers resistant to alleys		X	X		X	X	X	X		6
▪ Need for Higher Quality in exchange for Higher Densities		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	7
▪ Setbacks and Buildable Area —eliminate need for variances for outdoor spaces	X	X	X				X	X		5
▪ Homes are built to max. permitted setbacks, subsequent owner has No Room for Outdoor Space	X							X		2

Ideas & Potential Solutions	Stakeholder/Interviewee									
	BZA	R.C.	W.F.	J.F.	L.G.	L.S.	M.S.	K.W.	C.A-G.	TOTAL
<u>Setbacks & Sideyards</u>										
▪ Building envelope as regulating tool—define extents of building and outdoor space independently (tiered)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		8
▪ Rewrite PUD setback requirements or minimize focus on numeric requirements in favor of encouraging high-quality creative design	X	X			X	X		X		5
▪ Concessions on sideyards should be offset by greater front and rear yards		X		X	X					3
<u>Narrow Lots/Density</u>										
▪ Identify potential vacant areas of future residential where pocket neighborhoods are appropriate										0
▪ Narrow lots with smaller homes, but more vertical for less lot coverage			X					X		2
▪ Allow for alternate lot patterns, more than one unit per lot—accessory dwelling units	X							X		2
<u>Open Space (Public & Private)</u>										
▪ Proportionality of outdoor space SF to house SF	X							X		2
▪ More useable outdoor space in front of lots							X	X		2

