- 1 I would strongly support option 3 (over option 2) IF we received the full 13% of the outdoor living space. Including the driveway in the outdoor living section will not help us in any way unless we get the full 13% being proposed. With the newer homes increasing lot coverage would significantly help families looking for some outdoor living space for their families to enjoy. It has become increasingly more important to my family to be able to utilize our outdoor space after enduring guarantine for almost two years. Our youngest was born during the pandemic and has severe asthma. We are not comfortable using public outdoor spaces like parks and tennis courts and having a functional outdoor space will encourage and provide the opportunity to spend more time with our family and loved ones. Like many others in the community that bought one of the newer homes, I am very pro this proposal. I know the argument from the other side is we should have done our research on lot coverage before buying and we can move somewhere else if we don't like it. The problem with this however is that we love Vienna, and our research was based on neighborhood, walkability, and schools. At the time, lot coverage was not in our realm of areas we should be considering. We found a home we loved in a town we loved and telling us to move because we cannot have a patio due to lot coverage is unreasonable. If the outdoor lot coverage allowance was increased it would help alleviate the stress homeowners have to make small modifications and make their outdoor living space more appealing.
- I would strongly support option 3 over option 2 only if it was for the full 13% outdoor living space. I don't fully understand the reasoning behind including driveways in the outdoor living part, as a driveway is typically just a means to park a car and not really enjoy your outdoor living space, like a patio would. Further, although not part of this proposed update I'd ask that storm-water retention be a topic of conversation for the future. Having a permeable driveway would be a great way for lots to hold their own stormwater without contributing to flooding in low lying areas and perhaps also offer some relief to "lot coverage" as well.
- 3 Including driveways in the coverage is challenging especially with parking requirements. If the 25% were to stay some changes to how that is measured should be considered
- 4 It is very problematic as it highly limits building outdoor spaces like covered/screen porches, patios, etc. I am talking about for new builds (i.e., ~4k sq ft homes)
- 5 I have said this so many times my fingers have no skin left from replying to the lot coverage surveys. A builder can come in and build to 25% and it eliminates any options for any future homeowner to have outdoor space for 50 plus years (life of home). This has to be illegal and puts Vienna at risk at a lawsuit at some point in the future by someone like me who has zero options for outdoor space

because of Tommy Staats wo built out to maximum lot coverage leaving zero options for outdoor space for future homeowners.

- 6 Not in line with Fairfax County, homeowners should not be penalized for living in Vienna versus Fairfax
- 7 We need to maximize green space and ability to absorb rainwater and minimize runoff
- 8 Vienna should continue to provide lot coverage requirements that provide for as much green space as possible. Decks, porches and patios can be built if houses are slightly smaller. The TOV should not encourage builders to build bigger.
- 9 It seems like there are a lot of exceptions to this or people getting around it.
- 10 Exceptions should be made for public safety ie driveway turn around on a busy street like Park St, Beullah Rd, Nutley where its 4 + lanes, lawyer rd, courthouse rd.
- 11 My permit, although approved by the county of Fairfax, was denied by the city of Vienna earlier this year. It's ridiculous that I can't add a screened-in porch on an already existing deck. My backyard backs up to a wooded lot. The difference between a screened-in porch and deck does not impact on does not infringe on anyone it should be my choice. I look at some of the other construction going on in the area, including 4 story townhomes, and wonder why I can't put a screened-in porch on an already existing deck (no change to the overall "infrastructure" of my home/lot).
- 12 It's 2021. Build.
- 13 The current rules are good for the environment (to minimize impervious cover) and with the rate of incoming new residents and new building development being so high, if the rules are relaxed there will be even greater negative environmental impacts. I've seen what can happen with more relaxed rules (i.e. Arlington) and it's not good.
- 14 Not sympathetic to any policy that would further incentivize tear downs. Vienna should try to maintain its mix of housing options. I would be more sympathetic to allowing owners of older homes to modernize by adding a garage deck or porch. Could greater lot coverage be allowed on dwellings less than a specified square footage?

