

OTNP Stakeholder Meeting Notes

3/21/2016

Topic: Accessory Dwelling Units (continued from February Meeting)

Are there other thoughts you want to share after our last meeting?

- How does an ADU fit under the floor area ratio limits? Part of the overall limits?
 - Yes.
- Emphasize parking on the list of concerns.

What about other types of ADUs? (basement, “mother-in-law” apartments)

- Currently not permitted in the NCL district (Land Use Codes does not permit duplexes)
- In NCM, lot size required is at least 10,000 sf for an attached ADU
- You could have a mother-in-law unit now (without a second kitchen)
 - Trigger is the stove/oven to classify as a second, attached dwelling unit
- A separate structure is a carriage house
- Could address privacy and rear FAR concerns, but does count toward overall FAR requirements
- What are your thoughts?
 - Parking is still a concern. Could be up to 6 people if two units.
 - Parking requirements for a carriage house are more stringent than for a single family home (carriage house: 1/bedroom; house: 1 space for lots over 50-ft wide)
 - What about paving the backyard issues? Want to keep pervious spaces.
 - No more than 40% of front yard allowed to be paved – but that still means that people could pave parts of their front yards. Also if off an alley, supposed to be using alley for access.
 - Are hotels worried about short term rentals?
 - We haven’t heard this directly, mostly that they want everyone to play by the same rules (pay lodging taxes, etc.)
 - Would attached ADUs mean fewer short term rentals? Attached nature could discourage that.
 - What was the original idea of creating more flexibility? If you allow any of these to be vacation rentals, then you’re not achieving the goal that you stated, which was to improve housing choices and affordability. None of these should be vacation rentals. Would strenuously object to any expansion if people were building these to be short term rentals.
 - Attached ADUs shouldn’t be allowed in NCL, would require a major change to the zoning
 - What about a policy for longer-term (like housing swaps) to inform the City/police?
 - If you have the lot size, you can do this today (in NCM).
 -

- If you're going to allow carriage houses, I don't really see a big difference (vs attached ADU).
- I'd prefer to see in-home units than carriage houses.
- This seems to go contrary to the vision of preserving single-family owner-occupied.
- If we reduce the lot size, what is the actual impact? If it's only adding a couple hundred units over the whole OTNP neighborhood, no big deal. If it's 1,000, that's a different thing.
 - Numbers would be helpful, maps are less helpful.
 - Currently: 397 lots eligible
 - If we decrease lot size in NCL to 10,000, NCM and NCB to 9500, 730 lots eligible
- For me, the first option (730 lots) is ok, as long as parking is taken care of. Would prefer in-home/attached ADU, for greater owner responsibility as compared to carriage house.
- We need to think about all of these as rentals. No way to regulate whether that's vacation rentals or long-term rentals. Not necessarily going to be a family member, etc.
 - Information needed: what happens with the whole short-term rental conversation?
 - Should we require homeowner occupancy of main house? Could ask City attorney again.
- Attached ADUs should be called duplexes, because that's what they are.
 - Ask about duplexes, ask about in-laws, ask about rental units – find out what people are comfortable with
- Original lot requirements were put in because the neighbors didn't want to see all of the impacts from lots of carriage houses, etc. – traffic and other impacts.
- How do we bridge the need for some of these ADUs (nannies, aging family members, etc.) with the negative impacts of some of what we've seen (vacation rentals, two-story rental properties, etc.). How can we provide a little bit of flexibility? Apply for a permit to add a stove??
- What makes a little bit of difference to me is whether the utilities are combined. If you're renting to someone, but they're on your utility bill, more likely to take responsibility.
- Making sure that the ADU is truly accessory to the primary structure
- I do think we have a workforce housing issue. I wonder how this conversation would be different if we already had regulations around short term rentals.
 - Short term rentals going to P&Z in April and May to discuss Land Use Code changes.
 - Separate owner-occupied vs. non owner-occupied.
 - Exploring a concentration limit for NCM and NCL
 - Timeline is roughly July for potential Land Use Code changes
- In situations where you "round up" the number of units that can be built on a lot, could require that additional unit to be workforce housing or affordable, or a particular % of Area Median Income
 - But unlikely to see that until we have more supply.

- Why does lot size matter if the extra unit is in a basement? It seems like it shouldn't.

Topic: Evaluation Tool & Criteria (sample image below)

- Evaluate potential plan policies/actions, using triple bottom line approach (social, environmental, economic)
 - How are you going to rate the scores? What's the difference between a 3 and a 2?
 - Sometimes it's a defined number, sometimes it's more of a "gut" feeling.
 - For "public support" category, we may ask this group and use survey data
 - What are the options that will be evaluated?
 - Many of the things we've been talking about – Mulberry and Shields changes, ADUs, zoning changes, etc.
 - Maybe consider public support from all 3 elements – what does the public think about this option economically, socially, environmentally?
 - Think about weighting these categories to the ones that are most relevant
 - Individual criteria or overall categories (suggestion to weight environmental and social more heavily)
 - What are your thoughts about these evaluation criteria?
 - Why is "aesthetic improvements" in economic? Seems like it fits better in social category.
 - I would add a criteria that just says "property values" – maintain/increase
 - Encouraging continued reinvestment as a criteria
 - Something to look at – how many property owners have multiple properties? How many first-time homebuyers?
 - How to capture issues related to property taxes, people on fixed incomes? Include affordability criteria. Most people want property taxes to go up, and we can also agree that we have an affordability issue.
 - Some of these economic criteria are related to impacts to residents; some are more related to the City...
 - "Cost competitiveness" – change to "cost to implement" and put next to "funding availability"
 - What about a criteria for "does it grow the government"?
 - "Development/redevelopment potential or capacity" – how else could we talk about this? "Level of zoning/code change required" or similar
 - Seems like most of these will need definitions – for me, "housing choices" means being able to buy a smaller (1,000 sf) home with a yard
 - Add a "housing affordability" criteria
 - Could come up with a net cost, then use each criteria to evaluate people's willingness to pay
 - If you really wanted to be thorough, need to place some sort of value on the non-monetary criteria

- Put “bikeability” and “walkability” together; put “multi-modal transportation” under environmental
 - I would remove “transit” from social. Focus on recreational transportation in social, all other transportation in environmental
 - Three most important in social are “public support, safety, and sense of place”
 - Add “trails” to “access to parks”
 - Or consider a “recreational” criteria to consolidate
 - Is there a master plan for bike wayfinding?
 - Was Remington the test case for the bike wayfinding system?
 - “Improve wayfinding” could be a criterion
 - “Mix of land uses” – specify LMN and NCB
 - Do we really need to have “protection of night sky”? Might not be as important as others.
 - Community gardens are also important...maybe incorporate into “tree canopy cover”
 - Maybe remove “waste reduction/diversion” and “water use”
 - It would be ok to not worry so much about balancing the three categories. The social category to me is the most important, and most of the environmental criteria are outside of the scope of the plan
 - What’s missing for me is listing the objectives up front, then knowing what the numbers are actually measuring
 - What does the total mean? Either take the total away or make it mean something
- Next step: refine the criteria, then actually evaluate our potential options
 - Likely to have group help evaluate or use the tool at the next meeting

