



Ruthanne Fuller
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

#88-20
Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Barney S. Heath
Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 11, 2020

TO: Councilor Deborah Crossley, Chair, Zoning & Planning Committee
Members of the Zoning & Planning Committee

FROM: Barney Heath, Director, Department of Planning and Development
Jennifer Caira, Deputy Director, Department of Planning and Development
Zachery LeMel, Chief of Long Range Planning
Cat Kemmett, Planning Associate

RE: **#88-20 Discussion and review relative to the draft Zoning Ordinance**
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING requesting review, discussion, and direction relative to the draft Zoning Ordinance.
Other docket items to be taken up within the context of Zoning Redesign include #30-20, #38-20, and #148-20

MEETING: September 14, 2020

CC: City Council
Planning Board
John Lojek, Commissioner of Inspectional Services
Neill Cronin, Chief of Current Planning
Alissa O. Giuliani, City Solicitor
Jonathan Yeo, Chief Operating Officer

At the August 13, 2020 ZAP meeting, the Planning Department introduced the revised draft of Article 3 – Residence Districts. Staff presented on the extensive amount of work taken up in Committee so far this term that led to the recommended changes in support of the City Council’s goals and objectives. This meeting set up the Committee to now evaluate the ideas within the draft and understand impacts and outcomes in order to reach consensus on key policy decisions. The fall Committee calendar for this review, shared in the ZAP memo dated September 9th, 2020, will be discussed at this meeting.

The fall Committee calendar outlines three topic areas to be discussed at the upcoming ZAP meeting:

- A. District Dimensional Standards (Sec. 3.1)
- B. Building Type Dimensional Standards (Sec. 3.2)
- C. Building Components – allowable increases (Sec. 3.3)

District Dimensional Standards (Sec. 3.1)

The proposed five residence zoning districts (R1, R2, R3, R4 and N) are the foundation for regulation across Newton's neighborhoods and roughly correspond to five of the existing residential districts (SR1, SR2, SR3, MR1 and MR2). District dimensional standards regulate the placement of structures on a lot. Utilizing data collected from the Pattern Book, these standards were derived from Newton's existing scale and proportions. Setting the standards in this way helps ensure any future development or redevelopment relates to Newton's existing character.

In addition, the recommended standards help to facilitate desirable development patterns for Newton's future based on the City Council's other goals and objectives. This can be understood when all the district standards are viewed together as a transect that moves from larger lots/less lot coverage/larger setbacks (R1, R2, and R3) to smaller lots/more lot coverage/smaller setbacks (R4 and N). This typically corresponds with Newton's existing residential development patterns, but not always.

The standards to be reviewed at this ZAP meeting include Lot Frontage (see Table 1), Lot Coverage (see Table 2), Front Setback (see Table 3), Side Setback (see Table 4), and Rear Setback (see Table 5). What these tables reveal is that current ordinance standards (old lot or new lot) often have very little relationship to what exists on the ground. Therefore, it is not surprising that new development is regularly criticized as out of scale and proportion to the surrounding neighborhood. As mentioned above the proposed recommendation for each standard, within the August 2020 draft, attempts to strike the right balance between adhering to existing scale and proportion and allowing for an increase in diverse housing opportunities that are more economically and environmentally sustainable.

At this meeting, staff hope that the Committee members can discuss, and come to a consensus, on what priorities should inform each of these standards since these standards will determine the outcome, and overall impact, of any future residential development or redevelopment. Setting these priorities will inform staff that either the standards within the draft are correct or require minor adjustments.

Building Type Dimensional Standards (Sec. 3.2)

The proposed Zoning Ordinance uses Building Types as a tool to regulate the scale and proportion of development within each zoning district by setting standards for the mass and volume of a building (footprint, # of stories, story height). The Building Type dimensional standards, like the district dimensional standards described above, derive from Newton's existing building stock (House A through Duplex) or design best practices (Triplex through Small Multi-Use Building). So, setting the appropriate dimensional standards is critical for not only ensuring new development relates to Newton's existing building stock, but also facilitates additional building forms, suitably located, to achieve the City Council's goals. If set and mapped correctly, then staff recommend allowing these Building Types by-right to achieve another stated objective, to simplify and streamline the permitting and review process.