- 15 At the corner of Windover and Nutley, there's a house that looks enormous and out of sync with the neighborhood. If that is 25%, which I'm assuming since it was built before this code change possibility, then that is too much already.
- 16 Allows good coverage, excellent yard space, and needed permeable surface drainage for our Vienna storm sewer system.
- 17 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.
- 18 Option 1 maintains existing coverages, which is preferable to option 3 where one could possibly build on their entire backyard since no amounts are given other than limiting front yard coverage. As a homeowner, I may like to add a screened porch to my property to help maximize outdoor living areas, particularly during mosquito season.
- 19 I support the existing Town of Vienna lot & deck coverage definitions, which allow for much-needed green space.
- 20 The new homes currently being built are very large and very expensive. Allowing additional space for expansion will make living in Vienna even further beyond the reach of people with modest income. The additional land use would also have a negative ecological impact.
- 21 Option 1 maintains the quality of the neighborhoods in Vienna.
- 22 Large homes are being built with the 25 per cent lot coverage so there is no need for change. Increasing the lot coverage will affect drainage.
- 23 Houses in Vienna are already way too large. Please do not change this zoning requirement!!!!!
- 24 To do nothing would perpetuate the hardship of not allowing homeowner's like me from creating a screened porch.
- 25 Newly built homes using whatever mechanisms are more than 25% under roof. If the %s were increased Vienna would become a concrete jungle storm water tragedy
- 26 This is a good option and should be kept
- 27 Too restrictive.
- 28 Need to allow bigger main dwellings

- 29 Maintaining these limits should include allowable exceptions if permeable surfaces are used.
- 30 Doesn't allow homeowner of existing homes to utilize outdoor spaces.
- 31 Current new builds are already dwarfing older homes and it looks horrible.
- 32 I strongly believe the lot coverage requirement should stay the same. Reasonably sized homes in the area currently have plenty of room on their lots under these requirements to add a shed, patio and porch. If McMansion owners want a porch, they should have bought or built a smaller home. Keeping the lot coverage size the same means less continued detrimental impacts on Vienna's water run off and drainage plans that have been so disturbed in the past 10-20 years of over development. Keeping the lot coverage the same will also ensure there is enough green space and yard coverage to keep more trees and plant more landscaping which is far more important to the long term health of our town than a competition to see who can build the largest house possible on town lots.
- 33 I think option #1 limits our ability to create outdoor spaces.
- 34 Too restrictive, especially for outdoor living additions such as screened in porches. COVID taught us that outdoor living space is essential. We will likely encounter more viruses as predicted by CDC and global health organizations. We must be able to plan for future.
- 35 This is outdated. People are spending more time outside and want to do things like put on a usable front porch. The town shouldn't stop that.
- 36 This is best option with respect to protecting the environment, reducing stormwater runoff, and trees are more aesthetically pleasing than cement. Also, this option minimizes noise, hoarding stuff, and discourages more people inhabiting a residence. Finally, property values will be higher if more green space exists between lots.
- 37 Outdoor living space such as uncovered decks, patios or hardscape does not increase "massing" appearance of property
- 38 Option 1 is antiquated due to the recent building in Vienna.
- 39 It's not clear why the need for change, unless its to financially benefit developers.

- 40 Recent trends in the community -- including the COVID-19 pandemic -- have highlighted the need to modernize our approach to lot coverage to better accommodate residents' outdoor-living activities while continuing to (a) maintain current front/rear/side setback requirements and (2) promote stormwater runoff control. The problem with the current definitions is that they leave homeowners in many cases unable to make changes without altering the basic foundational footprint of a home. Providing special flexibility for outdoor-living areas like covered/screened porches and patios (in the same way we already do for decks) would give owners the opportunity to make personal choices about how to best use their yards as an outdoor extension of their homes.
- 41 Given the necessity for outdoor living the last couple years and moving forward, the current provisions are outdated and must be updated and adapt to what is now the normal lifestyle- outdoor living, requiring more leeway with covered/screened decks and use of patios to enhance outdoor liveable space. Vienna is a forward thinking visionary community and the policy should reflect it as such.
- 42 Lot coverage restrictions do not allow variety in designs and are too restrictive for the typical lot size in Vienna.
- 43 The option is overly restrictive.
- 44 I hunk we should be able to have some more outdoor space with pervious elements such as patios
- 45 I don't understand why decks and not patios have an extra allowance. Is it an environmental concern? I might support this more if I learned the reason behind it.
- 46 Too rigid.
- 47 Too restrictive and is unfair for smaller lots. Also forces people to build smaller driveways and garages which make people park on the streets and impede traffic flow.
- 48 This approach is nonsensical in that it treats "decks" as completely different than any other outdoor use, and also in that it conflates coverage with rainfall runoff control or remediation.
- 49 Prevents McMansions but doesn't allow for outdoor living space
- 50 Arbitrary, rigid formula for lot coverage. I cannot believe the knock-down/new build homes going up in Vienna actually comply with this.

