

Item 7 C Zoning Updates: Accessory Dwelling Units

NOMA is writing to you for your consideration regarding the staff's recommendation on the size of Accessory Dwelling Units as part of the R-1 Interim Zoning Ordinance. As you are aware, their recommendation is to raise the maximum size from the current 650 SF to the state mandated maximum of 1200 SF. However, they also state in their report that this maximum must acknowledge and is subject to other areas of the law that allow local control of height, setbacks, second story size and parcel coverage.

The R 1 Survey conducted throughout the R 1 neighborhoods late in 2017 had a question about the desired size of ADU's. The question: "I think ADUs in R 1 should be larger than the 650 SF max that our current law allows" had responses of only 25.75%. Residents do not want larger ADU's.

NOMA is requesting that you consider having the current **650 SF ADU or less** continue to be exempt from lot coverage for this size. There should also be some consideration as to the proportion of size of the main house to the ADU. Any increase in size up to the maximum of 1200 SF must be counted in the lot coverage in order to preserve the intent of the IZO for R I neighborhoods adopted earlier this year by the Council.

This is in keeping with what many cities in California and elsewhere has done. A useful site for this information can be found at: <https://accessorydwellings.org/adu-regulations-by-city/>. For example, Culver City has a maximum ADU size of 600 SF; Thousand Oaks, 600 SF; Glendale, 600 SF; Oxnard, 640 SF; Huntington Beach, 650 SF; Orange, 640 SF. In its report, the staff acknowledges the fact that cities limit maximum size to between 500-800 SF.

Santa Barbara, as recently as last week, adopted an ADU ordinance based on lot size. Lots of less than 5000 SF are limited to a 600 SF; a lot size of 5000 – 9999 SF are limited to 800 SF; lots between 10,000 and 14,999 SF to ADUs of 1000 SF; and those with larger lots to 1200 SF. In any case no ADU be allowed to exceed 50% of the main dwelling unit or 1200 SF whichever is smaller.

Interestingly, the average of these two extremes is exactly **650 SF**, what you have already determined to be appropriate. This can be interpreted as either a coincidence or a subliminal message to the Council.

The R-1 ordinance is city-wide. However, there is an appreciable difference in lot sizes for different neighborhoods. (North of Montana and Sunset Park, for example.) Since the primary structure is measured as a percentage of total lot size, the ADU should be as well. If not, then the impact would be unfairly greater on a smaller lot than on one of the lots found in Gillette Regent area. Taking a 9000 SF lot as is found in the Gillette Regent area, a 650 SF ADU would cover 7.2% of the lot and would be 14% of the primary structure. On a 6000 square foot lot as is found in Sunset Park a 650 SF ADU would be 10.8% of the lot and 21% of the primary structure. Many cities have, in their ordinances, both a maximum size and a percentage of either lot size, or the primary structure,

whichever is less. This would keep the ADU in scale with both the lot and primary structure. A provision to consider ADU size relative to lot size throughout the City would address this problem.

While the primary argument in favor of increasing the size of ADUs is to increase housing, there is no requirement that the ADU be used for additional housing. Companies are already marketing ADUs as a way to enlarge houses. It is a significant end-run around city planning efforts to control lot coverage and mansionization.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

The NOMA Board

Nancy Coleman, Chair
Danilo Bach, Vice Chair
Victor Fresco, Treasurer
Caryn Marshall, Membership
Jeff Brecht, Secretary
Phillis Dudick
Jeff Gordon
Todd James
Jane Koehler
Evelyn Lauchenauer
Steven Lissik
Sonya Sultan
Jim Williams