In this way, Building Types allow the City to directly regulate one of the top desires heard throughout the Zoning Redesign process, that the proposed Zoning Ordinance better regulate building size and placement on the lot. The current Zoning Ordinance applies generic dimensional standards to all buildings through FAR. The recommended Building Types in the proposed draft allow for multiple dimensional standards that differ from one Building Type to another within the same Residence District. This allows those making alterations to existing structures to better respond to the variety of buildings found throughout Newton and ensures any new construction appropriately aligns in scale and proportion to buildings nearby.

The main standard to be reviewed at this ZAP meeting for Building Types is footprint (see Table 6). This table shows that the standards for the maximum proposed footprint for each Building Type is set roughly at the median of Newton's existing buildings. This standard helps ensure that new structures comfortably fit into the established neighborhood patterns, while also not allowing the uppermost limits that exist in the city today.

The limitations set in the Building Type standards break the link between building size and lot size, replacing it with design focused standards derived from the existing built fabric in Newton. Breaking this link helps ensure buildings within a district are of a similar scale, regardless of lot sizes or configurations, while still maintaining controls on the overall size and ensuring proper distance between buildings through the district standards. Building Types do not regulate style, only volume, which can better respond to the diversity of housing forms in the city. Finally, allowing for a range of housing types and densities can facilitate an increase in availability in the marketplace for various income levels and household sizes.

It should be noted that the draft ordinance does not institute a required minimum lot size. Rather, using the Building Type and district dimensional standards we have calculated the minimum lot size required to build the maximum Building Type (see Table 7). This means that the minimum lot size required to build each building type is not a "one size fits all" number, but rather depends on which district the structure lies in. For example, a House C built to the maximum footprint in a the R1 district requires a minimum lot size of 7,600 square feet, in order to meet the district setback and lot coverage standards. But a House C in the N district requires a lot size of only 2,520 square feet. This system allows for a variety of housing forms to be permitted in each district, while also fostering the transect pattern of growth that moves from larger lots and less lot coverage in areas further from village centers to areas with an established pattern of smaller lots with more lot coverage.

Eliminating minimum lot sizes can encourage smaller homes to be built on these smaller lots, which can help achieve the City's goal of creating housing options at different sizes and price points. As an example, these smaller homes may appeal to Newton's aging population looking to downsize and remain in Newton, young families looking for a starter home, or individuals living alone, which is increasingly common in the United States.

At this meeting, staff hope that the Committee members can discuss, how setting the Building Type standards around the median facilitates the desired outcomes laid out by the City Council. Staff have understood these outcomes to include ensuring new development fits within scale and proportion of its surroundings and limiting building size to promote environmental sustainability and economic diversity.

Building Components – allowable increases (Sec. 3.3)

Like Building Types, Building Components allow for a greater ease of use and level of controlled flexibility when it comes to new development and redevelopment of existing residences. Through the Building Components standards, common home improvements such as dormers, bay windows, rear additions, porches, and other alterations to the main structure would be allowed by-right. It should be noted that to take advantage of any Building Component by-right, the proposal must meet all the specific standards of that component and all district dimensional requirements.

Using the same data of existing Building Type footprints, staff have recommended limited increases to the overall footprint through Building Components (see Table 8). This table shows that through Building Components, structures can increase their size through this bonus while remaining in scale and

proportion with existing neighborhood conditions. For House A through Duplex the proposed draft allows for maximum increase of 25%. In this way, Building Components allow for modest increases in size that fit with what we see in the city today except for the uppermost limits of very large homes in each Building Type.

Using the tables provided in this memo, staff hope that the Committee members can discuss, and come to a consensus, on the allowable increase by Building Components. The discussion will be predicated on the Building Type standards since the allowable increase is based on these numbers.

