



City of Fairfax, Virginia
Work Session

Agenda Item #

1.

City Council Meeting:

2/28/06

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of City Council and the Planning Commission Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission

FROM: Robert Sisson, City Manager 

SUBJECT: Residential Infill Development and Associated Issues

ISSUE(S): To consider three residential issues: residential construction completion, fences in front yards and the scale and character of new and upgraded housing in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 districts.

SUMMARY: The Mayor and City Council requested a review of three residential issues. Staff analyzed current City policies and researched how other jurisdictions addressed these issues. Staff recommendations are included for review and comment.

FISCAL IMPACT: Minimal

RECOMMENDATION: City Council and Planning Commission review and comment.

ALTERNATIVE COURSE OF ACTION: N/A

RESPONSIBLE STAFF/POC: David B. Hudson, AICP, Director, Community Development & Planning
Megan G. Cronise, Senior Planner, Community Development & Planning
Dan Malouff, Planner, Community Development & Planning

COORDINATION: City Attorney Code Administration

ATTACHMENTS: 1) Staff Memo dated February 24, 2006 (with attachments)



CITY OF FAIRFAX

Department of Community Development & Planning

TO: Robert L. Sisson, City Manager
THRU: David B. Hudson, AICP, Director, Community Development & Planning
FROM: Megan G. Cronise, Senior Planner, Community Development & Planning
Dan Malouff, Planner, Community Development & Planning
SUBJECT: Residential Infill Development and Associated Issues
DATE: February 24, 2006

The Mayor and City Council instructed Staff to investigate three residential issues. These issues include the length of time in which residential construction projects must be completed, the location of fences in the front yard setback, and the scale and character of infill development.

SPECIFIC ISSUES

Length of Construction

Both construction of new homes and upgrading of existing homes are major undertakings, financial and otherwise, for the homeowner or developer. Once begun, some residential projects in the City have taken years to complete. While under construction, the project can be an eyesore and a cause of neighborhood discontent. The City has very few tools with which to prompt homeowners or contractors to complete such projects.

City building permits remain active as long as some progress takes place within a six month period. If work is suspended or abandoned for six months, the Building Official can either suspend the permit or allow a maximum one-year extension. If the structure becomes unsafe due to lack of construction progress, the Building Official can designate the property as “blighted,” meaning “detrimental to the safety, health, morals or welfare of the community,” which could result in demolition of the structure. None of these options, however, assists the homeowner in completing the improvements.

Whereas in commercial development several bonds are collected to ensure compliance with the approved site plan, the bonding process for residential development is less involved. The City can only request an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and bond, pursuant to the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law, for residential projects disturbing 2,500 square feet of earth or more. The bond amount collected allows the City to stabilize the construction site, if necessary, but not to complete construction.

Fences in the Front Yard

There are a few residential properties in the City where homeowners have constructed six-foot-tall fences and walls at or very close to the front property line. These barriers create a “fortress” effect that is not a desired neighborhood characteristic. These fences are permitted because the Zoning Ordinance does not specify where fences or walls can be located on residential property. While a

Residential Infill Development

page 2

building permit is required by Code Administration if a homeowner wants to construct a fence over six feet in height, a shorter fence can be located anywhere on the lot as long as it does not interfere with sight distance.

Scale and Character of New and Upgraded Housing

The Zoning Ordinance uses the following tools in regulating development in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 Residential Districts (see Attachment 2 for more detail.)

- Height
The maximum height allowed is generally three stories or 35 feet.
- Building setbacks
Setbacks vary by zoning district.

District	Average Lot Area	Front Setback	Side Setback	Rear Setback
R-1	21,780 square feet	50 feet	15 feet	25 feet
R-2	15,000 square feet	35 feet	15 feet	25 feet
R-3	10,500 square feet	25 feet	12 feet	25 feet

- Lot Coverage for surfaced driveway, parking and vehicle storage areas
Not more than 25 percent of a front or a rear yard can be paved for a driveway, parking or vehicle storage area.