- 51 Current Lot coverage is in keeping with the attraction that Vienna offers. Any additional lot coverage will encourage the removal of mature trees.
- 52 In the last 10 years, Vienna has seen intense development with the accompanying loss of trees and other green space. We should not expand the coverage allowed for each house.
- 53 It does not take into account the type of outdoor living popular today.
- 54 Too restrictive on outdoor living options
- 55 does not solve the current problem
- 56 Did a renovation and never had an issue with lot coverage and adding space to our home
- 57 I am happy with the current zoning, although we live in a small house and could add a substantial amount before reaching 25%. The current problems are due to builders maximizing house size (and \$) while not leaving room for outdoor improvements. Better education of buyers and more concessions from builders would help going forward.
- 58 I like green space between houses. I do not want to live next to a huge house, massive parking space or concrete space.
- 59 We are already lousy with McMansions. Let's not make it even worse.
- 60 We are unable to improve our home by converting our deck into a screen porch. No change means we still won't be able to do this.
- 61 Houses are big enough already
- 62 Forcing homeowners to maintain a lawn/scrub/trees over a patio/deck is nonsensical. A patio/deck doesn't affect "open space" and is much more functional. This law is antiquated.
- 63 This rule is not appropriate for most new builds in Vienna which are designed to have a greater square footage to compensate for the ever rising lot price.
- 64 Seems a bit restrictive on outdoor structures
- 65 We need to limit paved surfaces. Storm runoff carries sediment into streams and erodes stream banks. Restoring streams costs millions.

- 66 So constrictive and outdated. We should be able to build more patio areas on our lots.
- 67 It's why we settled in Vienna. It's what sets Vienna apart from other residential areas in Northern Virginia. It embodies the essential concept of a suburban community, which is that people are not living right next to each other. If people have to have houses that are too large for a Vienna lot, let them step over the line into the County, where they can build as large as they desire.
- 68 Antiquated and needs to be updated.
- 69 Existing definition should be retained and not changed to diminish green space.
- 70 It's too limiting
- 71 We as a people have changed since this original code was created. We have more belongings and do more inside. Covered porches are more accessible to everyone and act as a go between to bring the outside closer to the inside. It also helps provide additional value to the property.
- 72 Green space is one of the key features in our Town, coupled with adequate space to allow sustainable tree coverage and growth. It is important to maintain current percentages.
- 73 Option 1 is already extremely permissive in what it allows. It should further restrict how close structures can be built to the street.
- 74 Given the last 18 months, residents are looking for more usable outdoor space and the current dated code is too restrictive on screened in porches
- 75 The current code is far to restrictive and does not account for current building design and trends.
- 76 This is a 70 year old rule and the town has changed dramatically. This doesn't positively benefit anyone, least of all homeowners.
- 77 Prefer the other 2 options.
- 78 I don't feel I have the expertise to judge the appropriate level of lot coverage. I would simply ask that you balance the needs of the environment and adequate storm water drainage against any desire by residents and developers to increase lot coverage. That said, I would support denser development in the form of "granny pods" or accessory dwellings in the neighborhoods with quarter acre + lots, all other things being equal.

- 79 It is very clear that the status quo on this is not what a majority of homeowners in Vienna want, so this would be a total failure of the Council if this were the outcome.
- 80 I asked for a covered porch on my house. Not allowed. Am handycapped and needed a ADA approved ramp. Deck and ramp approved but can't cover with a roof. Would like to cover my deck with a roof cover.
- 81 Keeps Vienna open and green.
- 82 With the current code, new construction homes around 4500 sq ft can't put on a screened-in porch.
- The code needs to be revised to address issues with older homes, the ones that 83 need to go to the BZA for variances because their homes were built in the late 50s/early 60s and do not take into consideration future code/zoning regs. There are older homes that can't put a front porch on their house or are limited from expanding their home because their RS-10 home, well under 25% is affected by other zoning issues. Let new million-dollar homes build to 21-22% lot coverage and then use the other 3-4% to get the other amenities that they want, but can't have because they originally built to 24.99%. To change the code to appease a specific group of homeowners is a disservice to the town Many of these behemoth, million dollar homes have changed the topography and impacted the previous flow of surface/run off water. Any yard downstream/downhill has suffered erosion even though P&Z says it doesn't happen. Trust me, it does and it is killing our yard. These homes cast shadows on original SW homes, yet many of the people supporting this effort oppose building a commercial structure above 35 feet, but its fine for a new home next to a 20/25 foot structure. Additionally, this initiative was started by a member of town council who would specifically benefit from changing the lot coverage zoning. This issue should never have been initiated as a standalone issue because one member of council built to maximum capacity. There are other zoning issues to fix to help allow for construction/renovation of homes to maintain the character of the town. While the new large homes were novelties when they first were constructed, that's not the case anymore. While design, on many may have curb appeal, they all have one thing in common - they are too big. Make the house smaller if you want a covered deck or patio. . Changing the lot coverage is not the solution.
- 84 This is a likely unsustainable option of moving forward.
- 85 No way we can keep this option in place please
- 86 Too restrictive. Many of the new builds do not follow this 25% rule.