Looking Ahead

At the upcoming ZAP meeting, scheduled for October 1st, staff hope to facilitate a discussion on the proposed Parking Requirements (Sec. 3.7), Garage Design Standards (Sec. 3.4), and Driveway Access (Sec. 3.7.1.E). In addition to Councilor questions and comments, staff will seek guidance on questions within in the Decision Tree memo, dated August 11, 2020.

Attachments

Attachment A Zoning Diagrams for

Table 1: Lot Frontage (Existing Conditions, Current Standards, and Proposed Standards)

Proposed Districts	The Real World Deciles <i>We'd have X% conforming if the minimum was set at ___</i>	Current Ordinance <i>Lot Frontage min</i>	Proposal (August 2020) <i>Lot Frontage min & max</i>
R1	10% conforming - 164 ft 20% conforming - 140 ft 30% conforming - 126 ft 40% conforming - 116 ft 50% conforming - 108 ft 60% conforming - 101 ft 70% conforming - 98 ft 80% conforming - 89 ft 90% conforming - 76 ft	SR1 old = 100 ft SR1 new = 140 ft	80 ft min frontage
R2	10% conforming - 110 ft 20% conforming - 99 ft 30% conforming - 90 ft 40% conforming - 83 ft 50% conforming - 79 ft 60% conforming - 74 ft 70% conforming - 70 ft 80% conforming - 62 ft 90% conforming - 53 ft	SR2 old = 80 ft SR2 new = 100 ft SR3 old = 70 ft SR3 new = 80 ft	60 ft min frontage 110 ft max frontage
R3	10% conforming - 102 ft 20% conforming - 89 ft 30% conforming - 80 ft 40% conforming - 73 ft 50% conforming - 67 ft 60% conforming - 61 ft 70% conforming - 56 ft 80% conforming - 50 ft 90% conforming - 45 ft	MR1 old = 70 ft MR1 new = 80 ft MR2 old = 70 ft MR2 new = 80 ft	50 ft min frontage 100 ft max frontage
R4	10% conforming - 102 ft 20% conforming - 88 ft 30% conforming - 77 ft 40% conforming - 69 ft 50% conforming - 63 ft 60% conforming - 59 ft 70% conforming - 54 ft 80% conforming - 48 ft 90% conforming - 36 ft	MR1 old = 70 ft MR1 new = 80 ft MR2 old = 70 ft MR2 new = 80 ft	50 ft min frontage 100 ft max frontage
N	10% conforming - 165 ft 20% conforming - 124 ft 30% conforming - 100 ft 40% conforming - 88 ft 50% conforming - 77 ft 60% conforming - 68 ft 70% conforming - 61 ft 80% conforming - 51 ft 90% conforming - 36 ft	MR2 old = 70 ft MR2 new = 80 ft BU2 = no min.	40 ft min frontage 100 ft max frontage

Table 2: Lot Coverage (Existing Conditions, Current Standards, and Proposed Standards)

