

Daniel Symer

From: David Carpenter <dc@hopeaz.com>
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2020 5:23 PM
To: Daniel Symer
Cc: Tiffany Antol
Subject: Zoning Code Revisions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dan-

I watched your P&Z presentation from the 22nd and I had a few comments and questions on the latest zoning code revisions:

- The new footnote in table 10-40.30.040.C seems to reduce the by right 29 units/acre to 22 for parcels that are outside of the ped shed in the general plan. Previously density is only reduced to 22 if the property was in the RPO, and I'm not aware of any reference to the general plan in that part of the code. But it also hard to read, so it's hard to tell if maybe you are trying to restrict density outside the ped shed, or to grant increased density in the RPO if you are also in the ped shed. This might need some clarification.
- In the new basement and crawl section 10-50.25.020
 - A. Creating a hard fast 9 foot rule seems like a no brainer on a flat lot but will be very hard to follow if the lot has any slope.
 - B. 1. Creating a hard fast 5 foot rule creates a catch 22 in the flood plain where a crawl space may need to be up to 6-7 feet to meet the FEMA rules
 - B.1. Creating a hard fast 5 foot rule will be very hard to comply on slopped lots. I've seen houses with crawl spaces that go from 3' to 15' over sometimes as little as 20 feet. Maybe you are trying to govern the amount of stem wall seen that is made out of concrete, but the stem walls would be OK if framed and had siding? Its hard to know what your intention is here but the outright banning of crawls spaces taller than 5' will create many issues in our highly topographic city.
 - B. 2. Craws spaces and stem walls are not traditionally building materials that are consistent with the design of a building (they are more complementary). For instance a building with all wood siding would not have wooden siding on the foundation walls. These walls should be block, concrete, stucco, or stone. Maybe list the appropriate materials you are trying to see more of... what are you trying to prevent here?
- In the section about building height in the last paragraph C Exceptions to the building height, you are changing the intent by combining stairwells and elevators in with the other elements that are subject to a 20% max height calculation. This will mean that only buildings that are 50' or greater will be able to exceed max height for a stairwell or elevator. This is because a stairwell or elevator is always going to be 10-15' tall to be able to serve the roof for a stairwell, or the top story in the case of an elevator. So, for instance if you have a 3 story building that is 35' tall, the way your draft is written now the stairwell or elevator can only be 7' tall. It is impossible to serve a rooftop with a 7' staircase and renders this section moot for anything less than 50'. Previously stairwells and elevators we allowed to exceed but limited to a % of the roof area not a height constraint.
- In 10-50.60.040 non-residential landscape requirements adding a min 10' from the back of sidewalk is a lot of land in an urban setting. This may make a lot of sense for a larger lot or in a suburban setting , but is there a way to waive this requirement when the parcel is urban in nature similar to the way T5 and T6 are waived ? or

maybe reduce to a 5' minimum? A parkway, plus sidewalk, plus 10 feet just seems like a huge setback (and inconsistent with the actual setbacks) and inconsistent with the way the urban parts of the city look. Maybe parkway trees, planters, or street trees can take the place of this 10' buffer? There are thoughtful ways to get landscaping in an urban setting without pushing the building back an abnormal amount. I think a 5' minimum might be a good place to start.

- It does not make sense to require a 75' wide lot to build a triplex, we have proven that the triplex works fine on 50' x 130' lots (so long as there is an alley). All the lots in the urban part of the city are 50' wide, so you are effectively barring their construction and reducing density in the urban core of the city where we are trying to increase density. Maybe require alley loading parking as a new restriction to make them work better, but the 75' is really just a ban since the city lots are not that wide. You rational in justifying this change by saying that the triplex needs to have 2,500 SF per unit as noted in table/footnote 6 of the residential zone standards, does not make sense because the 2,500 SF requirement is for a residential building in a "non-transect" zone. There were always supposed to be advantages to switching to the transect zone built into the code on purpose. This increased density over the underlying zoning was the main incentive. What you get in trade off is 35' in height as apposed to 60' in the underlying HR zone.

If you could please respond and make my comments available to P&Z and council I would appreciate it.

Thank You,

David Carpenter



Hope Construction
495 S River Run Rd.
Suite 100
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

P 928-527-3159
F 928-527-0357
C 928-380-5808

Daniel Symer

From: David Carpenter <dc@hopeaz.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Daniel Symer
Subject: Rooftop Equipment Screening

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dan-

So long as you are taking a moment to revise the code section on equipment screening I would like to offer a suggestion that this requirement in the code only apply to new construction. We have had several projects over the years where this requirement made it difficult and costly to simply install a vent or an AC condenser. On a project that we are designing right now the addition of an equipment screen, and more importantly the added wind loads that they must be designed for, was causing the load on the roof to exceed its original design parameters. This in turn was causing the removal of all the roofing, the reframing of the roof and then re-roofing the area, just to hide two air handlers. The cost was \$20,000.

The "section/sketch" shown as an example in the code is of a traditional commercial roof with parapet but most roofs in flagstaff are gables, or a maybe old commercial roofs with little or no parapet wall. I think this would be a great time to brainstorm a little about if any accommodations can be made in the more typical (atypical) situations. There must be some way to allow remodeling or upgrading an old building without subjecting folks to this kind of expense. Maybe in some situations equipment can be painted like the Tourist Home did as an option for the applicant? This is a relatively newer rule in Flagstaff so now that we know about some of the unintended consequences I'm hopeful some ideas can be thrown around before the work session.

Thank You,

David Carpenter



Hope Construction
495 S River Run Rd.
Suite 100
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

P 928-527-3159
F 928-527-0357
C 928-380-5808