

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 1 I find it hypocritical that a town that touts open spaces, parks & other environmental causes, is considering higher density housing. In search of more property tax revenue ?
- 2 It's hard to support without more detail on the percentages and definitions. I like that houses built can't be in top of each other per current code, so while I would support some expansion I wouldn't do so by more than about 5-10% or the equivalent in new definitions.
- 3 I think this could work, provided the %'s are adequate. I know the town did research on the past 100 homes built and only 1 was outside of the proposed percentages. The hard part here will be to find the right %. I support a 35% total coverage amount.
- 4 I am in favor of this option but I fear this will stall any decision for a long time to come and even push away too many council members who are open to some type of compromise. I say this because I watched the previous council meeting that went late into the evening when this was first put on the table in May or June. I could see that several members were really turned off by the original proposal. Even if this is the most professional way to move a complicated matter forward, I am against option 3 if it means turning off too many voting members who could vote for option 2 as well as this taking many years to work through. Does anyone else agree with me on this?
- 5 Sounds like it would be close to option 2
- 6 Same as option 2.
- 7 There are some really nice houses in Vienna - reducing house size might reduce home prices.
- 8 With out any definition this is hard to understand. I would need a clear understanding of how this works.
- 9 It's 2021. Build.
- 10 Same as Option 2, but I don't yet really have an understanding of the difference between Option 2 and 3 and would like to learn more.
- 11 Oppose unless this could be limited to a square footage maximum. (Ie for small homes)
- 12 Enormous houses should be on enormous lots. I'm not against big houses, but it makes our town seem much more like a city than a town.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 13 The proportion allotted for uncovered development is puzzling because the whole point of the zoning amendments was to allow for additional attached spaces for home offices, etc. This option appears to contradict the original purpose of the zoning proposals. If this option is selected, the Town should allow exceptions to lot coverage for driveways that are certified by the Town as properly designed and constructed to allow drainage, i.e., are not impervious surfaces, e.g., using gravel or specially designed pavers.
- 14 We already face water and runoff issues from other lots on our streets, so allowing them to possibly reduce the permeable surface are by much would only exacerbate the issues we currently face even with all of the drainage we have in place. Unfortunately, many of the other homeowners in our street have not invested in such measures, which means less permeable ground would likely increase our problems. Additionally, not allowing someone to fill the back portion of their lot helps with the overall aesthetic of the town.
- 15 My overall preference is that the Town of Vienna maximize our green space & minimize the potential for rainwater runoff, flooding, noise & light pollution in our neighborhoods.
- 16 While this option does potentially increase the percent lot coverage, reducing the permitted building coverage and redefining the non-building/outdoor living space may provide greater flexibility and, perhaps, add less to the cost of the house although I can't be sure about that. My interest is in creating more affordable housing and greater economic diversity in the Town of Vienna.
- 17 Who knows what the Town of Vienna Council would do if granted unlimited discretion.
- 18 This will have a negative effect on drainage. There is no need whatsoever for this change.
- 19 This is a disastrous idea! Who suggested it? Developers? Does it always have to be about money?
- 20 My feeling is that Option 3 would take much longer to implement whereas Option 2 could be done quickly.
- 21 Fairfax county already has 30% coverage while we are at 25%. We should conform with the county or better.
- 22 This would be an environmental travesty. As it is we are losing all our trees to new construction. This would not be the picture Of Vienna I love.
- 23 Terrible idea and is environmentally unfriendly
- 24 best alternative.
- 25 This is too confusing and could lead to abuses.
- 26 Existing properties would have to be grandfathered since items are going from one category to the other. e.g. driveway is going from lot to outdoor coverage.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 27 Absolutely do not do this. Vienna is an embarrassment of a town that has allowed barely regulated massive over building over the past years in residential areas. Smaller homes continue to be torn down in favor of a blight of massive homes that leave few-to-no trees on their lots and almost no green space. Our water run off has been disturbed so much that everyone's homes are flooding. So few trees remain that were here 17 years ago that the cicada emergence this year was extremely low. It's all because the Town continues to give-in to the demands and greed of builders who want to go bigger and bigger and bigger. If homeowners want a porch or a patio, build or buy a smaller house. Or better yet, preserve one of the smaller, solidly built 1950's homes that made this town the family-centric haven it once was.
- 28 I like this the best because I think it gives homeowners flexibility to make thoughtful improvements to our outdoor space. I know there are things I would like to do but I am limited by space.
- 29 Too complex and restrictive of outdoor living space. Driveways and game courts shouldn't take away from percentage allowed for living additions (screened porches, decks, etc)
- 30 Not opposed...don't really care.
- 31 The clarification in language is welcome, but it is hard to support this strongly with such a wide variance on the percentages.
- 32 Love the idea of kids being able to play on sport courts and outside
