

**Planning Commissioner's Written Comments  
July 10, 2012**

**North Street Residential (Z1200012)**

**Ms. Beechwood** - I reluctantly voted to approve this plan amendment and zoning change. A issue is the implementation of the Downtown Design Overlay District and its step-down zones into the surrounding neighborhoods. While I support the DDO and the vision for what we are trying to create with it, it is clear that implementation will not be an easy go. And I realize that by this approval, it sets an unfortunate precedent for future implementation all along the S-2 / neighborhood boundaries. But the feedback from the North Street community was quite clear. They could not envision a DD S2 outcome that would be acceptable. In fact, some Planning Commission members were also unclear on what was possible under DDO S2. This is feedback, which seems to indicate that more education is needed. I look forward to that.

**Mr. Gibbs** - This area of North Street (in my opinion, from at least Trinity Ave to Broadway St. (and including from +- Rigsbee to Old Five-Points area) is an area "on the border" of the Downtown and Urban Tiers and characteristically eligible for some "transition status" and a comprehensive planning approach.

It should have a zoning change, in my opinion, from DD-S2 (too restrictive – even in (some) applications in the Downtown tier, also my opinion) to something other than single-family that would allow more diversity of development but still be sensitive to the "historical character" of the neighborhood(s). Allowing also for any future needs to accomplish more mixed-use, and "density variability", the closer it gets to the more "historically commercial areas" at the edge of the Downtown tier (Old Five Points, Central Park, etc.).

A difficult distinction to make considering proximity to downtown, but DD-S2 is not best zoning for this particular area.

And having only single-family designation for this specifically targeted North Street corridor with what has been suggested by supporters, more Craftsman-style housing wouldn't, in my opinion, satisfy useful residential "density variability" for this "transitional area". Lack of housing diversity, compatibility in design, could have less vibrancy in appearance and function for the area with in-fill of only Craftsman-style copies. Cookie-cutter appearance ? Maybe.

This is my reason(s) for not supporting the A1200004 application but if some comprehensive planning for the area is not a consideration then I would support it, if for no other reason, that it's better than the empty lots and in-fills as it now stands.

**Mr. Harris** – Voted for approval.

**Ms. Mitchell-Allen** – I voted to approve.

**Mr. Whitley** – I vote to approve.

**Ms. Winders** – I voted to approve the rezoning for reasons discussed in my comments about the plan amendment.