

## ADU Update Open House Comments - Nov. 27, 2017

On Monday, Nov. 27 an ADU Update Open House was held at St. Paul's United Methodist Church from 5-7 p.m. Eighty-eight people participated in an open house format that included a brief staff presentation followed by a 30-minute question and answer period. Forty-three people shared their thoughts via a feedback form that asked the four questions listed in the column headings below.

The following are general themes from the feedback on this spreadsheet:

1. General support for the project purpose and why statements
2. Many shared the reasons why they are supportive of changes: creates additional diversity in the community, allows empty nesters to age in place, provides housing for family members, provides additional affordable rental opportunities
3. Support for not changing current requirements regarding owner occupancy
4. Support for key changes (saturation, size) to provide more flexibility
5. Concern with potential impacts of additional housing units in terms of nuisances that many associate with rentals (trash, noise, parking, etc.)
6. Disagreement over whether or not short-term rentals should be allowed in ADUs and OAU's

	Do you have feedback on the draft WHY and PURPOSE statements?	Do you have feedback on the list of focused code changes?	Do you have suggestions for analysis to understand potential benefits and impacts?	The purpose statement outlines that changes to simplify regulations and remove barriers will be done in ways that are compatible with neighborhoods. Some of the aspects include: size and/or height of house, good design, sufficient yard or personal open space, parking, noise, lighting, and energy efficiency. What other factors should be considered?
1	Yes, this should include Tiny Houses	Yes, Boulder should add a clause that allows Tiny Houses on wheels as OAU's, just like Fresno, CA has done.	I think it's about time to allow ADUs, OAU's, and Tiny Houses in Boulder!	Different types of OAU's, namely Tiny Houses. See Fresno, CA codes and regulations attached
2			I think I read some place that you were considering NO OFF STREET parking necessary for ADU. Bad idea. Very Bad. Please think about the impact on neighborhoods.	
3	Purpose / Why should be more specific to increase what kind of housing (small, affordable, etc.?). Purpose is to increase this type by how much? (i.e. I want to make sure that changes actually result in an increase of affordable housing options and not just on paper...)	I'd like to understand why some changes are being considered and not others. What I care about is enabling the ones that will provide the most opportunity	Just that you focus on potential benefits in your communication instead of just the rule changes because as a lay person I have no idea how to interpret the proposals to these implications	I think this is the wrong approach. Neighborhoods cannot and will not stay the same, it should be about the potential of each neighborhood to serve the larger Boulder vision and the vision should include the vision of the people we claim we want there to be room for. Thank you for taking this tricky challenge.
4	No	I think the parking space (10ft) is the most restricting item and is almost non-existent on less expensive housing (typically those that need an ADU first)	Analyze the # of homes without 10 ft on side of their house	Make below grade space count less than about grade space. Less impact on neighborhood / open space.

5		I am really excited and supportive of the changes. as an achitect in Boulder, I have had clients request ADU's for over 20 years and hove never been able to meet the criteria. We ? city that has become progressively less inclusive to youger families with less money and this step is very encouraging.	I see great benefit from collaborative housing between owners and renters. Older owners might be able to provide housing to families of caretakers. younger people who cna't afford a larger hoomie might create bonding and friendships with landlords.	This seems like a great alternative to forced affordable housing. Very citing and progresive!
6		Base things on dwelling saturation, not ADU saturation	Make an interactive map of the city, so people can click on any property and learn "within 300 ft. there are x parcels, y dwellings, of which there are z ADUs." This would allow people to know the local situation and grasp the possible changes that rule changes might cause.	
7	Human factos shoul be considered such as if people are elderly, or disabled or sick and need help.	I have 3 children, 2 are grown. They cannot afford to live in Boulder. 1 child is a recoving addict who would be homelss or dead if he did not live with me in our house. My other child has epilepsy, which despite brain surgery, 3 medications daily and a implantedvegal nerve stimulator, is unable to work, he would also be at risk of homelessness and coul die without his medicaiton. If these kids lived with me in the house they could each have a car and my and my youger child could als. I understand that parking is a big issue, but therser is a lack of parking, because so many people commute to Boulder. If I had an ADU or an OAU, I coul provide my family members with what could be desperatley need housing. Also, as my husband and I get older, we coul like to stay in our home. We can't afford a lot of care, but could trade some rent for hlep. I don't think this kind of extra housing would much impact parking or noise.		
8	we've tired to get an ADU, but there's no where on our property for a 2nd off street parking unit because of setbacks. Investment properties have no such requeirements and the ADU across the road has 3 off street (2 alley) that none of the ADU renters use. 3 vehicles in the driveway (setback) and 2 on the street. This rule is not effective. Please kill it.			
9		Do not remove the requirement that ADU's have to provide 2nd off-street parking space.	Yes, quantify the number of already existing unlicensed rentals and unlicensed ADU's. There	
10	Here's a positive suggestion: Any increased density proposal - whether co-ops, ADUs, fill in the blank - should be preceded by an assessment of existing conditions in various neighborhoods. The City should do baseline assessments of pre-existing stress conditions in various neighborhoods, before proceeding with plans that are likely to add more. Here are some ideas. The City could research and quantify:Percentage of housing units in the neighborhood that are already rentals. The amount of already existing ambient noise (due to background road noise, etc.) The number of Code Enforcement calls in that neighborhood for over-occupied rentals, unlicensed rentals, untrimmed lawns and tree branches/shrubs blocking the sidewalk, trash complaints, un- shoveled snow and ice. The number of Police Dept. calls re: noise complaints, barking dogs, loud parties, etc. How many "progressive elements" the neighborhood already has, indexed by# of multi-units, affordable housing developments, residences for homeless or formerly homeless individuals, etc. The extent and degree of the neighborhood's ethnic diversity, according to Census data and neighborhood elementary school data.		Further, the City could examine to what degree the neighborhood already exhibits many of the stated objectives of an inclusive city with a variety of housing options. Martin Acres, for instance, already has: Three large apartment/condo complexes. Alvarado Village, one of the City's first affordable housing developments and a largely Latino population (which is awesome, btw). The Bridge House ready-to-work facility/transitional housing for formerly homeless. Many shared rentals, including many student rentals. 22 languages are spoken at Martin Park/Creekside Elementary school, according to school officials. In terms of stressors.....Martin Acres also has many illegally over-occupied rentals. Many unlicensed rentals. Several illegal co-ops. Martin Acres has the constant background noise and drone from US 36, since the speed limit was raised from 45 mph 20 years ago.	