- 87 With increasingly extreme weather conditions we need the minimum amount of hard surfaces in Vienna. (Permeable surfaces perhaps being the exception.) Also, lot size is not the only key variable that should drive the formula here, I.e. a lot is not a lot. Differences in location, elevation and surrounding structural, fencing, drainage and surface implementations and other factors such as trees / tree loss affect how 'appropriate' a given lot coverage code may be. Neighbors and builders can comply with the current code (and sometimes not because how is this really fully monitored and enforced?) to the detriment of adjacent or 'downstream' properties.
- 88 The code needs to be updated to allow more usable outdoor space.
- 89 It seems that depending on the Zone the property is in, that this is very inconsistently applied.
- 90 Strongly disagree that definitions should stay as is. I do agree that Total coverage should be Upto 30% no more.
- 91 So upset at builders cutting down beautiful mature trees to make room for huge houses so close that residents look into next door neighbors bedrooms etc. Enough is enough! Now more than ever we need space and yards with trees.
- 92 While it is restrictive, it is ensuring that we have enough separation between homes and keeps density from being too great. Density and the lack of tree coverage due to striping of trees is a threat to changing our lovely town
- 93 To protect the Chesapeake Bay watershed, we need to limit impervious surfaces. Are we allowed to increase the amount of impervious surfaces under our current MS4 permit?
- 94 Existing restrictions make no sense. They are bad for homeowners and bad for the town.
- 95 I think outdoor living spaces such as patios, covered decks, and screened porches should not be included in the 25%
- 96 This gives homeowners the least flexibility to use their lot they way they want to and only favors builders who will maximize lot coverage for profit. Also, these standards from the 1950's no longer reflect the needs of today's homebuyers who may have multigenerational households and may be working from home full time. This also does not address the issue of extremely small driveways which leads to a lot of cars parked on the street.

- 97 I would be happy to see house lot coverage decreased, so Option 1 is the best fit for me in this case.
- 98 This is fine for new co structuring but difficult for older existing homes when the homeowner would like to adapt them to today's standards. If you have an older existing home it can be difficult to age in place without adapting outdoor spaces or things like entry steps with the existing lot coverage. Typically, older homes are not maxed out on lot coverage like the new builds but lot coverage and other setback requirements make adaptations difficult.
- 99 Would like to see an option where a shed does not count toward the main lot coverage percentage. Would like to see additional percentage for patio and screened porch.
- 100 The current lot coverage definition needs to be updated. Times have changed in the last 50+ years from when the code was last written/updated and ToV needs to grow in the positive direction as well. Restrictions placed on Town residents for lot coverage are unwarranted.
- 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 This will best help us maintain the character of the town without having overly large houses and outside spaces .
- 103 Developers are already cutting down trees for new homes. We don't need existing homeowners cutting down more trees to expand buildings on existing lots. Part of what makes Vienna so wonderful is the green spaces, which are disappearing at an alarming rate.
- 104 I understand this and have had to abide by this. But can't believe that houses that have gone up recently comply with this.

- 105 This is an antiquated and arbitrary regulation that doesn't take into account strict drainage regulations required for newer homes. Our back yard was radically sloped and turned into a gigantic drainage pit— making it unusable— to address this regulation yet we can't build a modest screen porch that would have absolutely no impact on drainage efficiency. In addition, clever builders have ways of exceeding the limit. We feel over-regulated with no real purpose. It has become a battle between owners of older and newer homes. If I hear the term 'mcmansion' again I will scream. Newer homeowners pay our fair share of taxes and follow the rules yet are portrayed as villains by some. Homes built as of 2016 are fully compliant. Homes built before 2016 and contributing to drainage issues and erosion could be brought up to code without punishing us. . We are not asking for much.
- 106 I think the building is out of control, as is. Builders are already taking advantage of the current lot coverage, can you image what they will try to do with 5% more.
- 107 Patios and other outdoor space is needed now more than ever. It would improve the look of many backyards and increase property values.
- 108 Too restrictive, particularly on detached garages and backyard patio/gazebo's
- 109 We would have liked to increase our outdoor activity space but were unable to due to restrictions that were more limiting then Fairfax County lot coverage requirements.
- 110 More needs to be done to educate home buyers, especially those buying newer, larger homes, about what can and cannot be built after they buy their home. Perhaps a brochure in the TOV website. Buyers should do their due diligence but TOV can make it easier for them.
- 111 This is a 1960's era zoning policy that prices people out of Vienna. It is completely destructive and limits options for all residents, and prevents financial (and therefore racial) diversity in our town.
- 112 These are the established standards based on the original Vienna community. I see replacement constructions that appear to exceed the 25-30% lot coverage so there might be some question as to how these codes are actually applied especially in favor for developers.
- 113 Don't mind it but it is restrictive. Should increase to add driveway/decks
- 114 This limits enhancements to older homes where builders build up to (or over) the current lot coverage.

