

*City of Alexandria, Virginia*

---

**MEMORANDUM**

DATE: DECEMBER 3, 2009

TO: INFILL TASK FORCE MEMBERS

FROM: PETER LEIBERG, ZONING MANAGER,  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING

SUBJECT: Proposed Revisions to Adopted Infill Regulations

---

On November 4, 2009, the Infill Task Force reconvened to receive an update from staff regarding the implementation of Residential Infill Regulations approved by City Council on June 14, 2008. Staff analyzed the new regulations and provided the Task Force with suggestions for possible changes to the language.

Attached are the proposed text changes as discussed at the previous Task Force meeting and a few housekeeping changes for your review. We apologize in advance for a certain level of technical complexity for what are essentially very few and relatively minor changes. For example, we have moved whole sections and renumbered them. See paragraph 1 below. We hope the following explanation helps to clarify without any unnecessary confusion. The proposed changes are:

1. After further review of the infill regulations, staff believes that for clarification purposes section 7-1002 should be incorporated into the Supplemental Regulations for Certain Residential Zones, section 7-2500. Section 7-2503 currently refers back to the front door threshold regulations in 7-1002(B) and (C). Staff believes this section is a more appropriate location for the front setback and threshold height regulations. See attached pages 1, 3 and 4.
2. In order to allow porches and other additions to not have to be located on the established or average front setback line, staff added new language to 7-2503(A), formerly section 7-1002(A), making it clear that the those rules only apply to new buildings and allowing the director to determine the appropriate front setback for additions and porches on a case by case basis. See attached, page 3.
3. Staff has added language to language to 7-2503(C), formerly section 7-1002(C), making it clear that a blockface determination is necessary for front setback as well as front door threshold and building heights. See attached, page 4.
4. Section 7-2503(C), formerly section 7-1002(C), has also been changed to reflect our discussion about how the substandard lot protocol for determining blockface is not working

well for infill cases. While we still need an administrative protocol for unusual situations and have retained that language, we deleted the reference to substandard lots. The same change has been made in section 7-2502(C) regarding determining blockface for average building heights. See attached, pages 4, 2 and 3.

5. Staff believes section 11-1302(D) needs adjustment regarding the availability of a special exception for front setbacks. On review, we realized that the word “average” should be changed to “established.” Additionally, section 11-1302(D)(1)(a) seems unnecessary as it repeats the requirements of 7-2503(A), formerly section 7-1002(A). For similar reasons, we are recommending that section 7-2504(C) be deleted. It repeats the provisions already a part of section 11-1302(C). See attached, pages 7 and 4 for housekeeping measures.
6. To address the issue of increased heights for detached rear garages, staff has added new height maximums to section 7-2505(B)(1), increasing the prior maximums by 1.50 feet. We attempted to incorporate the ideas from the last Task Force meeting about having the roof shape and slopes mimic the main house without a maximum height, but found too many potential variables to make the rule fair and workable. See attached, page 5.
7. As discussed at the last Task Force meeting, the infill regulations requiring side yard access to attached garages do not address the problem this rules creates on corner lots. Staff has added language to section 7-2506, creating an exception to the rule for corner lots and reformatting the section overall for clarity. See attached, page 6.

We hope the Task Force supports the above changes. The Task Force is scheduled to meet on December 9, 2009 to review and discuss the text and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.