



MCKENNA

March 13, 2024

Warren Rothe
Assistant City Manager
Grosse Pointe Park
15115 E. Jefferson Ave.
Grosse Pointe Park, MI 48230

Subject: Zoning Ordinance Update – Public Engagement Data

Mr. Rothe:

On December 2 and December 4, 2023, Grosse Pointe Park hosted two public open house events at city hall for residents and stakeholders to share their thoughts on several aspects of neighborhood and commercial development as they pertain to the City’s ongoing comprehensive update to the zoning ordinance. Online surveys were available from February 9 to March 8, 2024, to gain additional insight; these surveys were structured similarly to the in-person engagement. Data from in-person and online engagement were merged.

The following report synthesizes the raw data by topic/board. A narrative analysis of this feedback can be found under separate cover.

RESIDENTIAL ZONING STANDARDS

Building Materials

Exterior Residential Building Materials	Status in Current Draft	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Brick (including face brick but not veneer), burnished concrete masonry or masonry	Primary	23	1	(Below)
Cut stone, field stone, ceramic cladding, cast stone, natural stone, or manufactured stone	Primary	22	2	
Wood, including cross laminated timber, dimension lumber, and reclaimed wood	Secondary	21	1	
Burnished and textured concrete masonry units (CMU)	Secondary	17	3	
Standard concrete masonry units (CMU)	Prohibited	17	6*	
Fiber cement siding or panels	Primary	18#	7	
Precast concrete panels	Prohibited	18	4	
Stone composite panels (e.g., Steni Colour)	Secondary	18	3	
Closed cavity façade (e.g., glass curtain wall system)	Secondary	17	4	
Clear or lightly tinted glass	Secondary	18	2	
Green façade **	Secondary			
Metal wall panel (including steel)	Prohibited	18	4***	
Vinyl	Prohibited##	15	12	
Exterior Insulation and Finishing System (EIFS) / Stucco	Prohibited	14	13	
Fiber-cement siding DUPLICATE	Prohibited	2	2	

HEADQUARTERS
235 East Main Street
Suite 105
Northville, Michigan 48167

☎ 248.596.0920
☎ 248.596.0930
MCKA.COM

Communities for real life.



Building Material Comments:

- Design should not be regulated
- What about existing homes that are wood siding primary? It's a significant vernacular in GPP.
- Too many restrictions may price people out of the community
- Stucco ok
- Front-facing consistent materials I second this comment
- Real stucco should be permitted. (received 2 add'l dots)
- Create architectural review board
- Variances should be allowed for well-designed new technology
- All new build should complement the look of the street/neighborhood
- Fiber cement, stone composite & EIFS are cheap

* We have CMU primary homes in GPP

** This is confusing! I don't know what I am agreeing or disagreeing with. For example maybe I'd like it to be primary as well.

*** Disagree prohibiting for new construction

With texture/patterns

Prohibited unless already vinyl

- Most anything that looks natural but vinyl.
- West park is like a art collage mix and match
- Several older homes are covered with h vinyl siding. New construction/modifications near existing vinyl clad homes would add to the integrity of that neighborhood.
- There is very nice looking, high end vinyl siding now on the market. It can be hard to tell the difference between it and wood, Hardi-Plank, or shingles.
- Drivit can look good in certain applications. Same with precast concrete. Metal panel prohibited should include aluminum siding.
- Vinyl exists throughout the community.
- Vinyl siding as a secondary exterior surface is affordable, long-wearing, attractive.
- Vinyl siding is affordable and looks good for a long time with reasonable care. I've not heard one valid reason why it should be prohibited from use.
- Keeping the look of traditional houses
- the material is subordinate to how used and formed.
- Do you not understand why the Stucco alternative would not be permitted considering tutor style is a primary style in grosse pointe. There's a little to no history of stone fades do not understand why they should be allowed. The only thing that should be would likely be Mason, Stucco, Colonial style clapboard.
- Stucco homes can be beautiful! Minneapolis has thousands (probably!) of beauties, including my parents' home there.
- I do agree that some of the prohibited items should be prohibited but question whether the proper place should be in the building code rather than the zoning code. Some types of concrete, metal, vinyl and stucco might be acceptable while others are completely unacceptable. Properly made precast concrete when painted can be attractive and sturdy. metal has many possibilities when properly used. The aluminum siding placed on the soffits on my house in the 1970s only held moisture and rotted the ends of the rafters, etc. The vinyl gutters sounded good but warped in the hot sun.
- By prohibiting certain materials, particularly less expensive materials - you're disabling many homeowners from being able to make affordable updates and repairs. Furthermore, many of the older homes in the park are already constructed with steel siding (just one example) - aside from banning certain materials due to environmental issues or flammability, I see no reason to prohibit things like steel, concrete, etc.