- 115 We'd like more usable outdoor space for a patio or a screened porch. It's easy to max out with our current regulations.
- 116 It seems that for many this option is too restrictive. I am concerned that if the current lot coverage is changed too much, we are loosing even more green space and the houses will look even larger.
- 117 When I wanted to pave my driveway, I had to deal with a 50 foot setback, my original garage with set back 2/3 back on my property, and the previous owners decks. I was asked to remove sheds, patio, and reduce the width of my driveway. On the other side of the street, the lots are wide so they don't have the same requirements. Your current system is very unbalanced and punitive to lots like mine and advantageous to others.
- 118 Need more green-space requirements. Increase set-backs from property boundaries. Aim for 25% rather than current 30%
- 119 More options should be available for patios that do not affect sight line and aesthetics and allow 65% of space to be unaffected a significant amount
- 120 Existing lot coverage limits are a little restrictive when considering outdoor spaces
- 121 i have a fair amount of back yard space that is currently not being used due to these restrictions. adding some add'l sq footage for outdoor entertainment areas would increase the overall value of the homes in the town
- 122 The current limits on lot coverage preserve the green spaces that make Vienna such a nice place to live, walk, and drive!
- 123 This is an outdated zoning plan that does not meet the needs of current residents.
- 124 This is restricting property rights and quality of life.
- 125 This does not help me as I want to build an outdoor patio and I am already at maximum lot coverage.
- 126 This is an outdated plan that does not meet the needs of residents in the year 2021. We live in multigenerational households that need more space, and especially more outdoor space as it is a safer alternative for social gatherings in the age of the pandemic.

- 127 Too restrictive; Vienna is allowing large developers to split up lots to .25 acre while still building enormous houses, this leaves people almost no options for expanding their outdoor living spaces and enjoy their lives in Vienna. If you are going to allow developers to do this, you need to expand the options for outdoor living.
- 128 The town should improve the rules for outdoor space regarding lot coverage.
- 129 I think it's important to have as much green space and permeable surfaces on a property as possible. The current lot coverage allows for a generous home and outdoor living space.
- 130 Outdoors patio is important for me therefore increased lot coverage will benefit me.
- 131 Increased lot will benefit me and will allow building outdoors patio.
- 132 Outdoors patio is important for me and increased lot coverage will allow me to benefit from building a patio.
- 133 The code is outdated and needs to be updated for 2021. More and more homes in Vienna are new construction and homeowners should have the ability to add outdoor living space.
- 134 We ran into this problem when trying to add a screen porch where a deck already existed in our original ranch home. Our goal is to live in our home without tearing it down for a giant new build and it was incredibly frustrating to see mansions all around our lot but not be able to have a simple patio in addition to a modest screen porch in place of a deck that already existed. In addition, the rules regarding permeable services still counting against lot coverage seem counterintuitive to the claim that this requirement is to help prevent rain water runoff issues.
- 135 I am strongly in favor of maintaining a spacious urban landscape. It is already too crowded in my opinion.
- 136 People should have more flexibility than the current system.
- 137 This is outdated for how Vienna residents prefer to live now.
- 138 does not conform to county code being they do inspections...
- 139 Would like to enclose our porch and need increased %

- 140 Is very restrictive especially on larger newer homes. Anything being done would improve the values which helps the town of Vienna long term.
- 141 This is too restrictive and does not allow for permeable stone or pavers.
- 142 Too limited. Property owners should have nearly total say over how they use their property.
- 143 I have one of the small original Yeonas homes with a small addition (total above ground square footage is about 1,700. My house is being DWARFED by other houses around us that fall within the current 25% coverage yet are massive and overshadow. I can't imagine what another 5-10% would do.
- 144 Homeowners should be able to change their homes as their needs change.
- 145 Allows for increased trees and green space and ultimately less crowding
- 146 Too restrictive relative to the average size of houses being built for families in Vienna
- 147 the existing coverage allowance is not sufficient
- 148 We need to be thinking about global warming, rising water tables and the chances of more flooding. Losing areas where there are natural flood absorbing lands, in favor of more structures which will collect rainwater adding to more flooding risk, is not good for the Town
- 149 Good for the land and community
- 150 Too limiting on screened outdoor spaces mosquitoes are debilitating in Vienna, need the option to have screened spaces outside or else we are trapped inside all summer.
- 151 Lot coverage should be increased and there should be some 'factor' associated with using pavers or other porous surfaces for driveways or decks. Percentage of covered living space should be increase.
- 152 Houses in Vienna already overwhelm the available space. With these suggestions, hones will only get larger.
- 153 I think we need to offer more options and flexibility to homeowners.
- 154 too restrictive. bad for economic development and tax.
- 155 Good