Other tools, which are currently not applicable to the City's R-1, R-2 and R-3 districts, are used to regulate commercial development and could be used to further define the scale and character of new and upgraded housing (see Attachment 2,) such as:

- Open Space and Lot Coverage
Requiring a minimum percentage of useable open space per lot, and/or a maximum percentage of lot coverage, automatically reduces the amount of impervious surface per property and addresses the appearance of overdevelopment of lots.
- Bulk/Massing
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) measures density and is calculated by dividing the gross square footage of a building by the lot size. The angle of bulk plane relates a building's total height to its distance from the property line.
- Architectural Detailing
Each neighborhood in the City has its own set of architectural similarities. These elements should be considered for use as a design feature in new homes and additions to tie new construction into the existing neighborhood. Certain design techniques can also be used to visually minimize a structure. These techniques can include varying wall surfaces with bump-outs of different sizes, stepping back height in tiers from the street, and breaking up the roofline. Adding elements such as porches and decorative features can also add architectural interest and reinforce the human scale.

RECENT EXPERIENCE

Recent Residential Infill Development

According to Code Administration building permit records, approximately 40 new houses have been constructed in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 districts since the beginning of 2001. Homeowners in these zoning districts have also pulled hundreds of permits for additions and exterior renovations to their homes, including "pop-top" additions where additional stories have been constructed on top of the

original building.

OTHER JURISDICTIONS' APPROACH

Fences in the Front Yard

Neighboring jurisdictions have more strict regulations regarding such situations. Fairfax County permits only four-foot-tall fences and walls in the front yard setback by-right, though in certain situations for corner lots (defined in the County as having two front yards) on a major thoroughfare, by-right fences may be eight feet tall. Arlington County also limits by-right front yard fences to four feet tall, with a further restriction that any by-right fence on any side of the lot within three feet of a public right-of-way be likewise limited to four feet in height. Alexandria only restricts by-right front yard fences on corner lots, where they can be no higher than three-and-a-half feet, except on the secondary front side of the building, where six-foot-tall fences may be built as long as they meet additional setbacks. By restricting front yard fence height to around four feet, the property and home beyond are visible from the public right-of-way and appear to be better integrated with the neighborhood, thus reducing the “fortress” effect that fenced front yards can have.

Length of Construction

Other jurisdictions use the same tools that the Building Official uses to try to encourage homeowners to complete projects. Determining that a structure is “blighted” is the most powerful tool that jurisdictions, under Virginia law, can use to eliminate structures that are unsafe.

Scale and Character of New and Upgraded Housing

Infill and redevelopment of existing neighborhoods is an important issue to many jurisdictions in Northern Virginia. “Mansionization,” or significant enlargement of homes through either tear-down and rebuild or renovation to the extent that the new home is out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood, in particular has come up as a subject of debate in almost every nearby locality. To get a sense of what the City’s neighbors are doing and how they view the matter, a brief survey of nearby localities was conducted (see Attachment 3) to ascertain what efforts, if any, they are taking to control “mansionization” in older neighborhoods. The most common tools used by nearby jurisdictions to control “mansionization” are more strict limitations on lot coverage and impervious surfaces.

EXISTING CITY POLICY

Policy direction pertaining to neighborhood investment and infill development in the City of Fairfax can be found in three documents – the Report of the 2020 Commission, the Task Force for a More Livable City of Fairfax, and the Comprehensive Plan. Applicable excerpts from these documents are provided in Attachment 1 for your review. The principal underlying theme contained in these documents is that many of the City’s neighborhoods are 35 to 50 years old and require investment to incorporate amenities found in homes constructed today. As a result, a balance must be struck between encouraging this needed investment, and ensuring that this investment results in improvements that are complementary to the neighborhood context.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the issues addressed in this memo be forwarded to the Planning Commission for the purpose of preparing and recommending amendments to the City Code. The Planning

Commission should also work with the Fairfax Renaissance Housing Corporation to ensure that homes improved under that program are consistent with the goals outlined in City policies. These amendments should be developed in a manner that is consistent with City policy that encourages investment in the City's aging housing stock.

Length of Construction

1. The Building Official proposed amending the State enabling legislation for the blight ordinance to include, "incomplete construction, where the building permit has been suspended due to lack of progress" as a condition for contributing to blight.

Fences in the Front Yard

2. Adopt a Zoning Text Amendment for the R-1, R-2 and R-3 Residential Districts to restrict fence height to a maximum of four feet by-right in front yards. Homeowners could still apply to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a Special Exception to this requirement, to address unique circumstances.

