Covenants

Zoning doesn’t prevent more than one residence on a lot, covenants do. Old neighborhoods have plenty of houses with rental apartments in them and converted garages.

City council candidates don’t know the difference between covenants and zoning. (and Planning?)

The single-family house zoning makes it so not everyone pays the landlord middleman to live. (landperson?) Single-family zoning makes it so that it occurs to the maturing adult that they may buy if they can get a down-payment together. What are the programs that help with that? They may have equity rather than rent gone each month. Their rent may be the same as their mortgage payment, if their house is small enough or low priced enough.

It would be great if development happened equally in subdivisions, since old neighborhoods already have 3-6 times the density per lot. Core urban infrastructure may not handle more sewage and plumbing. Subdivision infrastructure is not burdened so that tampons float in the culverts during a hard rain.

One more thing: covenants can be changed, and some of them expire. Seniors aging in place might want that. It is covenants that are rooted in racism, but it is current versions of red-lining that keep real estate agents and investors from developing ADUs and basement apartments in subdivisions, and that makes the city want to build in the “poor” neighborhoods rather than where more professors and higher income friends live.

Let’s educate. This distinction is why I want to talk about covenants. The City could/should help neighborhoods evaluate and update their covenants, and it's no more difficult than conservation district set up.

I think this will be helpful in the council races. Please educate me if I've misunderstood.