- 156 Some lots as it is feel like they have exceeded the 25% I couldn't imagine what it would feel like if they got even more of a % allowance.
- 157 Not enough of a choice.
- 158 We need as much uncovered area on our properties as possible to allow water to percolate into the soil and to allow more trees to take root and grow. Climate change is upon us and we must each do our bit to counteract its effects.
- 159 I want to be able to add a garage closer to my neighbor's property. Current offset is too restrictive
- 160 Overly restrictive relative to fairfax as a whole
- 161 Are you sure the only reason was space between houses? What about water run off of hard-scaped land?
- 162 The trend in replacing older houses with mega-mansions is unsustainable. The limited, natural environment is being eroded. Young families are unable to find affordable housing options in Vienna.
- 163 this is not helpful, it doesn't change anything.
- 164 Severely limits outdoor options because the rules are so restrictive.
- 165 The town has embarked on the path of approving larger homes on exiting lots. Retaining the existing lot coverage does not support this approach. Homes with 6+ bedrooms need additional parking space especially on streets where there is no street parking.
- 166 Swimming pools are desirable but May exceed 5% limit including hard surface surrounding the pool.
- 167 Houses are getting too big, trees are taken down, not much space between houses, there is no variety in prices of housing for people just starting out or older people; cantilevered features should be monitored, I've seen cantilevered houses (cantilevered walls on at least 3 sides).
- 168 Multi-generational living and lowering student debt is our economic reality no matter what Vienna VA votes for.
- 169 Not realistic considering the land cost in Vienna
- 170 too constraining given current demands. increase is only small, and will not affect community aesthetics.
- 171 The current code maintains the Vienna neighborhood feel

- 172 Important to maintain green and the look of our neighborhoods. Helps with storm water management and sustainability. Lot coverage does not need to change - 25% lot coverage has served the Town well in regards to storm water mgmt, sustainability, and lovely green residential neighborhoods. If a resident wants an exception or has a special need, they can go to the BZA. There will always be residents who want to exceed lot coverage no matter the number. Also, builders and residents will build to the maximum lot coverage because of the high land value.
- 173 The homes in Vienna that are being built today (and for the last 10 years or so) are way too big. For those paying attention, we have a climate crisis. These homes consume too much energy due to their large size. We should reduce the lot coverage.
- 174 As I see the new houses replacing the older homes, when you have a street with many teardown replacement homes, it is looking a bit crowded, so having the current lot coverage seems to be a reasonable limit.
- 175 Maintaining as much green space in Vienna as possible is of primary importance to me
- 176 Outdated dose not meet the needs of families today.

- 184 30% lot coverage is limiting
- 185 70 year old rules... time to look at them
- 186 A lot of new houses look they already take up more than 25%. We need to protect the environment and our groundwater by having permeable surfaces
- 187 An exception for decks but not patios does not seem to serve a purpose as they are functionally similar. Decks require extensive chemical treatment that is contrary to any run off concerns that might be related to the current preference for decks,
- 188 antiquated, too restrictive, and illogically separates uncovered decks...
- 189 As a longtime resident of Vienna I am dismayed at the deforestation taking place when new homes are constructed. Allowing more lot coverage promotes less green space.
- 190 As it is now houses being built seem too big for lot size. Increasing would not be welcome.
- 191 Been living with it and made my living experience difficult.
- 192 Does not allow homeowners to fully maximize their lots for enjoyment, and stifles the ability to enhance homes which could further enhance the community and Town.
- 193 Doesn't allow enough outdoor living space.
- 194 Fine with this, but like the idea of having outdoor living spaces as long as tree coverage remains
- 195 Hard to enforce but preferred.
- 196 Having large open space with trees and grass make Vienna Vienna. Houses should no be allowed to be closer than they currently are.
- 197 Highly encourage an increase in outdoor living space. This past year with the COVID-19 pandemic has only emphasized this need.
- 198 Houses are already too large. Builders and home owners need to know that they can or cannot build even bigger.
- 199 I believe the existing lot coverage definitions need to be revised.