Proposed Districts	The Real World Deciles <i>We'd have X% conforming if the maximum was set at ___ (percentile includes all impervious surface on a lot)</i>	Current Ordinance Rules <i>Lot Coverage max (closest translation in current ordinance is the inverse of "useable open space")</i>	Proposal (August 2020) <i>Lot Coverage max (recommendation is to include all structures and paved areas for driveways and parking)</i>
R1	10% conforming - 8% 20% conforming - 12% 30% conforming - 15% 40% conforming - 18% 50% conforming - 21% 60% conforming - 24% 70% conforming - 27% 80% conforming - 32% 90% conforming - 39%	SR1 old = 35% SR1 new = 30% <i>*Inverse % of useable open space</i>	25% max. lot coverage
R2	10% conforming - 12% 20% conforming - 17% 30% conforming - 21% 40% conforming - 24% 50% conforming - 27% 60% conforming - 31% 70% conforming - 35% 80% conforming - 41% 90% conforming - 49%	SR2 old = 50% SR2 new = 35% SR3 old = 50% SR3 new = 50% <i>*Inverse % of useable open space</i>	30% max. lot coverage
R3	10% conforming - 18% 20% conforming - 25% 30% conforming - 31% 40% conforming - 36% 50% conforming - 41% 60% conforming - 47% 70% conforming - 53% 80% conforming - 61% 90% conforming - 72%	MR1 old = 50% MR1 new = 50% MR2 old = 50% MR2 new = 50% <i>*Inverse % of useable open space</i>	50% max. lot coverage
R4	10% conforming - 23% 20% conforming - 30% 30% conforming - 35% 40% conforming - 41% 50% conforming - 47% 60% conforming - 52% 70% conforming - 58% 80% conforming - 67% 90% conforming - 78%	MR1 old = 50% MR1 new = 50% MR2 old = 50% MR2 new = 50% <i>*Inverse % of useable open space</i>	60% max. lot coverage
N	10% conforming - 27% 20% conforming - 40% 30% conforming - 52% 40% conforming - 60% 50% conforming - 68% 60% conforming - 76% 70% conforming - 84% 80% conforming - 91% 90% conforming - 98%	MR2 old = 50% MR2 new = 50% BU2 = no max. <i>*Inverse % of useable open space</i>	70% lot coverage

Table 3: Front Setback (Existing Conditions, Current Standards, and Proposed Standards)

Proposed Districts	The Real World Deciles <i>We'd have X% conforming if the minimum was set at __</i>	Current Ordinance Front Setback min	Proposal (August 2020) Front Setback min & max
R1	10% conforming - 65 ft 20% conforming - 50 ft 30% conforming - 43 ft 40% conforming - 40 ft 50% conforming - 36 ft 60% conforming - 33 ft 70% conforming - 30 ft 80% conforming - 28 ft 90% conforming - 23 ft	SR1 old = 25 ft SR1 new = 40 ft	25 ft min front setback
R2	10% conforming - 40 ft 20% conforming - 34 ft 30% conforming - 31 ft 40% conforming - 29 ft 50% conforming - 27 ft 60% conforming - 26 ft 70% conforming - 24 ft 80% conforming - 21 ft 90% conforming - 15 ft	SR2 old = 25 ft SR2 new = 30 ft SR3 old = 25 ft SR3 new = 30 ft	20 ft min front setback 40 ft max front setback
R3	10% conforming - 38 ft 20% conforming - 31 ft 30% conforming - 28 ft 40% conforming - 25 ft 50% conforming - 22 ft 60% conforming - 19 ft 70% conforming - 16 ft 80% conforming - 13 ft 90% conforming - 8 ft	MR1 old = 30 ft MR1 new = 25 ft MR2 old = 25 ft MR2 new = 25 ft	10 ft min. front setback 35 ft max front setback
R4	10% conforming - 34 ft 20% conforming - 29 ft 30% conforming - 24 ft 40% conforming - 22 ft 50% conforming - 18 ft 60% conforming - 16 ft 70% conforming - 13 ft 80% conforming - 9 ft 90% conforming - 5 ft	MR1 old = 30 ft MR1 new = 25 ft MR2 old = 25 ft MR2 new = 25 ft	5 ft min front setback 35 ft max front setback
N	10% conforming - 40 ft 20% conforming - 29 ft 30% conforming - 23 ft 40% conforming - 19 ft 50% conforming - 15 ft 60% conforming - 12 ft 70% conforming - 8 ft 80% conforming - 3 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	MR2 old = 25 ft MR2 new = 25 ft BU2 = Lesser of ½ bldg. height or average neighboring lots	0 ft min front setback 25 ft max front setback

Table 4: Side Setback (Existing Conditions, Current Standards, and Proposed Standards)

