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Dimensional Concerns

This Proposal Does Not Change The Building Dimensions Already Allowed in Residential Zones

View from the Front
This Proposal Does Not Change The Building Dimensions Already Allowed in Residential Zones

**CURRENT CODE**

140'x50' lot
2,450 SF Single family home:
- 30% lot coverage
- 30' height

**ADU PROPOSAL**

140'x50' lot
1,400 SF Single family home + 525 SF ADU (above garage):
- 30% lot coverage
- 30' height

This Proposal Does Not Change The Building Dimensions Already Allowed in Residential Zones

**Overhead View**

140'x50' lot
1,400 SF Single family home + 525 SF ADU (above garage):
- 30% lot coverage
- 30' height
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Rogers Park Court

24th Avenue
"Cities can support the building of ADUs by reforming their zoning regulations (particularly minimum lot size and floor area), minimizing design review, and easing owner occupancy requirements. According to our survey of homeowners, the single biggest motivation to start an ADU project is the easing of land use regulations."
• Purpose statements carry no regulatory weight.
• Purpose statements in existing code have not proven to ensure any of the outcomes they call for.

• The existing language of “ensure that accessory dwelling units maintain and are compatible with the appearance of and character of the principal residence, lot, and neighborhood” is a purpose statement and not a requirement.
• There are no criteria for what compatibility with character of a “residence, lot, and neighborhood” means.

• Owner occupancy requirements do not exist for any other type of housing in the municipality.
• Owner occupancy requirements do not necessarily regulate short term rentals.
• What is the rationale for a special setback for an ADU?
• The proposal allows ADUs to reach the existing height limit for principal structures.

• ADUs are not currently considered in calculations of density. This is a high-level policy question.
• Owner occupancy restrictions do not exist for any other type of housing in the Municipality.

• The Municipality has incomplete data on how many ADUs exist throughout the Bowl.
• Requiring owners of non-permitted ADUs to remove them would take extensive enforcement action and remove housing from the community’s housing stock.
• There are no provisions in the code to define “neighborhood stability”
• Staff did not find any evidence of ADUs decreasing residential stability.

• The ADU project was a direct result of 2040 plan guidance to reduce barriers to the provision of ADUs.
• ADUs are not counted towards density.
• The Midtown Community Council area does not have any single-family zoning.

• The ADU project was a direct result of 2040 plan guidance to reduce barriers to the provision of ADUs.
• ADUs are a residential use which already likely exist in all neighborhoods in the City.
• Short term rentals are a larger issue that affect all housing types.
• The Planning Department has spent over one year gathering data supporting this project.
• Allowing more flexibility in height, setbacks, and size are all demonstrated ways to improve ADU production.
• Increasing housing stock does not decrease housing capacity.
• Short term rentals are a larger issue that affect all housing types.
• Owner occupancy regulations do not necessarily regulate short term rentals.

• Vehicle storage is not required to be a part of housing within the Municipality.
• Snow removal is a street management issue.

• This proposal has never overridden or restricted the ability of property owners to create covenants.
Thank you!