- 200 I do not support additional lot coverage. Builders will build to the maximum and houses and lot coverage are already oppressive. We should have an additional squeeze on building that designates a maximum square footage based on lot size, as well as maximum lot coverage.
- 201 I do not support continuing to treat decks differently from porches. Most houses in Vienna are already right at 25% so including porches but not decks means that you can build an enormous deck without a variance but you can't build a porch. It does not fit with the idea of preserving the land area. If homeowners had the option to choose deck or porch or patio, more land would be preserved than the current rules.
- 202 I feel that the residential areas of Vienna would be negatively impacted by allowing larger lot coverage by dwellings.
- 203 I understand the need to prevent water runoff issues, but the existing lot coverage is frustrating.
- 204 In the current living standards, need more living space
- 205 investing in outdoor living areas makes a lot of sense, now more than ever.
- 206 is restrictive and you limit many materials that are extremely pourous (gravel, etc.)
- 207 It places to many limits on landscaping the backyard. This is true especially if the house is set further back on the lot and the driveway needs to be longer to access the garage.
- 208 It seems that some properties are held to this coverage definition and others are not. I admit this is perception without having verified the recorded lot coverage status of any particular property. Option 1 has limited improvements to my property.
- 209 It's time to update.
- 210 It's too strict and lends itself to people breaking the rules "after the fact."
- 211 Lifestyle changes include more outdoor living spaces.
- 212 Limits outdoor living space.

- 213 Maintains open space. Developers can work within the parameters and be upfront with home buyers with how much of the lot coverage they have used.
- 214 Most of the new holmes, maximize the lot coverage limits, leaving the owners with limited flexibility. As a homeowner, this outcome is less than desirable.
- 215 Much too restrictive
- 216 My concern is aesthetics. Massive, tall houses built on raised beds tower over and shade their neighbors, block sunsets, and alter runoff patterns (killing plants and creating ice on neighbor's driveways) have reduced the beauty and safety of our neighborhoods. Cantilevering to build a bigger (more profitable) house may technically allow the required percolation of water into soil, but the aesthetic issues of oversized (relative to lot) houses are not addressed. The influence of developers on the town government is a great concern - they do not have the town's best interest in mind, even if the bigger houses bring bigger tax revenue. And by the way, the town needs to stop bragging about not raising tax rates. Everyone is wondering why the rates are not lowered given the massive windfall that larger houses provide the county and town. Good communication, engagement strategies and other common change management techniques are helpful, but they do not turn a bad idea into a good one.
- 217 My feeling is the occupants of larger houses like myself want to use the yard, but have already covered it with a building. I don't see that as a reason to extend it. However, we now have a utility box on our yard from buried power lines, and I'm not sure that should be counted the same.
- 218 My recent home build was under the current rules and was limiting to my family- others should be subject to these rules as well as they were implemented for a reason.
- 219 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.

- 220 Need consistency throughout alternatives. Existing code uses term "accessory structures" while new options bring the term "buildings" into use. Believe the term "structures" with modifiers would be consistent. Also believe that items currently exempt from lot coverage need to be reviewed and tightened. As I note in option 2 comments, cantilevered features can potentially result in added square footage. Window wells could do the same. Pool coverage needs more definition. Is the pool deck counted or not. With a large pool, it would be possible that upwards of 75% of a lot could be covered...far exceeding the proposed upper limit of 35% lot coverage.
- 221 Need to extend the coverage definition for outdoor living to include screened in decks and porches. Screened in outdoor living should NOT be part of lot coverage.
- 222 New residential homes that are maximizing their lot coverage are already changing the character of Vienna with oversized structures on the towns modest lot sizes.
- 223 Not enough outdoor space.
- 224 Not modern enough
- 225 Once upon a time, the homes in the Town of Vienna had character and represented all kinds of families with lots of big trees and open green space. Nowadays, a select group of builders put up oversized look-alike mansions killing cutting down all the big old trees, clear-cutting lots, and ultimately killing all the surrounding big old trees 4-5 years down the road on their neighbors' property with no repercussions. Enough is enough. Bigger is not better and ruins the quaintness of the Town that makes Vienna unique. Fairfax County allows more lot coverage than Vienna. For those who want more lot coverage then move outside the Town limits.
- 226 Outdated
- 227 Outdated, wasteful, environmentally unsound
- 228 Outdated.
- 229 Restrictive, antiquated and irrelevant for today's desired living.
- 230 Ridiculous to limit my own backyard.
- 231 Sticking with the same 50 year old code doesn't make sense.