- 33 Too much is TBD for this survey to be accurate.
- 34 This is worst option with respect to protecting the environment Option 3 increases stormwater runoff, while reducing trees and green space which are more aesthetically pleasing than cement. Also, this option will encourage noise, hoarding stuff in and on these surfaces, and encourages more people inhabiting a residence. Finally, property values will be lower if less green space exists between lots.
- 35 Depends on definitions
- 36 This option seems much more difficult to regulate than Option 2. I like the overall increase in lot coverage to 35%, but it needs to be more straightforward for homeowners to be able to follow. Also, many homes would already be out of compliance if driveways move to a new definition.
- 37 It's not clear why the need for change, unless its to financially benefit developers.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 38 Option 3 takes a rational approach to the lot coverage issue by creating new definitions of "building coverage" and "nonbuilding coverage," and I would support this result if the building coverage percentage is at least 22-23%, as noted. But I think Option 2 is more practical and fair than Option 3 because, unlike Option 3, Option 2 keeps "single-story screened porches that cannot be converted to interior living space" in the same category as other outdoor-living spaces such as patios and uncovered decks. The risk with Option 3 is that builders of new homes could use up the entire building coverage area and leave homeowners with no practical flexibility to add a screened porch without major foundational changes. Option 3 thus unfairly favors hardscapes over covered porches.
- 39 I need to better understand this option. I would support it if it grants more use of outdoor living space.
- 40 Need more information, the percentages are such a wide range
- 41 This provides the most flexibility of the three options, but not all lots are the same so makes sense if there is just an overall lot percentage rather than having separate for building and outdoor living. This basically forces the designs/layouts of the houses in the area to be the same box and doesn't provide the variety that this cute town should want. Let the homeowners decide how they want to utilize the 35%. I only support this option over option 2 if lot coverage is 35%. Also, offsets need to be revised as they are very restrictive.
- 42 It provide the right balance
- 43 I do support the flexibility of the homeowners to determine what the extra allowance should be used for as long as 22-23% will not increase the square footage of a house. I personally would like to slightly widen my driveway and I don't feel like this would have a negative impact on my lot or street scape. This is the only option that would allow me to do it. I would support this model if the percentage allowed for the house structure is lowered to 22-23%. We don't need a model where the base house structure can get even bigger.
- 44 I'm not clear on why the presence of a roof is the distinguishing factor. Why should a covered front porch be different from a non-covered front porch? This seems a little arbitrary to me and I prefer the indoor/outdoor space language of #2, though I get that could be tricky to define.
- 45 This seems to allow the most flexibility and lets homeowner choose whether to have bigger house or more outdoor space.
- 46 This might be acceptable, but is completely unknown so I can't form a reasoned opinion. If this option included consideration of the goals of the regulations and then evaluated various approaches to achieving that goal, rather than just changing definitions, I would strongly support it.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 47 This at least allows more flexibility in the formula, and is the only one that moves driveways and parking spaces into non-building improvements, which they are.
- 48 This option will decrease the air quality since mature trees will be destroyed. I see this option as an opportunity for house prices to further increase and make it impossible to afford to live in Vienna. Additionally I see this option as being put forward only to provide additional funds in the form of an increase in the county and TOV's tax base
- 49 see above. Also, we need to revisit the required tree coverage. Why are lots allowed to be clear cut (e.g. corner of Ware and Marshall)?? More trees are needed than the 25% coverage that will occur in 10 years, or whatever the current law says.
- 50 Too restrictive on coverage
- 51 The last thing we need is larger, more expensive, and more sprawling houses in Vienna. Given the inability of the Town to write clear and enforceable rules during the previous MAC process, I can not trust the Town to write any expansion of lot coverage in a way that won't just create bigger houses, less trees, and more water run-off problems.
- 52 does not solve the problem of allowing those of us with existing outdoor living space to add a shed or storage
- 53 Can't support something so undefined.
- 54 This has appeal because it separates the house allowance from outdoor allowances and has a smaller housing footprint allowance (although I fear for taller houses such as my neighbor at 109 Wilmar) but until the numbers are final, I cannot support this without reservations.
- 55 Way too much house and concrete.
- 56 Too undefined to comment, but I would support smaller building coverage in favor of larger improved outdoor spaces.
- 57 I'm not sure this outcome would help us. For the entire second half of summer into the fall we are stuck inside because of bugs! I really want to be able to build a screen porch so we can be outside without bug bites.
- 58 Need details.
- 59 Seems overly complicated, and doesn't deliver any more than the 35% proposed above.
- 60 This is simply too much paved surfaces. With climate change, we're getting more and more flooding.
- 61 Too vague. Feel 25% makes sense and is straightforward for already built homes and too be built to maintain consistency. Convo should focus on what's allowable for outdoor space beyond the 25% not connected to primary structure. Option 2 is straightforward and gives existing Howe owners flexibility