Proposed Districts	The Real World Deciles <i>We'd have X% conforming if the minimum was set at ___</i>	Current Ordinance Rules <i>Side Setback min</i>	Proposal (August 2020) <i>Side Setback min & max</i>
R1	10% conforming - 33 ft 20% conforming - 24 ft 30% conforming - 20 ft 40% conforming - 17 ft 50% conforming - 15 ft 60% conforming - 13 ft 70% conforming - 11 ft 80% conforming - 8 ft 90% conforming - 5 ft	SR1 old = 12.5 ft SR1 new = 20 ft	20 ft min side setback
R2	10% conforming - 19 ft 20% conforming - 15 ft 30% conforming - 12 ft 40% conforming - 11 ft 50% conforming - 9 ft 60% conforming - 8 ft 70% conforming - 7 ft 80% conforming - 6 ft 90% conforming - 4 ft	SR2 old = 7.5 ft SR2 new = 15 ft SR3 old = 7.5 ft SR3 new = 10 ft	12.5 ft min side setback
R3	10% conforming - 18 ft 20% conforming - 13 ft 30% conforming - 11 ft 40% conforming - 9 ft 50% conforming - 8 ft 60% conforming - 7 ft 70% conforming - 5 ft 80% conforming - 4 ft 90% conforming - 1 ft	MR1 old = 7.5 MR1 new = 10 ft MR2 old = 7.5 MR2 new = 10 ft	10 ft min side setback
R4	10% conforming - 17 ft 20% conforming - 13 ft 30% conforming - 11 ft 40% conforming - 9 ft 50% conforming - 8 ft 60% conforming - 6 ft 70% conforming - 4 ft 80% conforming - 3 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	MR1 old = 7.5 MR1 new = 10 ft MR2 old = 7.5 MR2 new = 10 ft	10 ft mi. side setback
N	10% conforming - 23 ft 20% conforming - 15 ft 30% conforming - 11 ft 40% conforming - 8 ft 50% conforming - 6 ft 60% conforming - 4 ft 70% conforming - 2 ft 80% conforming - 0 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	MR2 old = 7.5 ft MR2 new = 10 ft BU2 = ½ bldg. height or equal to abutting side yard setback; if abutting residential, greater of ½ bldg. height or 15 ft	7.5 ft min side setback

Table 5: Rear Setback (Existing Conditions, Current Standards, and Proposed Standards)

Proposed Districts	The Real World Deciles <i>We'd have X% conforming if the minimum was set at __</i>	Current Ordinance Rules Rear Setback min	Proposal (August 2020) <i>Rear Setback min</i>
R1	10% conforming - 94 ft 20% conforming - 75 ft 30% conforming - 63 ft 40% conforming - 53 ft 50% conforming - 44 ft 60% conforming - 34 ft 70% conforming - 24 ft 80% conforming - 6 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	SR1 old = 25 ft SR1 new = 25 ft	40 ft min. rear setback
R2	10% conforming - 74 ft 20% conforming - 57 ft 30% conforming - 47 ft 40% conforming - 40 ft 50% conforming - 34 ft 60% conforming - 28 ft 70% conforming - 20 ft 80% conforming - 10 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	R2 old = 15 ft SR2 new = 15 ft SR3 old = 15 ft SR3 new = 15 ft	30 ft min. rear setback
R3	10% conforming - 68 ft 20% conforming - 50 ft 30% conforming - 40 ft 40% conforming - 33 ft 50% conforming - 26 ft 60% conforming - 19 ft 70% conforming - 12 ft 80% conforming - 4 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	MR1 old = 15 ft MR1 new = 15 ft MR2 old = 15 ft MR2 new = 15 ft	20 ft min. rear setback
R4	10% conforming - 65 ft 20% conforming - 49 ft 30% conforming - 39 ft 40% conforming - 31 ft 50% conforming - 25 ft 60% conforming - 19 ft 70% conforming - 12 ft 80% conforming - 5 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	MR1 old = 15 ft MR1 new = 15 ft MR2 old = 15 ft MR2 new = 15 ft	20 ft min. rear setback
N	10% conforming - 75 ft 20% conforming - 54 ft 30% conforming - 42 ft 40% conforming - 33 ft 50% conforming - 23 ft 60% conforming - 17 ft 70% conforming - 11 ft 80% conforming - 4 ft 90% conforming - 0 ft	MR2 old = 15 ft MR2 new = 15 ft BU2 = 0 ft or abutting residential/ public use district (greater of ½ bldg. height or 15')	15 ft min. rear setback