Fence Materials

Fence Materials	Status in Current Draft	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Barbed wire	Prohibited	27	1	(below)
Brick	Not mentioned*	8	19	
Chain link	Permitted, with no additional material	23	5	
Composite (typically plastic and wood mix)	Permitted	23	2	
Concrete block	Not mentioned**	21	7	
Electrified Fence	Prohibited	22	3	
Iron	Permitted	27		
Living fence: hedge, bush or shrub	Permitted	27		
Living fence: vine on lattice	Permitted	24	1	
Metal	Permitted	19	6	
Pipe***	In current Ordinance only	19	5	
Stone	Not mentioned	8	18	
Treated wood	Permitted	26	1	
Vinyl	Permitted	21	8	
Wire	Permitted	1	4	
Wire, sharp-edged of any kind	Prohibited	21	6	
Wood (naturally durable)	Permitted	22	2	

Fence Comments:

- Living trees or shrubs in front with height limit
- Chain link – vinyl coated only
 - Brick – ok
 - Block – no
 - Wire – no
 - Stone – ok
 - Vinyl – ok
- Brick and stone can be an asset to landscapes. Plastic and wire fences are utilitarian.
- Stone concrete and brick done right is beautiful fence wall
- Same as above. There are already plastic fences in many yards.
- I don't understand why there should be no brick or stone. Many fences have brick pillars between wood panels. A dry stone fence (as opposed to one that is cemented in) is gorgeous.
- I've seen plenty of very nice brick and stone fences...and they fit the character of our city.
- Chain link, metal and wire are ugly. Electrified fences provide pedestrian safety. Brick and stone are attractive.
- Although affordable and widely available, vinyl fence panels lack long-term stability especially when used as a DIY project. They scuff and mar easily, becoming an eyesore. Brick and stone fence materials complement the existing brick & stone exterior building materials.
- Brick or Natural stone fences are beautiful and historically used everywhere. If prohibited, is the city going to enforce it even on Windmill Pointe? Current fence restrictions are not enforced on WMP drive. They are all WAY in front of the front of the homes. Vinyl fencing should be prohibited, it does not hold up, and when cracked /damage it is very unsightly.cheap
- why prohibit brick or stone if it
- stone and brick fences are consistent with area architecture.
- Hey, final or plastic fencing should not be allowed. It is impossible maintain. Do not understand why brick walls tastefully executed with demonstration would not be permitted.



- Stone and brick fences are classic, add to the estate appeal, and are made of natural components. They in no way devalue the property or the look of it. In fact, they enhance both. Cannot fathom the reason for prohibiting either. Drive around Grosse Pointe, brick and stone walls are everywhere and they look amazing.
- There are some existing examples in the Pointes and they are beauties!
- The brick and stone walls are very attractive and low maintenance. Where located will have some impact. Look at the sound walls that MDOT constructs.
- Prohibiting materials that already exist with old homes in the community shouldn't be prohibited.

