

**From:** [Kirk Westphal](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** concerns about introducing new curb cuts; possible to liberalize group housing  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024

---

Dear ORC:

I'm glad that you're looking at potential changes that could facilitate housing. I have a couple of concerns (if I'm understanding the proposals correctly).

#### ADU/driveways

I think the proposal to "grandfather" existing driveways and curb cuts is rational, particularly because I imagine that many of them are the only driveway leading to a property in general.

However, what concerns me is the potential for this to introduce 1) brand new curb cuts, 2) more off-street parking spaces overall, and 3) parking located in the front yard that can cause sight line issues for people using sidewalks.

New curb cuts are something the city regulates because they're a known public safety concern, so I just want to raise the issue. It's not on the scale of something on an arterial road, but curb cuts anywhere are hazards, particularly if a vehicle is backing up with obstructed views due to another vehicle.

I'm in favor of lot splits (and theoretically allowing those new buildings driveways), but with tighter sites that may have an ADU I'm concerned about pedestrian conflicts due to obstructed views. Perhaps there's a way to limit the number of curb cuts per X street frontage to avoid sight problems?

Also, would a new front-yard parking spot increase the rent of the ADU by effectively bundling the car storage with rent? (I suppose that can be addressed with a comprehensive parking unbundling ordinance, which I believe is on the work plan.)

#### Group housing

Is there a reason why group housing is not being considered along with student-related housing (coops and fraternity/sorority)? I realize this discussion was generated by a co-op organization, but could the discussion easily be expanded by including other group housing? I saw the comment, "care must be exercised to ensure equal treatment of similar housing arrangements" but it appears the scenarios presented only apply to student-related housing.

Also, would it be an option for Scenario #3 to have the lot area requirement default to the base zoning district? I imagine CPC doesn't want to meddle with inventing new numbers given the comp plan process, but could the "extra" lot area demands simply be removed in the meantime?

Thank you for reading!  
Kirk Westphal