

**Summary of comments received at Open Houses
April 9 and 12, 2011**

The City hosted two open houses to review some of the proposed changes to the residential zone district standards. At the open houses, participants were asked to provide written comments on the proposed changes. Below is a summary of the comments received.

**SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO
LOT DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS**

Do the proposed changes seem appropriate?

Number of positive responses: 5

Number of negative responses: 0

Comments:

- They cover more types of housing. The “old” regulations were old! (some from pre-1969)

What do you think would work better?

- No responses received.
-
-

SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SETBACKS

Do the proposed changes seem appropriate?

Number of positive responses: 4

Number of negative responses: 0

Comments:

- Times change, and Lakewood has grown since 1969!

What do you think would work better?

Comments:

- Neighborhoods where single family housing exists and a multi-family dwelling or office/commercial building can be located across the street and is allowed to go to 50 feet or more with only a 50-foot limit between is too close. A prime example is the new building at Garrison and Colfax Ave.
-
-

SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR LARGER ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

Do the proposed changes seem appropriate?

Number of positive responses: 3

Number of negative responses: 1

What do you think would work better?

Comments:

- I think R-1 setback for large garage structure should be 15 feet from side rather than 10 feet...especially if taller than 15 feet! (Wheat Ridge height max – 15')
 - Grade Control – Permit required for flatwork – no raising grade to make building taller than 20 feet! Drainage regulations/Plan for drainage. Survey required if large structure being approved. Consider impact on neighbors and neighborhood.
 - Time will tell! Probably will need adjustment again in a few years.
 - I find it odd that building heights are measured by side-wall height rather than the highest point on the building. I can see the potential for a property owner to take advantage full advantage of the roof height to minimize the effectiveness of the proposed set-back requirements. To avoid this potential abuse, I would suggest that a formula be implemented wherein any proposed outbuilding that exceeds a height of 10 feet would require that the set-back must be increased proportionately.
-
-

SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON FOOD PRODUCING ANIMALS

Do the proposed changes seem appropriate?

Number of positive responses: 6

Number of negative responses: 1

Comments:

- Yes! I'm looking forward to having chickens. Thank You!
- Yes – raising more types of animals is popular now.

What do you think would work better?

Comments:

- 4 chickens are not enough. Please change to 9 (for year round eggs).
- 4 chickens are not enough. 9 chickens are more appropriate because there is more consistent egg production.
- 6 hens should be allowed. 6 hens will give about 4 eggs/day or just over 2 dozen eggs which is more reasonable.

- Increase number of chickens to a realistic number – 9 or more because chickens do not all lay at the same time.
 - Just please keep the permit process simple and inexpensive, and please don't require neighbor approval like Denver. And regarding manure, we need to be able to compost it on-site. It doesn't make sense to require sending it to a landfill.
 - Proposed structures adjacent to single family neighborhoods should have a 100-foot minimum setback from existing single family dwellings.
 - A concern is if a neighbor chose to have 4 chickens & 3 goats & a beehive on a 5,000 square foot lot. That seems like quite a bit. Also what about the feces? What governs its disposal, etc.? Some people don't even clean up after their dogs.
 - In the new R-1-9 district, how many horses, goats, etc. allowed?
-
-

SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Do the proposed changes seem appropriate?

Number of positive responses: 4

Number of negative responses: 1

Comments:

- I think setbacks for any dwelling unit that is detached should be minimum side and rear 20-foot setback.
- With aging boomers, you are wise to begin to address this issue. Would the size of the mother-in-law unit be able to be larger with larger lot size?
- Yes – as long as they more or less match the main structure architecturally.
- I am certainly NOT a fan of the proposal to allow ADUs in the single-family residential districts. This could lead to undesirable rental units in our established quiet neighborhoods.

What do you think would work better?

- I think the rear set-back requirement should be the same as the established front set-back.
-
-

OTHER COMMENTS

- Thanks for hosting meeting.
- Vehicle limits should be lowered – perhaps all zoning sizes.
- In regard to livestock, chickens, bees. Let's make sure that the requirement for keeping them encourages, not discourage, the keeping of

- these, such as high permit costs or unreasonable codes regarding manure removal, pen size, and requirements.
- Congratulations on adding flexibility (overall) and being cognizant of “zipper” concept. Thanks for your work!
 - I know there are places in the city that have barns, etc. with chickens AND roosters, because I have heard them! I think changing and refining zoning regulations after many years was needed.
 - Your presentation alludes to higher densities to be allowed in areas as defined by the Lakewood Comprehensive Plan. Why are they not defined? This has been an ongoing issue and open to interpretation and usually is interpreted to fit someone’s needs or wants when proposing a new development.
 - I would like to see written into the code an article that prohibits any variance which would create a new non-conforming property.