- 232 Supports TOV's efforts to keep Vienna affordable by guarding against ever larger and more expensive homes
- 233 The causes a lot of street parking due to elimination of driveways which is a hazard for trash pickup, school buses, snow removal and children riding bikes. No patio or deck, no table to enjoy the outdoors, entertaining especially these past years during pandemic. Families with immune compromised, high risk families are stuck in side the home not able to be outside for fresh air. It also deters people from moving into the town which means it will lower property values. Its an outdated policy.
- 234 The code is obsolete given modern day homes and home sizes. It was made for two bedroom homes of the 50s and 60 and is does not accommodate modern construction. Causes a lot of street parking due to lack of proper driveway, cannot enjoy out door living due to lack of patio or screened in deck. lower quality of life. depressed property values due to awkward looking driveway shapes on new construction and no patios.
- 235 The current code needs modification in favor of more homeowner flexibility.
- 236 The current policy has been effective at preventing Vienna from becoming over-built. By preventing the construction of over large homes this policy has helped maintain an inviting small town feel to Vienna.
- 237 The rules are too stringent for today's living standards and need to be updated.
- 238 There seems to be a lot of variances granted, that are not standardized. If one homeowner is allowed a sport court that puts a coverage at 35%, then why is that not allowed for someone else? There needs to a specific reason, other than the driveway is too steep for playing. There are plenty of options for playing within the Town. There needs to be consistency in the process.
- 239 This code is outdated and severely limits options for flexible outdoor living space.
- 240 This doesn't reflect the reality of how living in Northern Virginia and in COVID times has evolved. A change is required to meet modern needs nad times.

- 241 This option is very limiting and causing us to consider to move. We are also stuck with a water trench in our front yard that limits landscaping and a 2 car garage with a one car driveway.
- 242 This option prevents the homeowners from beautifying their lots and building structures suitable for outdoor living such as covered decks, patios, and screened-in porches. Because of the current lot coverage requirements, our family is not allowed to build a patio with a fire pit that we would love to have. Such outdoor space would have been great to have during the pandemic for outdoor gatherings with friends and family.
- 243 This options is very restrictive and outdated and limits our ability to enjoy our outdoor spaces.
- 244 This was created 60-70 years ago and the world has changed. Given the heightened desire / need to stay home and center our activities around our homes, or doesn't make sense to unnecessarily and arbitrarily retain the existing lot coverage code.
- 245 To restrictive especially given the increased value/cost of acquiring lots or tear down homes. A bit more flexibility will not distort the neighborhood.
- 246 Too constrained
- 247 Too restrictive
- 248 Too restrictive and prohibits addition of covered patios. In era of Covid, being able to safely gather in a covered outdoor setting is more appealing and we are not able to make additions based on our current lot coverage.
- 249 Too restrictive especially considering there are many streets with no street parking
- 250 Too restrictive. Its my property! I want more flexibility!

- We have been taxpayers in the town of Vienna in the Carter's Glen 251 development for over 25 yrs and were astounded and angry to learn that in order to rebuild our 25 yrs old 16x16 ft deck which we hoped to include a new, modest 12x12 ft screened porch (as part of that 16x16 footprint) that we would be expected to pay \$1000 to apply for a variance, not knowing if we would be approved or not. Also, we have heard nightmare stories from other homeowners trying to obtain a variance. The whole process seems unevenly applied based on our observations walking all over Vienna during the pandemic --we have seen many newly constructed homes that have replaced small ramblers. How these enormous homes were able to get a lot coverage variance is truly a mystery yet the Town expects us to pay \$1000 just to review our screened porch plan. Finally, aside from our desire to improve our outdoor living space with a screened porch, we'd really like to have this feature b/c the mosquitos in our neighborhood are fierce and we are reluctant to spray a bunch of chemicals in our yard to combat them.
- 252 We need to allow homeowners to improve their outdoor living spaces. Hardscapes add value and livability to a home, but are impossible if the builder exhausted the loot coverage. We need to update this and allow our residents the ability to turn their homes into the pictures of beauty and livability they can be.
- 253 We need to keep Vienna green. Developers are tearing down mature trees which absorb tons of water, and provide shade. We do not need homeowners to do more of this so they can have more patio/deck space on their already enormous house.
- 254 We would like to have a better options to create outdoor living space .
- 255 While our nicely remodeled house is now sandwiched between two looming houses there should still be some flexibility with regard to outdoor structures. We were unable to extend our tiny kitchen porch of 65sf because of 12' setback yet a house the size of an apartment building could be constructed next door.
- 256 With the reality of covid being around for awhile, outdoor living have greatly increased not only for leisure but also for one's health. Having a screened in / covered deck/sunroom is a really necessary to have a safe gethering for social interactions that is even more needed in these trying times of restrictions. Thank you.
- 257 Would like to be able to make a larger deck