Scale and Character of New and Upgraded Housing

3. Create neighborhood-specific pattern books and architectural guidelines to address design of new and upgraded housing.
4. If neighborhood-level planning determines that it is necessary, adopt Zoning Text Amendments addressing one or more of the following:
 - a. Building height;
Although 35 feet is sufficient and in keeping with neighboring jurisdictions, there is a need to determine how house heights should be measured.
 - b. Angle of bulk plane;
In addition to the standard setbacks, a 45-degree angle of bulk plane would result in a building height equal to its distance from the property line. Some neighborhoods may necessitate different angles to accommodate their unique characteristics.
 - c. Lot Coverage
Maximum lot coverages for principal structures, driveways and parking spaces and other impervious surfaces can be used to regulate the impact of improvements on residential properties. Arlington County uses a sliding scale for measuring lot coverage (Attachment 4) that takes into account differing lot sizes and could be applied to any of these three characteristics:
 - i. Principal structures
 - ii. Driveways and parking spaces
While a sliding scale measurement could work well, a 25-percent maximum coverage for surfaced driveway, parking and vehicle storage areas for the front or the rear yard exists in the Zoning Ordinance and functions adequately.
 - iii. Other impervious surfaces (Decks and patios; basketball or other hard-surfaced courts; accessory structures)

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Previous Consideration
- 2) Current Zoning Regulations
- 3) Mansionization Restrictions Around Northern Virginia
- 4) Arlington County Lot Coverage Summary

Attachment 1 - Previous Consideration

page 6

POLICY GUIDANCE

Since the City has been effectively “built out” for many years with few large tracts of developable land remaining, infill and redevelopment have been important aspects of many City plans and reports dating back at least into the 1990s. City policies, plans and planning recommendations on the subject are in ample supply. The most important documents besides the Zoning Ordinance dealing with infill planning are the 2020 Commission Report, the Task Force for a More Livable City Report and the Comprehensive Plan. The most pertinent parts of these three reports are summarized below.

2020 Commission Report

The report urges the City to:

- Consider applying neotraditional principles to redeveloping properties. Neotraditional techniques are modeled on pre-subdivision development and aimed at orienting neighborhoods around pedestrians rather than automobiles.
- Prevent and reverse the deterioration of existing residential development.
- Promote high-quality development by enforcing code standards.
- Adopt neighborhood-specific land use plans and recommendations, recognizing the differences between individual neighborhoods.
- Pursue historic preservation of buildings that contribute to the City’s character.
- Recognize that due to economic constraints, wholesale redevelopment of present subdivisions is unlikely without significant increases in allowed density. Therefore, the City should permit more urban densities where appropriate.
- Embark on a home rehabilitation program (the Neighborhood Renaissance program fulfills this recommendation).

Overall, the 2020 Commission viewed redevelopment as an opportunity to enhance Fairfax’s unique sense of place and further cultivate its town-like character, as distinguished from the surrounding suburban development.

Task Force for a More Livable City Report

The report urges the City to:

- Continue and expand support for the Neighborhood Renaissance program and other associated programs.
- Add a dedicated “Home Improvement Specialist” to City staff. (One staff planner currently fulfills this role, but the position is not dedicated.)
- Allow certain encroachments and reductions to required setbacks in residential zones.
- Prepare stock architectural plans for improvements to homes in certain neighborhoods, to be made available to current or potential residents at little or no cost.
- Encourage national home builders to establish a presence in redeveloping neighborhoods and construct “model homes” in certain areas to provide visible examples of improvements that can be made to the City’s existing housing stock.
- Consider waiving application and review fees for certain targeted improvements.
- Purchase, rehabilitate and resell distressed homes using City funds, as necessary.
- Encourage development of new upscale single-family detached homes with traditional setbacks and lot sizes at every reasonable opportunity.
- Emulate redevelopment in the Town of Vienna, where builders are tearing down older homes in established neighborhoods one by one and replacing them with newer homes valued more highly.

Attachment 1 - Previous Consideration

page 7

Overall, the Task Force viewed redevelopment and enlargements of homes in established City neighborhoods as a positive trend that is necessary for the City to remain competitive with its neighbors, which have more room for newer homes.