* Mention: add – permitted (plus 1 dot means 3 votes in favor)

** 3 written votes to prohibit

*** PVC? Metal pipes?

Fence Standards (Placement, Dimensions)

Placement	Maximum Height	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Front Yard / Waterfront yard	Prohibited forward of the front building line	24	3	• (Below)
Side, against another parcel	4' 6' with written OK from neighbor(s) or for commercial lots, pending PC OK	21	7	
Side, against a right of way	6'	21	3	
Rear	6'	23	3	
Corner	2' within Clear Vision Triangle (see 5.08) Address or plat determines "front" & "side" for heights	19	2	
Living fences	9' in any location	19	7	

Fence Comments:

- Keep site lines open to the water
- 6' side fences next to other parcels permitted without neighbor approval
- People shouldn't have water views blocked by a fence, trees. Water views are for everyone, not just super wealthy (in reply by another person?: "my house, my rules")
- What is considered the front of a waterfront lot? I can see where side fences that go past the front of the home to the road or nearly to the road would be desirable. Many of the current waterfront lots have fences along the sidewalk/roadway. Not sure how close to the waterfront fences should be allowed on those lots.
- 6' is too low, 7' is better with taller people today. Corner 2' fences what a joke. At least 42" maximum.
- Why do I need a neighbor's consent for privacy in my own yard?
- 6 foot with neighbor consent condemns the next neighbor to live with a prior grant.
- "Generally, fences cannot be less than 2 feet from a public sidewalk or 3 feet from a road, alley, or rear lot line." - Let's start with this one, which is not enforced or followed almost anywhere in the park. Drive along our streets - almost every corner home has a fence up that is a foot or less away from the public sidewalk. And, in the rear... those fences are usually placed right on the property line, which is often only 3 feet away from the back of most garages. Remember, the lots are narrow and small on BOTH ends of the Park AND houses are very close together. All the fences around my backyard are just an inch to 3 inches from the property lines. 3 feet would put the rear fence right on the back of my garage, or maybe just inside the rear wall. And, same thing on the side of that garage... a fence 3 feet away would end up on the other side of the property line, in my neighbor's back yard. On the other side, 3 feet away from that neighbor's garage and driveway plasters a fence on the side of my house and up and over my backyard deck. The reality is that this standard can not be followed in neighborhoods where homes were built long before these "standards" were created. As for the height objection... I should NOT have to get my neighbor's permission to put a 6 foot tall fence up between our back yards. 6 feet is the standard privacy size. If it's OK to put up



a 6 foot tall fence in the rear w/o seeking neighbor's OK, as stated above, then it should be just the same standard for putting up a 6 foot tall fence between houses that's going to join to that 6 foot tall fence in the back!

- A 6 foot fence next to a right of way obstructs vision. Nine-feet tall living fences also obstruct clear lines of sight.
- 6 feet in back when there is an alley is fine. Permitting 6' in back of property will cut off views. Permitting 6' on sides with neighbor's permission is arbitrary and depends on the neighbor... either prohibit all 6' fencing, or deny all 6' fencing on sides. If a person wants a tall fence, do a living option.
- Should be held to the same height and neighbor approval process as other fencing. A 9 foot natural fence could significantly block desired sunshine from a neighbor's backyard adversely affecting gardening.
- Is this height or distance from property lines.
- Do not understand how to respond to these questions, since they are not indicated as prohibited or permitted.
- Both sides should be finished. Especially on the side facing the neighbor. My neighbors old wire fence worked just fine to keep their dog in. 3-foot.

Garages

1. Front-facing attached garage, front entry, no setback				
	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	20	15		No further than front line of house. (This comment got 3 additional dots)
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	22	13		
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	17	12		
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	18	14		
2. Front-facing attached garage, front entry, set back				
	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	5	22	1	
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	6	23	1	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	5	20	1	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	4	22	1	
3. Front-facing detached garage, front entry, set back				
	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	6	23	1	Garages need to match house with materials Garage should not be closet structure to either street on corner lots
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	7	21	1	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	6	18	1	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	6	21	1	
4. Side-facing attached garage, side entry, front of house				
	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	9	21	1	



NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	11	18	1	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	7	19	1	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	8	20	1	