Table 6: Building Type Footprint (Existing Conditions and Proposed Standards)

Proposed Building Types	The Real World Deciles <i>We'd have X% conforming if the maximum was set at ___</i>	Existing Median Footprint <i>Lot Coverage max (closest translation to current ordinance is the inverse of "useable open space")</i>	Proposal (August 2020) <i>Footprint includes attached enclosed spaces for habitation or storage</i>
House A	10% conforming – 1,822 sf 20% conforming – 2,026 sf 30% conforming – 2,212 sf 40% conforming – 2,300 sf 50% conforming – 2,407 sf 60% conforming – 2,543 sf 70% conforming – 2,713 sf 80% conforming – 3,005 sf 90% conforming – 3,476 sf	2,407 sf	2,400 sf
House B	10% conforming – 954 sf 20% conforming – 1,085 sf 30% conforming – 1,184 sf 40% conforming – 1,277 sf 50% conforming – 1,371 sf 60% conforming – 1,469 sf 70% conforming – 1,579 sf 80% conforming – 1,725 sf 90% conforming – 1,914 sf	1,371 sf	1,400 sf
House C	10% conforming – 962 sf 20% conforming – 1,100 sf 30% conforming – 1,209 sf 40% conforming – 1,287 sf 50% conforming – 1,351 sf 60% conforming – 1,452 sf 70% conforming – 1,534 sf 80% conforming – 1,620 sf 90% conforming – 1,707 sf	1,351 sf	1,200 sf
House D	10% conforming – 1,876 sf 20% conforming – 1,975 sf 30% conforming – 2,086 sf 40% conforming – 2,201 sf 50% conforming – 2,317 sf 60% conforming – 2,458 sf 70% conforming – 2,639 sf 80% conforming – 2,825 sf 90% conforming – 3,143 sf	2,314 sf	2,300 sf
Duplex	10% conforming – 1,215 sf 20% conforming – 1,379 sf 30% conforming – 1,492 sf 40% conforming – 1,580 sf 50% conforming – 1,671 sf 60% conforming – 1,763 sf 70% conforming – 1,873 sf 80% conforming – 2,028 sf 90% conforming – 2,286 sf	1,671 sf	1,800 sf

Table 7: Minimum Lot Size (Existing Conditions, Current Standards, and Min Lot for Max Building Type)