2004 Comprehensive Plan, General Points

- The City has an aging population, but increasing numbers of immigrants are keeping household size relatively stable, though there continues to be a slight downward slope. (Pages 15-18)
- Protecting existing City neighborhoods is the primary goal of the Comprehensive Plan's Housing section. (Page 55)
- The City seeks a variety of housing types and price ranges. (Page 55)
- The City's housing stock needs to be modernized and upgraded for the City to remain competitive with neighbors. (Page 55)
- The City's housing stock should provide places for both families and individuals to live. (Page 55)
- The Very Low Density land use category was created to protect those areas with different features than the bulk of the low density neighborhoods. (Page 55)
- The City's housing stock is composed of more single-family detached houses than neighboring jurisdictions. (Page 56)
- No new rental apartments have been added to the City's inventory since 1990. (Page 56)
- Housing values are appreciating in Fairfax and the region as a whole. (Page 56)
- The City is currently more affordable than its neighbors and lacks an appropriate amount of “move up” housing. This applies to both single and multi-family components of the City's housing stock. (Page 57)
- Though there are many HOAs, many units in the City are not served by one. (Page 60)

2004 Comprehensive Plan, Recommendations

The plan urges the City to:

- Conduct an analysis of zoning in the City's residential neighborhoods to ensure it is consistent with the City's vision. (Page 55)
- Create larger neighborhood cluster units that cover all properties in a given area (6-12 for the whole city). (Page 60)
- Encourage the provision of a wide range of housing types and costs. (Pages 63-67)
 - Provide for move-up housing.
 - Promote senior housing in the City.
 - Monitor the adequacy of subsidized housing and seek access to additional affordable housing opportunities.
 - Help the City's renters become homeowners.
 - Encourage implementation of universal design in new construction.
- Preserve and enhance the City's existing housing stock while ensuring traditional neighborhood characteristics are respected. (Pages 63-67)
 - Monitor overall stability of neighborhoods.
 - Identify areas of the City that would benefit from rehabilitation assistance or conservation measures.
 - Promote existing housing preservation / rehabilitation programs, especially in areas identified for improvements.
 - Aggressively pursue activities that will result in improvement of the City's neighborhoods.

Attachment 1 - Previous Consideration

page 8

- Ensure current classifications in the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance are suitable for allowing neighborhoods to revitalize while maintaining their essential characteristics.
- Prepare plans and development guidelines specific to each neighborhood in the City.
- Promote maintenance of existing neighborhoods and adopt residential appearance guidelines. (Pages 63-67)
 - Review city codes and plans to ensure they adequately meet City needs.
 - Adopt community appearance guidelines for residential neighborhoods.
 - Publicize maintenance programs.
- Encourage residential infill in appropriate places and promote upgrading the City's existing housing inventory. (Pages 63-67)
 - Ensure land use and zoning mechanisms promote residential use.
 - Allow for innovative design to make new residential development possible on difficult properties.
 - Update the City's Zoning Code to facilitate upgrading of existing residential
- Create a geographically based system of local organization to mediate between civic, HOA and City-wide issues. Include members not eligible for HOAs such as renters and owners of non-subdivision properties. (Pages 63-67)
- Analyze and amend City plans and Zoning to better allow traditional neighborhood characteristics to preserve through redevelopment. (Pages 63-67)
- The City should adopt a residential component of the Community Appearance Plan. (Page 103)

Protecting existing residential neighborhoods is the primary housing goal of the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan, however, recognizes that different parts of the City have different needs and that single-family detached homes are not the only portion of the housing stock in need of improvement.

Attachment 2 - Current Zoning Regulations

page 9

CURRENT ZONING REGULATIONS

Zoning Tools

Density, Residential:

The number of dwelling units per acre, calculated by dividing the number of dwelling units by the property acreage.

RT District – Nine townhouse dwelling units per acre

RT-6 District – Six townhouse dwelling units per acre

RM District – 10 dwelling units per acre, maximum 15 per acre with City Council approval

P-D District – 12 dwelling units per gross acre

RPD District – Per Future Land Use Map (Comprehensive Plan)

CPD District – Four dwelling units per gross area

Open Space, Residential and Commercial:

“Total area of land or water within the boundaries of a project designed and intended for use and enjoyment as open area or improved for recreational purposes”

RT and RT-6 Districts – 900 square feet per dwelling unit

RM District – 10 percent of the total gross lot area

P-D District – 20 percent of the gross tract area

RPD District – 10 percent of the gross tract area

C-1L District – Minimum 30 percent of the lot area

C-1 District – Minimum 30 percent of the gross lot area

C-2 District – Minimum 25 percent of the gross lot area

C-3 District – Minimum 20 percent of the gross lot area

Ground or Lot Coverage, Residential and Commercial:

The percentage of the property or lot that the footprint of the building (and sometimes other structures or surfaces) occupies.