5. Rear yard garage, attached or detached

	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential		32		
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	1	30		
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2		27		
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	1	29		

6. Corner lot, side-facing attached garage in rear, no setback

	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential		29		No setback must have height restriction for property it backs too.
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1		27		
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2		24		
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	1	26		

7. Corner lot, side-facing detached garage in rear, no setback

	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	1	27		
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	1	25		
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	1	23		
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	1	24		

8. Corner lot, side-facing attached garage in side yard



	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential		28		
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1		26		
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2		23		
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3		25		
9. Corner lot, side-facing home + attached garage				
	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	5	22		Would prefer that garages prominent/even with home façade be a special land use in the event that a garage that is less prominent to house is not possible.
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	4	21		
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	3	20		
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	2	22		

Additional Garage Comments:

- An attached garage with a double door detracts from the architecture of a house. For example many subdivisions feature garages in front with an attached house in the rear of the property.
- Hide the garage on large lots.
- I am saying to permit all, not because I personally like them all, but because it's too late to change all the variety that is already present in the Park... and, actually, that's what gives our city it's special character and charm. Our lot sizes are all varied, so garage placement is really going to depend on the amount of land available. No style should be "prohibited"..
- Front-facing, attached garages with no setback emphasize vehicles & vehicle traffic, thus detracting from the pedestrian-friendly/walkable neighborhood goals for GPP.
- front entry looks like a sub-division. Not in style of GPP homes. UGLY
- Please do not continue to erode our neighborhoods by permitting front facing garages.
- Looks generic.
- A garage should be an accessory building, not a front facing design element. The term used is either "double-wide" or garage with attached house.
- Dislike snout houses!
- See above reason for front-facing, attached, no setback garages.
- same as above
- Suburban style homes can be found anywhere in metropolitan Detroit. Our housing stock and walkable neighborhoods are unique to Grosse Pointe and a few other areas. If permitting the style of front praising, garages



continues, our streets will be filled with fads with trash, cans, and two SUVs in the front yard. a few specific streets that already are proliferated by the style of home should be allowed to continue.

- Not any garage door featured along the front site line of a house.
- See above reason for front-facing, attached, no setback garages.
- Not in front. Should be an accessory building for a vehicle, not a space in a house.
- See above reason for front-facing, attached, no setback garages.

Short-Term Rentals & Accessory Dwelling Units (General / Miscellaneous Land Use Comments)

ER – Estate Residential Districts- Comments:

- Not too many STRS, but up to a point is ok
- Allow ADUs in all districts
- ADUs more appropriate in the ER district
- Boat wells SLU should be NP in ER districts or with additional regs. Hoists okay
- SLU approval goes to Council, public notice community buy-in, for entire ZO - mail notices
- Regulate these STR fee and muni. Income. Buns are not worth it.
- No Group Homes ER or NR-1, No STRs ER or NR-1
- Mansions – allow subdivide into condos

NR-1 Neighborhood Residential District – 1 – Comments:

- No ADUs (?) anywhere
- Allow condos like the ones on Cadieux in more districts - well designed
- STR
- Multiunits (?)
 - Increase Regulations
 - Decrease % for investors
 - Fee for license
 - Do Not increase taxes – already too high @ \$10k the reason I need to STR my property is the taxes.
- No short term rentals in NR-1
- Airbnbs are desperately needed in this community, there are no hotels in this area.
- No STRS

NR-2 Neighborhood Residential District – 2 – Comments:

- No to Tri quads, ADUs or short term rentals which would destroy the character of current predominantly single family residential areas. Also, where short term rentals are allowed they should be dispersed, regularly inspected, and regulated. Fines should be steep for breaking the rules.
- Recreation – sports facilities – as a SLU only in all districts
- No short term rentals or recreational uses
- STR's: only in non-single homes, so only allow in NR-2 and NR-3, in MF structures
- Short-term rentals only allow in NR-2 and NR-3

NR-3 Neighborhood Residential District – 3 – Comments:

- Don't support short-term rental or Airbnb. There is not enough infrastructure support.
- Yes STRs
- Keep alleys we have, need them for parking in residential areas.
- Up to 6-8 units if lot & parking requirements are met.
- Clean up alleys
- Parking and infrastructure does not support more people
- City weeds not responsive



- Rental parking
- No more demo's of homes for parking
- Encourage dense housing
- Get rid of parking minimums
- Airbnb's are desperately needed in this community, there are no hotels in this area
- Homes being torn down in the neighborhood, notice if commercial, parking lots or mixed-use.
- Bad business for community residents
- Blight is an issue, demo is not the solution, improving what we have.
- Transparency
- Next Steps in the code
- Investors – want pp who live in the current community, want those who are invested, not low prices
- Indoor recreation, no but smaller parks
- Our neighborhood is already at max capacity due to multi residential dwellings. It's also the most affordable area in the points.
- No accessory units, no tearing down of houses, preserve/improve what we have
- Need stronger regulations for permits and inspections, rentals, yards, rats, concern over short-term rentals, the scale is tipping from owners to investors.

Accessory Dwelling Units (Location, Configuration)

1. ATTACHED (Addition)	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	3	20	7	Detached ADU's only
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	5	20	5	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	5	16	4	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	7	15	5	
2. DETACHED (Standalone)	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	4	19	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property over an .5 acre (min. size) • Fan of the architecture review board. Keep up at the community. • Let them decide If no longer an ADU, in any situation, what happens - can they be converted to STR's?
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	5	19	7	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	4	18	4	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	6	16	8	
3. ABOVE GARAGE (ATTACHED)	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	5	22	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Airbnb • Yes Airbnb
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	7	19	3	



NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	6	17	3	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	7	17	4	
4. ABOVE GARAGE (DETACHED)*	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	3	10	9	<i>*Note: This configuration was not available for votes/comment at open house event</i>
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	3	11	6	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	4	9	3	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	4	9	6	
5. INTERIOR (CONVERTED GARAGE)	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	5	20	5	
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	6	18	5	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	6	16	3	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	7	13	5	
6. INTERIOR (UPPER FLOOR)	NP	P	S	
ER Estate Residential	7	21	4	Practically must be different from a duplex
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	8	20	3	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	7	16	1	
NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	8	16	3	
7. INTERIOR (BASEMENT)	NP	P	S	Comments
ER Estate Residential	8	21	1	
NR-1 Neighborhood Residential – 1	8	20	2	
NR-2 Neighborhood Residential – 2	6	17	3	



NR-3 Neighborhood Residential – 3	9	16	3	
---	---	----	---	--

Additional ADU Comments:

- Generally look awkward
- Unnecessary crowding and parking problems
- Nope - don't prohibit any of them - It's my house, my lot and MY CHOICE if I want to do this and how I want to do it.
- above a garage detached increases population density with probably unrelated persons, VRBO, or other temp situations.
- Unnecessary crowding and parking problems
- Unnecessary crowding and parking problems Note: what are the terms and conditions set out below?
- This part of the city already has enough multi-dwelling units, and more homes are being purchased by rental investors every day. There's barely enough infrastructure to handle the population we have (e.g., parking, trash).
- I had trouble mobing from one section to another.

COMMERCIAL ZONING STANDARDS

Parking Configurations

Note: Online survey only asked for 'preferred' configuration(s) within each district; those preferences have been merged with the tallies for permitted ('P') configurations.