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 62 This seems to be the most reasonable. Currently, if the house is set back far on the lot, much of the coverage is taken up by the driveway itself. That's not fair.
- 63 See answer to #9 above, only more so.
- 64 Anything to change the current status quo is better than nothing.
- 65 Too vague to agree to at the present time
- 66 My biggest concern with increasing lot coverage is the impact to town trees. It would be ideal to ideal to somehow tie number of trees taken down to minimize impact.
- 67 This option gives owners the choice of how best to design their outdoor living and separates covered vs uncovered spaces. Easier to understand.
- 68 When consolidated for all Town properties definitely threatens to yield a a reduction in Town's green space and tree coverage
- 69 This option is just ridiculous. I would recommend people not move here with this kind of zoning.
- 70 This one seems to be making things complicated with unintended tradeoffs. For example, what if the garage is in the back of the house? Or the house sits back far from street? Those are visually good things, but it increases the driveway area. If you increase the driveway area, then you cannot have a patio or deck in the back? If this option is selected, then the 22% building coverage seems OK, and the other coverage should be at least 11% for the driveway, patio, and deck. Although would prefer 23% building and 12% other to have the most flexibility.
- 71 I support allowing larger structures on building lots in Vienna
- 72 Screened in porches and decks should be encouraged.
- 73 As far as I can tell, this might allow for a longer driveway that would allow a garage in the backyard. New houses (on 1/4 acre lots) in Vienna now all have Garages in FRONT of the house. Not only ugly -- but takes living space, so people cannot have a bedroom on the 1st floor. As population ages -- we NEED bedroom space not requiring steps.
- 74 While I support option 3 I am concerned about increased storm water run off as we expand lot coverage. It appears we are taxing our current capacity.
- 75 The fact that the details aren't even defined make this a weak option to consider.
- 76 October, 2020, I had my approved deck and ADA ramp built. I am an amputee that just wanted a porch but not allowed. Why? I don't know. I Want to cover my deck to add an approved roof. Please allow. Other houses have porches on my street.
- 77 I can't support this one due undefined limits.
- 78 I think total lot coverage/deck coverage should be increased but not enough detail for option 3 to know what I would be supporting/opposing.
- 79 Same as opposition to option 2

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 80 Ultimately the area will become denser. These changes may be required in time. If not in this particular round.
- 81 Outdoor living spaces add to community togetherness. It enables full use of you property and encourages spending more time outside. It also facilitates getting to know others in the town.
- 82 Strongly support with modification – request a slight increase to structure percentage— 24-25% (instead of 22-23%).
- 83 I believe making house 25% and than redefining anything outside (driveways, patio etc) helps support the goal in mind of house additions. This also allows for positive improvements but should not be limited to just the front yard. A double parking spot is Desired while still having a front yard but limiting to 30% front yard wouldn't allow many people to enhance their growing family needs or stay at home needs. I would not seperate out front yard from back yard, but the definition seems more accurate in this proposal.
- 84 While I don't believe anyone wants to amend the coverage requirement to allow new homes to encroach lot lines and shadow neighbors, we do need a common sense update to the code. For example, we have a patio in our backyard that was built with pervious stone and set in sand. However, it still counts against our impervious lot coverage allowance. Also, outdoor spaces add enjoyment as well as value of homes
- 85 This would be our second choice since it is less restrictive than the current plan.
- 86 See above comments.
- 87 I strongly agree that definitions should be updated. I STRONGLY disagree that total coverage is TBD. I Strongly agree that Total Coverage under new definitions should NOT exceed 30%. No exceptions. We need more green and trees and less cement/roofs/building structures in our town.
- 88 Our town, with the exception of some very lovely moderate sized new homes is becoming boring and overpowering. So sick of construction dirt and noise and no shade making a walk unpleasant. There is a reasonable way to build decent homes in a small town. This is not it!
- 89 I think this third option provides more flexibility for different situations.



# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 90 Given that this has so much uncertainty since %ages are not defined and only estimated, I cannot support or oppose this one. What I can say is that I oppose having more density and more enormous homes as it is changing Vienna's culture. Furthermore, I do not see how the is and past surveys are hitting at the heart of the matter and that is that developers are maximizing buildings on land, properties are being subdivided, and trees are being clear cut. We are a joke of a tree city. Furthermore, why have we not required sidewalks be built and infrastructure improvements be done? A missed opportunity. Our family is disturbed daily by the sound of construction and awakened each morning by the sound of it. It is difficult to drive and walk through town due to the construction. It has significantly degraded our standard of living.
- 91 If the total impervious surface can be limited to 30%, then Option 3 seems reasonable. If the limit on impervious surfaces is increased above 30%, then I remain opposed.
- 92 Option 3 allows more flexibility to create an outdoor living space specific to each homeowner
- 93 Like the ability to have the flexibility of additional front or back yard covered seating area.
- 94 I don't fully follow the pros / cons vs option 2. But if it accomplished the goal of being able to add a patio above and beyond the current 30% I would be a proponent
- 95 this would limit the size of houses on a lot (I would imagine?) which could be good for Vienna. It seems like the houses just keep getting bigger and bigger! Driving around Vienna I actually don't see how some of the new houses stick within the lot coverage requirements.
- 96 This option affords homebuyers the most flexibility to use their lot as they please while still having reasonable limits in place to preserve the town's character. It also allows homebuyers to correct the most frequent builder oversight - poorly designed driveways. This is a personal concern of ours. Our driveway was cut on either side before the RUP was released because it was ~0.02% over the 25% lot coverage. The result is a driveway that requires MANY maneuvers to get in/out and grass dying on either side due to being constantly driven on (the ramp from the street is exactly the width of 1 car so there is no room for error). Being able to correct a suboptimal driveway would address a pain point among a lot of residents, and also allow us to have guests, in laws, etc. park on the driveway instead of the street. Considering the current prices of homes in the neighborhood, we are hoping that TOV advocates for residents and homebuyers with Option 3 that ensures builders leave future homeowners some flexibility to use their land as they please.



# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 97 I would like to see smaller houses, but if the house size is only reduced to 23% (a change barely distinguishable from 25%) and the additional coverage allowed goes up to 35% total, then that is a step in the wrong direction.
- 98 It is a license to disregard the setting for which most homeowners moved to Vienna.
- 99 No need to rewrite the zoning. Prefer less lot coverage.
- 100 Makes the most sense given the surrounding fairfax county regulations and the homes just outside the town. Currently residents are being punished for living inside the town with regulations that are impeding on their quality of life and ability to enjoy their homes.
- 101 Lot coverage limits already allow "McMansions" that, in my opinion, cover too much of the lot. There is little need for larger allowances.
- 102 Strongly oppose - we do not need this amount of coverage on the small lots in our town.,
- 103 See answers to 1 and 2 above.
- 104 I'm afraid people will build large driveways and parking areas that are an eyesore to the community. We want to preserve our small town feel and not hurt the environment as well.
- 105 I somewhat support this proposal because it addresses the problem but would need to learn more about it.
- 106 How much house do you need. The over building is ruining the small town feel of Vienna.
- 107 I think this is the best compromise between retaining our overall low lot coverage and allowing some flexibility to increase outdoor living space. There has to be some type of stormwater runoff mitigation, however . . . neighbors should not have to pay the price for someone's desire for a new deck or porch.
- 108 The pandemic has only emphasized the need for more outdoor space. This option provides homeowners the best chance at making outdoor improvements.
- 109 Not entirely clear on future "TBD" percentages
- 110 Would like to see building coverage at 24 or 25% and outdoor living/non building coverage at about 10%.
- 111 I still oppose the increase lot coverage, but this seems to be at least more flexible and encourages people to build smaller homes to accommodate their desire for greater outdoor living.
- 112 Better. Still too restrictive. We wonder why less wealthy people can't afford to come to Vienna. This is the best one because it most effectively lowers the oversight of the town into things that shouldn't be the town's business. These options are all still not sufficient for the realities of the 21st century and we should be ashamed of all of them.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 113 Cannot support (or comment) any proposal that contains no details to contrast to other the options. Need to supply proposed definitions.
- 114 This seems like a good middle ground, but also seems to make it a lot more complicated. Simple is better. TOV may be signing up for a lot of headaches.
- 115 This option is better than Option 1.
- 116 I am supportive of a plan that will provide more coverage if the rules of straightforward with easy formulas to calculate coverage under the new model taking inputs from the plat of my lot.
- 117 35% of lot coverage with structure is far to large and this option seems ambiguous.
- 118 For me, this a great improvement in the code as it addresses lots like mine which are not ideal.
- 119 Too ill-defined. Need more info on this before voting. Could provide good flexibility in the time of COVID. In general, we need more ability to add Mother-In-Law structures on existing lots, or just roofed storage (sheds, garages with lofts)  
...
- 120 Additional front yard coverage could cause further opposition to sidewalk projects in vienna
- 121 This seems like it would take way way too long and yield few benefits that could not be achieved via option 2
- 122 Seems to create uncertainty and arbitrariness and since its not really defined and has the potential to be gamed, I lean against this somewhat.
- 123 This would encourage builders to maximize interior space, and likely lead to complaints in the future
- 124 I would like the town to take a look at the current housing code due to many home owners with bigger, but older homes not being able to expand or improve their property (i.e. convert carport to garage and change decks and porches to enclosed areas).
- 125 see comments in 1
- 126 Green space is one of the things that makes living in Vienna so nice. I strongly oppose increasing lot coverage for single family homes
- 127 The increase in total coverage to 35% will reduce Vienna's wonderful greenery.
- 128 While I am not personally opposed to this I think it is the most controversial option as it will allow larger houses to be built. Option 2 is better for the town as it will keep the house sizes at their current maximum and allow existing residents to have the outdoor space they need.
- 129 I already built my house so I don't need additional lot coverage for a house, I need additional lot coverage for patio.
- 130 Option 3 is a good option but Option 2 is my preferred option.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 131 Option 3 is also a good option but I do not need additional lot coverage for my house so my preference is Option 2.
- 132 This sounds like a waste of time.
- 133 It should not reduce the lot coverage for those who already own homes.
- 134 I strongly support this option if the percentages for building coverage are increased to 24% or 25%. We have a new construction house on a 10,000 sq ft lot and are currently at the 25% lot coverage and have an uncovered deck. With Option 3, we still would not be able to cover our deck. Are you considering increasing the percentages from the proposal (22% to 23%) as I would think this would impact most new builds on 10,000 sq ft lots?
- 135 Who wants bigger driveways and parking spaces?
- 136 Owners should have the most flexibility to use their land as they see fit.
- 137 This is a second choice for me. I like that the definitions seem more flexible, but I have concerns that builders of new homes will build to the max and prevent future homeowners from adding outdoor spaces they may enjoy as the years pass.
- 138 people want more building space less yard to maintain more like county regulations thank you.....
- 139 We are losing too many of our trees in Vienna
- 140 Paving over grass, trees, and shrubs will be horrible for our environment. We need to carefully protect our planet and the average family does not need 6,000+ sq ft for a residence. We must control our appetites. We only have one planet.
- 141 This feels worse than option 1
- 142 This option would allow us to have the outdoor living space we thought we'd be able to have before we bought this house. We didn't realize how restrictive the town of Vienna's zoning code was when we bought.
- 143 Kicking the can down the road in my opinion, but possible will allow for more specificity, i.e. permeable stone and pavers not counting as lot coverage.
- 144 the only reason Vienna hasn't turned into Arlington or other dense parts of NOVA is due to our "antiquated" zoning code which has saved our time.
- 145 Still doesn't go far enough to empower property owners
- 146 I don't like the squishy-ness of this option.
- 147 We need to consider increased tree and green coverage for climate change. We felt the impact this summer, so let's do our part in the town to maintain trees and preserve nature as much as possible.
- 148 Overly complicated and adequate driveways for families are likely to take up too much of the "outdoor" coverage, leaving little allocation for outdoor living / improvements

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 149 w/o knowing the percentages it is too vague to support
- 150 I think this would alter the Town's charm and appeal. It will look like Landsdowne or one of those neighborhoods that clearcuts trees, and packs in homes tightly. Also, I am concerned about the flooding risk, as mentioned earlier.
- 151 Will have to be carefully worded so that homeowners don't try to exploit the exceptions (eg trying to claim that multilevel decks are actually "stairs"). I would support if total coverage stays below 30-35%
- 152 May have more flexibility but harder in built homes to adjust ratio
- 153 I think this option offers the most flexibility and improved living options for home owners.
- 154 too many variables. anticipated range of coverage needs to be defined.
- 155 Good
- 156 Given the percentages is still undetermined - my fear is we somehow will get massive houses on smaller plots of land, limiting our privacy. It also allows for less green space. Vienna prides ourselves on our trees yet with so many new houses going in we have few mature trees and changing with this option will give ppl more motive to cut down their trees.
- 157 For option 3, I'm in favor of increasing the total coverage to 35%
- 158 Instead of Sport Courts, have more public parks with more indoor and outdoor activities, skate parks
- 159 I worry about water run off of hard-scaped land as we already have issues with water soaked dirt causing pooling of water. Will my neighbor's tennis court be built so that water runs off it into my yard instead of being soaked into the ground in their yard because I am down hill from them for example?
- 160 Current owners should be allowed as developers to add water catchment systems in order to increase coverage.
- 161 See Option 1 comments
- 162 This seems like drastic change and would take alot of effort by the Town to update/enforce. Option 2 gives the similar results with
- 163 Looking around Vienna I'm seeing some massive houses on very small lots so I can only assume someone received a waiver. The houses look totally out of place
- 164 Again it is a reasonable compromise for everyone.
- 165 Total proposed coverage should be 40%
- 166 This option supports the town's approach of allowing large homes to be built on existing lots. Without option 3 home owners are ultimately frustrated to learn the home they bought can't support the needs for their family
- 167 To prevent "exceptions"
- 168 May accommodate pool and deck.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments

- 169 "to be determined" is not helpful. If covered building size is smaller than 25%, I'd be in favor.
- 170 the resulting density is too high. New homes will dwarf existing homes, open space and trees lost
- 171 Please refer to above for one family's stand on the lot coverage. The bottom line: 5% increase + the outdoor living spaces coverage of 40-45% would be a great albeit a very small first step.
- 172 Could be improved with a higher carpet area percentage to at least 30%
- 173 What problems are you trying to solve with the more restrictive options?
- 174 not clear what the tradeoffs are here. generally support more flexibility within total impermeable requirements. could be very problematic for certain lots that require significant setbacks.
- 175 I feel the current code is appropriate and see no need to change it and again the maximum of 35% is a big increase from current
- 176 Changes the long term look of our residential neighborhoods and adds imperious surface and flooding. Due to climate changes many communities are moving in the other direction and trying to reduce impervious surface in their localities.
- 177 Increases impermeable coverage.
- 178 Permeable Pavers are eco friendly. The town needs to rethink this matter.
- 179 As I previously stated, as the new homes replace the old, this level of expansion would result in a crowded landscape for the town.
- 180 more tree protection is needed
- 181 This seems to allow the home owner the most flexibility to have a home they want. The changes should not be for the builder but for the home owner!

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 180 35% is not high enough. If homeowners decide if they want 50%, let them do it.
- 181 35% lot coverage is still very little lot coverage but offers more opportunity for homeowners to build additional outdoor spaces to improve their quality of life.
- 182 Additional flexibility is nice, but NOT in favor of more driveway/parking spaces so would prefer option 2
- 183 Again 30% seems to be a reasonable lot coverage that simply removes the preference for decks, but would serve the purpose of allowing for the additional outdoor living space. 35% would only benefit new builds. What would the Town get for providing this bonus to builders?
- 184 Again, I think this would be a great option for existing homes but not for new builds for the reasons stated in my Option 2 explanation.
- 185 Agree that driveways and patios should be considered outdoor living spaces. The restriction on driveways only increases the amount of cars parked on the street which is not ideal. Patios should be included in the same category as uncovered decks.
- 186 Allows developers to build ever larger homes making Vienna less affordable
- 187 Allows for outdoor space for modern living.
- 188 Anything that decreases total covered structure coverage from 25% downward is good. All the new houses are too big. Builders will ALWAYS build to the published maximums. I'm fine with giving homeowners more uncovered hardscape coverage options, in exchange for less coverage by covered structures.
- 189 Anything that will allow for deck owners to enclose the existing structure, please!

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 190 As long as the total lot coverage for ALL covered or structures doesn't cross 25%, I'm ok with this. I actually like that covered structures would get smaller; I fear that promises wouldn't get kept and it would open the way for bigger houses. It would be a win if houses could get smaller and outdoor space could get bigger. That is of course possible with the current building code, but NO BUILDER chooses to do this. This proves that builders will ALWAYS build the largest house possible and then squeeze in the most outdoor space that they can with what is left over. If you increase the allowable house size, builders will build to the maximum limit. That is in their best interest, but not in the best interest of the neighbors, the environment, the accessibility and affordability of Vienna, the ability of seniors to age in place, of teachers and firefighters to actually live in this town where they work. We need smaller houses and a lower price point that can actually maintain this town as vibrant and multi-layered economically, and not just for the uber-rich.
- 191 As presented this policy is not fully developed enough.
- 192 Been always deny to make the minimal extension improvements to accommodate my physical disabled condition where a wheelchair was imposible to accommodate during a long term surgery and probably next to be performed. Don't need a McMansion but certainly the right to have a functional home by having the right to expand a little bit.
- 193 Best of the 3 options. Decks and outdoor living spaces are key to quality of life. Homeowners should have the option to use their property for this purpose.
- 194 better option for screened in porches, which are needed around here
- 195 Better than option 1, but worse than option 3. The problem I see with option 2 is that it limits square footage to the home size and some prefer more indoor space over outdoor space and there's no reasoned basis to discriminate one type of space over the other. That, in my view, is because both cover the ground equally and present the same drainage issues.
- 196 building coverage does not need to be bigger
- 197 Decks should be included under the building coverage



# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 198 Don't attach rewriting Vienna's code with expanding lot coverage. They're 2 separate issues. Want to made Vienna's code easier to read? Do it. Want to change the lot coverages? Nope.
- 199 Driveways, patios, sport courts, etc. should be counted in the first category of lot coverage.
- 200 Exemption after exemption have been made over the years that are ruining this town. No more exemptions.
- 201 Expands lot coverage too far; would creat lengthy timeline to create new policy
- 202 feel this option gives the homeowner the choice of how they want to invest in their property....like the concept of smaller house footprint being rewarded with a higher percentage of outdoor living allowances. think this is on trend and in the best interest of TOV. To satisfy concerns of neighboring properties, perhaps adjusting the setback and requiring landscape screens are ideas worth considering. thank you for the opportunity to comment. szd
- 203 Gravely concerned by non-permit work
- 204 How about a modification of #3 to give the homeowner more flexibility in their backyards to create outdoor/multi season living space that can encompass, deck, covered deck, swimming pool (Shed to house all the pool equipment), fire pit, etc.
- 205 I am confused by the definition of this option, as it has a lot of "to be determined" its definition. I like the added poor coverage aspect, but don't follow the finer points.
- 206 I am for any changes that allow additional outdoor space whether it's a small shed or an outdoor patio
- 207 I do not fully understand the advantages of this option but I generally prefer it to option 1.
- 208 I found this option to be confusing. The town did not do a sufficient job of highlighting the differences between this option and option 2

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 209 I like that this reduces building coverage to compensate somewhat for outdoor building, but a house already built covering 25% should not get the full outdoor area from the new policy. I also like that it's more flexible. Same caveats as option 2 with respect to civil and environmental analysis.
- 210 I prefer more leniency with this option so we can improve our home.
- 211 I support extra coverage for driveways/parking spaces to get extra homeowner's cars off the street.
- 212 I think 35% is not enough these days to satisfy the new reality of safe outdoors gathering. Maintaining 6 ft apart or a safe distance is really hard with this space restriction.
- 213 I would generally be in favor of new definitions that allowed home owners flexibility in utilizing outdoor living spaces, including patios, covered decks, and screened porches.
- 214 I'm a 35 year resident of Town of Vienna. I no longer feel confident that the ad Town cares about the preservation of habitat and quality of living space.
- 215 Increase total coverage to 35% to allow flexibility to enclose outdoor space.
- 216 It is unfortunate that many people cannot put in a small patio for a table and grill b/c of the current max covering percentage. I hope this gets changed
- 217 It's so vague- how can anyone support option 3?
- 218 Lots are too small for the enormous houses being built. Houses tower over existing homes and intolerance is growing within The TOV which may ultimately cause residents to leave.
- 219 More flexibility is good, but would like to see more allowable coverage on the lot for outdoor living in addition to baseline house coverage. A closed in patio in this area is a great quality of life addition due to the insect population. As someone who moved here from California, we find our uncovered deck unusable most of the year.
- 220 much more logical division of building vs. non building components and, at least on the top end of the percentage ranges, allows for meaningful outdoor living spaces to be added...that said, 8% would be way too little coverage for the non building components...