R-1, R-2, R-3 Districts – maximum 25 percent of the front and rear yards can be surfaced driveway, parking, or vehicle storage area for a single-family dwelling

RT District – minimum of 680 square feet per unit

RT-6 District – minimum of 680 square feet per unit

RM, P-D, RPD Districts – maximum 50 percent of the total gross lot area

I-1, I-2 Districts – 85 percent maximum of total lot area

Not all zoning districts have a lot coverage requirement, and both minimum and maximum requirements are used depending upon the zoning district. An opportunity exists to expand the residential provision to limit the amount of driveway, paving or vehicle storage areas by including all impervious surfaces to reduce accessory structure clutter as well.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR), Residential and Commercial:

“Divide the gross floor area of all buildings on a lot by the lot area.”

P-D District – 1.0 maximum

CPD District – As determined by Planning Commission

C1-L District – 0.40 maximum

C-1, C-2, C-3 Districts – 0.50 maximum

Transition Overlay District – 0.50 maximum; 1.0 maximum if 33 percent gross floor area permanently dedicated to retail or residential use

A maximum and/or a minimum FAR can be used to regulate the proportion of a house to its lot.

Attachment 2 - Current Zoning Regulations

page 10

Bulk Plane, Commercial:

“Delineates the maximum bulk of any improvement which may be constructed on the lot.”

C-1, C-2, C-3 Districts

Front – 30 degrees

Side and Rear – 45 degrees (adjacent to residential)

Historic District

Side and Rear – 45 degrees (adjacent to residential outside the Historic District)

When coupled with the required setbacks, utilizing a bulk plane requirement can determine the prominence of a house’s elevation (or lack thereof.)

Potential Opportunities for Improvement

City regulations measure building height several different ways. The Zoning Ordinance uses the following methods to measure maximum building height:

Standard Height Measurements

- From the average elevation of the existing grade to the highest point of the structure, with the highest point of the structure being:
 - Level of a flat roof;
 - Deck line of a mansard roof; and
 - Average height level between the eaves level and ridge for a gambrel or gable roof.

(Definition of “height”)

- From the average elevation of the existing grade to the level of the highest point of the structure (Accessory Structures)

Residential Height Measurements

- Three stories (R-1, R-2)
- Three stores or 35 feet (R-M)
- Three stories above grade or 35 feet (Old Town Fairfax Historic District)
- Three stories or 35 feet measured on all exposed external walls, any basement that has any wall three feet above the ground shall be counted as a story (R-3, R-T, R-T6)
- Three stories or 35 feet; compatible with adjacent developments and consistent with the character of the general area (RPD)
- 43 feet exposed wall height above the finished grade; decorative and architectural elements not used for human habitation may extend an additional five feet (Old Town Fairfax Transition Overlay District)

Commercial Height Measurements

- Three stories or 35 feet to the top of the highest exposed external wall or from the top of any screening for rooftop mechanical equipment (C-1L)
- Five stories above grade or 60 feet (C-1, C-2, C-3)
- Six stories or 60 feet measured on all exposed external walls; mechanical equipment, towers and spires not used for human habitation can go an additional five feet (P-D; CPD and I-2 are similar)
- Equal to the height of the most restrictive adjacent zoning district (I-1)

Attachment 2 - Current Zoning Regulations

page 11

The Office of Code Administration uses definitions from the 2000 International Building Code. The “building height” definition is similar to the “height” definition in the Zoning Ordinance:

- Vertical distance from grade plane (a plane representing the average finished ground level at the building) to the average height of the highest roof surface

“Story height” and “basement” are also defined in the Building Code although are not included in the Zoning Ordinance:

- Story height – Vertical distance from the top of one finished floor to the top of the next finished floor
- Basement – Portion of a building partly or completely below grade plane (a plane representing the average finished ground level at the building)