Alley		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District		11	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satellite parking with service • Artspace + trolley • Allow golf carts on street like Bay Harbor • No angle parking in the commercial districts.
	CBD Central Business District	1	10	2	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District	1	10	2	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District	1	8	2	



On-Street Parking		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District	2	15	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking encroaching into residential areas • As part of total street design include bike lanes • No angled parking • Shared bike roads • Permit parallel parking
	CBD Central Business District	1	15	1	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District	1	12	1	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District	4	11	1	

Liner Building with Interior/ Rear Parking		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District		12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build up, not out • Preserve houses, affordability and diversity
	CBD Central Business District		15	2	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District		11	2	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District		10	2	



No Ground Floor Retail		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District	7	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer structure in lieu of demolishing homes • 2-3 level to match current esthetics of District • I am generally not in favor of stand alone parking garages but think that there may be situations where they make sense. If there is a way to justify them under certain restricted conditions, I would favor that.
	CBD Central Business District	8	4		
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District	8	4		
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District	7	3		

With Ground Floor Retail		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District*	5	9	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (above header:) ...”or with residential liner” • Must have good design and screening of car areas • Parking structure limited to a main street like Jefferson and only 1 level above ground <p>* Dimensions not possible</p>
	CBD Central Business District	3	13	5	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District	2	11	7	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District	5	9	7	



Screening/Landscaping

Note: Online survey only asked for 'preferred' screening/landscaping method(s) within each district; those preferences have been merged with the tallies for permitted ('P') methods.

Landscaped		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District	1	7	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping to include rainwater/stormwater management (got 2 votes) No bike lanes All are good. Setbacks should be such to allow snow removal and not shading where ice would accumulate. I think screening is important but it should be tailored to the site. All of the options should be on the table. integrating greenery into a lot integrates lot into neighborhood
	CBD Central Business District	1	9	2	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District		10	2	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District		10	2	

Screened with Plants		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District		7	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant heights limited for security Does this assume the lot is behind the bldg.? Plants often die Don't favor plants only. Behind bldg.
	CBD Central Business District		9	3	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District		8	3	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District		8	3	



Screened with Masonry Wall		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District		8	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In combination with landscape and stormwater management alum and masonry • Behind bldg.
	CBD Central Business District		13	2	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District		13	2	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District		9	2	

Screened with Black Aluminum Fence		NP	P	S	Comments
	NMU Neighborhood Mixed-Use District		7	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alum & masonry • No fencing on residential facing sides • Masonry walls
	CBD Central Business District		7	4	
	CMU Corridor Mixed-Use District		7	5	
	CIVIC Civic and Parks District		8	5	

Commercial Design Standards

NMU, Neighborhood Mixed-Use – Comments:

- Sentimental, terrible architecture
- Consider delineating between ground floor, window % vs upper floors high at ground 75% with target % 50 total of façade
- Encourage more ht./density
- Lighting above awnings and canopy does not make sense.
- Need to address signage
- 2.5 stories, 3rd story has setback from front
- No electronic parking meters, always allow for coins
- Entry points need to be improved
- Noise level of commercial
- If going 3 stories, which I agree with, it should have step back on rear to no over shadow residential



- Property maintenance issues
- Charlevoix – remain with current 1-2 story to maintain character like roof top deck for restaurants

CBD, Central Business District - Comments

- 60% is excessive for energy compliance.
- Rendering shows 2-3 stories but regs proposed is for 3
- Would prefer more 75-80%
- Banal
- How are buildings material addressed?
- Vestibules are key in one climate – should be internal
- More alignment in façade along sidewalk

CMU, Corridor Mixed-use District – Comments

- Banal
- More glass at ground floor, less at floors above
- Rendering shows 2 story but proposed reg is 3?
- Light level definition
- No transparency requirements Alter/Border to City
- Remain 2.5 height for CBD/CMU areas

Note: Online survey only asked if people generally agreed or disagreed with the proposed design standards for all districts; these are tallied below. Additional comments from the online survey are included.

Standard	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Minimum Facade Heights (taller, denser buildings)	7	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height in-line with current architecture • I like front setbacks. • the objection to glass seems arbitrary. • Glass windows are more welcoming as long as not covered with paper signs of cabinets.
Maximum Side Setbacks (reduced space between buildings)	9		
Minimum Percentage Build-To Lines (buildings closer to the sidewalk)	7	2	
Required Street Frontage Pedestrian Access	9		
Minimum Percentage of Glass on Facades	6	3	
All Facades Requiring Architectural Features	9		