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 221 My concern with this one is bringing the lot coverage area down from the current 25%. Would all current properties be grandfathered? If your house is at 23% with a small driveway keeping you under 25%, but you have a large deck because of the separate 5%, you would very likely be over 23% with the new definitions. Then you would be totally locked out of further improvements without a variance.
- 222 Need a 4th option, these options do not give residents enough control of their own property/land/living spaces. Outdoor areas are becoming more important due to social distancing and in general due to increased benefits of being outdoors.
- 223 Option 3 makes a useful distinction between covered living space vs decks, patios, sports areas, driveways, all of which still cover the ground Hopefully the building percentage will be limited to 23% and the uncovered ground covers will be limited to 8%.
- 224 Our desire is to have more flexibility in what we can do as a homeowner with our lot to create an outdoor living spacesl, not visible to the street but in our own backyard.
- 225 Our ultimate desire is to have more flexibility in what we can do with our lot backyard in particular, to create an outdoor living space that we can enjoy. 8 to 10% additional is in the realm of flexibility especially when you talk covered area in conjunction with hard scape.
- 226 outdoor living and flexibility is key to modern lifestyle and current health requirements
- 227 Outdoor living such as screen in porches should NOT be part of building coverage. Screen in Decks, patios, uncovered decks and sport courts should be part of the outdoor living calculation and NOT the building coverage calculations/lot coverage Building Coverage should be 25%, Outdoor living/Screened in Decks should be 10-15%
- 228 People don't even use their outdoor space that much. The current regulations are generous
- 229 Please set the building coverage at 23%.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 230 Primary dwelling (indoor living space) could be limited to 20-22%. Accessory outdoor covered spaces (limited to single story) could be an additional 3-5%. All other uncovered space (patios, uncovered decks, driveways, courts) could take up difference between 20-35%. Each type of coverage could have individual limits as well like shed or covered deck no more than 3-4%, patio no more than 7%.
- 231 provides proper driveways and on property parking options. reduces street congestion and increases street safety for fire, police, school bus, public works, drivers. allows homeowners to enjoy their properties and outdoor living by patios and screened in decks. make total coverage at least 35%. increases property values and in turn town revenue.
- 232 reduce street parking which will then reduce the changes of accidents to property or people with school buses, garbage trucks, kids riding bikes when less cars are parked on street. Easy for snow removal and increases qualify life for outdoor enjoyment. Those with family members who are high risk, can enjoy outdoors during this pandemic.
- 233 Remove driveway from outdoor living space. This is not living space, but space to collect vehicles and keep them from parking on streets.
- 234 Same reason as provided for Option 1.
- 235 The possibilities here are not completely clear but we would support any new regulations that would allow us to add a screened porch to our yard.
- 236 The vague definitions and percentages are concerning.
- 237 There are so many beautiful yards outside of town because Fairfax County allows for homeowners to apply for a variance. I have no issues with the size of the current dwellings but think homeowners should have more options in designing outdoor living spaces.
- 238 This appears to be the developers' solution for bigger houses, more cost per square footage, and no regard for open green space. Exactly what Vienna needs less of.
- 239 This code needs a complete overhaul, as option 3 describes. Residents should have much more flexibility in how they allocate space on their own lots.
- 240 This feels like the most modern choice with today's considerations for home arrangement and needs.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

## Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 241 This is confusing, goes backwards as far as flexibility in enhancing our homes, and inexplicably encourages building out uncovered hardscapes over covered patios covered decks, which many value as a desirable way to enhance our homes outdoor living spaces.
- 242 This modernizes the code to represent what homeowners want and need in a post-pandemic world.
- 243 This option provides flexibility but seems like increases would be more open to interpretation.
- 244 This option seems revolutionary and not evolutionary, this could cause confusion between existing and new builds. This seems like it would also lengthen the timeline for change.
- 245 This seems like the least complicated option. Again, being a homeowner who recently built and did not include a deck or patio at the initial build, I have found navigating the rules for patio, deck, screened deck, in addition to the setback rules, to be very complicated. Additionally, most contractors are not up to speed on these details, so effort and cost are spent designing and review options with The Town of Vienna that cannot be built. I think a simpler option that allows up to 30% makes sense. 35% seems like it may be too large given the size of lots in the Vienna area.
- 246 This would be a ideal while not detracting from overall aesthetics.
- 247 This would invite more oversized, crowded houses.
- 248 TOO COMPLICATED. AS THEY SAYING GOES MAKES IT SIMPLE STUPID!
- 249 Too limiting.
- 250 Too much of this is undefined. Need to add gazebos to covered spaces in the words (already shown in the options matrix table. Need to define "areaways. Doesn't seem to have definition now but I can only find the word in one place in a P&Z application.
- 251 Very concerned about runoff and lot coverage causing flooding and lack of permeable surfaces. Also, major loss of trees like at Parkwood.
- 252 We do not need personal sport courts in private residences. We should support the Town parks for this purpose. This seems like a slippery slope and many existing homes would be already out of compliance.

# CODE CREATE VIENNA - Lot Coverage Opinion Poll

Option 3 Comments *from 09.20.2021 at 12 pm to 10.08.21 at 12 pm*

- 253 We need this. Please set the building lot coverage to 23%.
- 254 Will just result in bigger houses, and the teardowns are already ridiculous
- 255 Wish we had a # higher than 35%, but better than option 2.
- 256 Would like the percentage increased slightly. Don't think it is enough to make a difference
- 257 Would support broader flexibility but concerned residents may not be as forward looking and this may not have a chance of being implemented.