Attachment 3 - Mansionization Restrictions around Northern Virginia

page 12

Jurisdiction	Front Setback	Rear Setback	Side Setback	Height Limit	Building Coverage	Others	Recent Changes
City of Fairfax	25, 35, 50 ft*	25 ft	12, 15 ft*	35 ft, 3 stories*			
Fairfax County	20, 25, 30, 35 40*	25	8, 10, 12, 15, 20*	35 ft			None yet, but it's in their work program and changes to FAR, coverage and building height may be considered. Also considering a "neighborhood conservation overlay", which would be like a historic district, but difficult to enact because you need 100% buy-in.
Falls Church	25, 30*	20, 30, 40*	10, 15, 20*85	35 ft, 2.5 stories, 3 stories*	20%, 25%*	Impervious surface: 35%	Enacted impervious surface limit (there was none previously). Upcoming Council actions may reduce lot coverage and/or setbacks.
Herndon	35, 45, 50*	25	10, 15*	35 ft	25%		Unable to contact town planning office.
Vienna				35 ft		Impervious surface: 25%	None. The issue was in the news, but ultimately it was decided that existing rules were adequate.
Arlington County	25 ft, 50% height of building	25	8	35 ft	Sliding scale 16%-53%*		Building lot coverage used to be up to 56%. See attachment 4.
Alexandria	25, 30, 35, 40*	7, 8, 10, 12, 25*	7, 8, 10, 12, 25*	35 ft		FAR: 0.45, 0.35, 0.3, 0.25*	None, but working on a report to the Planning Commission. Considering a task force/committee.
Prince William County	30, 35*	25	10			Impervious surface: 30, 40%*	None.
Manassas	35	25	10, 15*	35 ft			None yet, but issue is on the table and Zoning Committee is looking at options. Making the whole city a historic district is under consideration.

* Depending on the zone.

Attachment 4 - Arlington County Lot Coverage Summary

page 13

ARLINGTON COUNTY LOT COVERAGE

The Arlington County Board, in response to the many citizen concerns regarding the size and scale of new houses in Arlington County and after extensive study by Arlington staff, adopted an Ordinance amendment regarding lot coverage on November 15, 2005. No appeals were filed within the required 30 day time period so the Ordinance is in full effect.

It was determined that lot coverage requirements are the most direct way to limit the size of homes. Staff was tasked with determining reasonable coverage limits that would protect neighborhoods from very large houses in the future while still allowing reasonable sized houses for today's market and taking into account differences in the character and density of the various neighborhoods. Prior to the amendment, lot coverage was a regulation in the Arlington Zoning Ordinance and was set at 56% for each residential district. The new lot coverage requirements are zoning district-based and work on a sliding scale as density increases. Homes on smaller lots are permitted to cover a greater percentage of their property than homes on larger lots, even though homes on larger lots may be larger in terms of raw square feet.

The table below is part of the Ordinance and outlines regulations in the different residential zoning districts.

Categories	R-5	R-6	R-8	R-10	R20
Maximum Lot Coverage	45%	40%	35%	32%	25%
Maximum Lot Coverage With front porch	48%	43%	38%	35%	28%
Maximum Lot Coverage With rear detached garage	50%	45%	40%	37%	30%
Maximum Lot Coverage With rear garage and front Porch	53%	48%	43%	40%	33%
Maximum Main Building Footprint Coverage	34%	30%	25%	25%	16%
Maximum Main Building Footprint Coverage with A front porch	37%	33%	28%	28%	19%
Main Buildings Footprint Cap	2380 sf	2520 sf	2800 sf	3500 sf	4480 sf
Main Building Footprint Cap with a front porch	2590 sf	2772 sf	3136 sf	3920 sf	5320 sf

Notes:

- There are not only total lot coverage percentages, but caps for main building footprints.
- Allowances are made for desirable amenities such as a front porch or rear detached garage.
- The maximum main building footprint coverage on undersized lots in a zoning district shall be the same square footage as permitted on a standard size lot in that district, subject to all setback requirements.
- Existing nonconforming buildings may be rebuilt at their existing size if the structures are damaged or destroyed by natural causes if construction commences within two years of the calamity.
- For all lots in R districts that are not used for one-family dwellings, lot coverage shall not exceed 56%.