Proposed Districts	The Real World Deciles <i>We'd have X% conforming if the maximum was set at _____</i>	Current Ordinance Rules <i>Lot Size min</i>	Proposed Adjustments <i>Max Building Type – Min Lot Size</i>
R1	10% conforming - 32,241 sf 20% conforming - 24,989 sf 30% conforming - 20,435 sf 40% conforming - 17,384 sf 50% conforming - 15,763 sf 60% conforming - 14,935 sf 70% conforming - 13,276 sf 80% conforming - 11,751 sf 90% conforming - 10,021 sf	SR1 old: 15,000 sf SR1 new: 25,000 sf	House A – 10,000 sf House B – 8,000 sf House C – 7,600 sf House D – 9,800 sf
R2	10% conforming - 15,030 sf 20% conforming - 12,277 sf 30% conforming - 10,842 sf 40% conforming - 10,013 sf 50% conforming - 9,086 sf 60% conforming - 8,157 sf 70% conforming - 7,448 sf 80% conforming - 6,760 sf 90% conforming - 5,562 sf	SR2 old: 10,000 sf SR2 new: 15,000 sf SR3 old: 7,000 sf SR3 new: 10,000 sf	House B – 5,400 sf House C – 5,040 sf
R3	10% conforming - 13,640 sf 20% conforming - 10,701 sf 30% conforming - 9,331 sf 40% conforming - 8,147 sf 50% conforming - 7,260 sf 60% conforming - 6,551 sf 70% conforming - 5,777 sf 80% conforming - 5,022 sf 90% conforming - 3,978 sf	MR1 old: 7,000 sf MR1 new: 10,000sf MR2 old: 7,000 sf MR2 new: 10,000sf	House B – 3,833 sf House C – 3,500 sf Duplex – 4,500 sf
R4	10% conforming - 13,095 sf 20% conforming - 10,328 sf 30% conforming - 9,131 sf 40% conforming – 7,800 sf 50% conforming – 6,840 sf 60% conforming - 6,018 sf 70% conforming – 5,456 sf 80% conforming – 4,516 sf 90% conforming - 3,130 sf	MR1 old: 7,000 sf MR1 new: 10,000sf MR2 old: 7,000 sf MR2 new: 10,000sf	House B – 3,583 sf House C – 3,250 sf Duplex – 4,250 sf Triplex – 4,250 sf
N	10% conforming - 30,690 sf 20% conforming - 17,105 sf 30% conforming - 12,672 sf 40% conforming - 10,083 sf 50% conforming - 8,514 sf 60% conforming - 7,229 sf 70% conforming - 6,351 sf 80% conforming - 4,913 sf 90% conforming - 3,624 sf	MR3 old:7,000 sf MR3 new: 10,000sf BU2: 10,000 sf	House B – 2,840 sf House C – 2,520 sf Duplex – 3,480 sf Triplex – 3,480 sf Townhouse Section* - 4,875 sf Multiplex – 5,675 sf *Calculated for two Townhouse Sections

Table 8: Building Components - % Bonus (Existing Conditions, % Allowance, Proposed Max Footprint)

Proposed Building Types	The Real World Deciles <i>Existing building footprints (inclusive of building components)</i>	% Allowed increase in Footprint <i>Increase allowed beyond max building footprint (must comply with district dimensional standards)</i>	Proposal (August 2020) <i>Max building footprint + max building component allowance</i>
House A	10% conforming – 1,822 sf 20% conforming – 2,026 sf 30% conforming – 2,212 sf 40% conforming – 2,300 sf 50% conforming – 2,407 sf 60% conforming – 2,543 sf 70% conforming – 2,713 sf 80% conforming – 3,005 sf 90% conforming – 3,476 sf	600 sf <i>25% increase</i>	3,000 sf <i>~80th percentile</i>
House B	10% conforming – 954 sf 20% conforming – 1,085 sf 30% conforming – 1,184 sf 40% conforming – 1,277 sf 50% conforming – 1,371 sf 60% conforming – 1,469 sf 70% conforming – 1,579 sf 80% conforming – 1,725 sf 90% conforming – 1,914 sf	350 sf <i>25% increase</i>	1,750 sf <i>~80th percentile</i>
House C	10% conforming – 962 sf 20% conforming – 1,100 sf 30% conforming – 1,209 sf 40% conforming – 1,287 sf 50% conforming – 1,351 sf 60% conforming – 1,452 sf 70% conforming – 1,534 sf 80% conforming – 1,620 sf 90% conforming – 1,707 sf	300 sf <i>25% increase</i>	1,500 sf <i>~70th percentile</i>
House D	10% conforming – 1,876 sf 20% conforming – 1,975 sf 30% conforming – 2,086 sf 40% conforming – 2,201 sf 50% conforming – 2,317 sf 60% conforming – 2,458 sf 70% conforming – 2,639 sf 80% conforming – 2,825 sf 90% conforming – 3,143 sf	575 sf <i>25% increase</i>	2,875 sf <i>~80th percentile</i>
Duplex	10% conforming – 1,215 sf 20% conforming – 1,379 sf 30% conforming – 1,492 sf 40% conforming – 1,580 sf 50% conforming – 1,671 sf 60% conforming – 1,763 sf 70% conforming – 1,873 sf 80% conforming – 2,028 sf 90% conforming – 2,286 sf	450 sf <i>25% increase</i>	2,250 sf <i>~90th percentile</i>