11	I support the why and purpose statements! We would love the increased flexibility, affordability, and commitment to resource sustainability that increasing ADU/OAU accessibility affords.	Love the relaxed parking suggestion - we live in a neighborhood with rentals (legal and not) and owners. There is plenty of street parking. If you want to regulate parking, create parking zones.	1. Would be helpful to have existing data on 1+2 bedroom rental apartments up to a certain square footage to understand how expensive Boulder's housing has become for the population that would be served by ADUs. 2. Estimate the number of illegal ADU rentals that are currently not in the system. 3. Estimate the carbon reduction impacts of shorter commutes by local renters	
12	Making these rules less restrictive will help us achieve our goals - more environmentally sustainable, more vibrant and diverse. Suggestions to tie to Boulder priorities - done make incremental! It will take time to change. Great Move!	All are better - more are best! 1/3 is too restrictive; 1/2 is still restrictive. Why not any mix? Don't prioritize parking over people. Those are good changes. All neighborhoods should be OAU-ready. Eliminate the 10 or 20% saturation rate.	Talk to businesses. How far do their young employees commute and why? What is the real "cost" of providing multiple parking spots? Is that the best use of our limited space? Align with city of Boulder's stated goals. How does it help/hurt?	Providing diverse housing for ALL stages of life.
13	Combine OAU and ADU into one ordinance - the current differences are hard to understand, and make no sense!	Eliminate completely 10% limit!! Eliminate off-street parking requirement. Raise the occupancy limit by at least 2 more people!	How many applications for ADU/OAUs have been restricted due to the 10% limit? More in-depth analysis of experiences from other cities, including Portland.	
14	Yes, to allow owners to age in place and for housing - not just affordable! But housing for those that want to rent and work in Boulder	Yes make simple rules. Get parking codes amended and density and square footage - all problems.	Help owners to age in place without de-valuing of property. Seniors need this but so do single moms.	No deed restrictions - you will devalue our homes!
15		Allow permit to transfer on sale and scrape or greatly expand 10% rule because if I invested in the ADU why shouldn't I be able to see it like that? I've created value = tax base. Concentration - I was discouraged from buying a home where 10% rule affected my choice of use.	An ADU should be rentable on short-term basis to fill gap between long-term renters. Remove lot size requirement.	Changes in owner's financial circumstance or other demonstrated need even in places where it might not be allowed.
16	Could "tiny" portable houses be part of this solution in areas where there is accessibility to move in and out? or in commercial and industrial areas?	parking will always be an issue in areas where there are lots at 6000 sf or not much bigger - kids use the street to play in and parked cars limit line of sight for safety both for walking people and vehicle use, drivers of bikes	distances in code for set backs to properties - stay same?	(circled "noise") less respect? grandfather! \$ major loss to owner etc.! if try to revoke these changes.

17	Very supportive! why wouldn't the city of Boulder leverage homeowner's own willingness to invest in ADUs and broaden the tax base for supporting our schools and open space by creating additional housing?	Very in support of code changes, minus the potential restriction on short term rental use.	Think about sensible location based standards for allowing ADUs near transit corridors, etc to limit automobile use and encourage sustainable transit.	ADUs will have little impact on neighborhood character.
18	It is important to keep the focus on the actual goal. In just this meeting, that was easily over-shadowed by each person's personal situation.	I agree with all proposed changes and am excited for the possibility of revisions to the code.	utilize meet-up for the next meeting to capture more of the commuters - conduct a survey on next door.	
19	Acknowledge times have changed - the economy makes owning a home a largely unreachable dream for most people. Rentals are the future for any housing - like Europe.	The saturation thing is crazy and illogical. Different neighborhoods have different capacity to have ADUs - need to see that.	We need a SAFE way to collect accurate data - right now, it is not safe to share anything about an ADU.	Housing one's own family is increasingly important - from children to parents. Thinking about who is living in the ADU could be important.
20	I think the "why" and "purpose" statements are spot on.	*remove the saturation requirements; *either remove the additional off-street parking req. OR allow parking in front setback. *collapse ADU/OAU/LAU definitions - there shouldn't be a distinction. *I support size limitation of 1/2 sqft of primary or 1000 whichever is less.	I think keeping the owner-occupied requirement is a good idea. I think ADUs should be for long term rental only.	Keep existing rules for bulk plane, solar fence, FAR and allow ADUs (attached or detached) within those limits. Thank you for considering this. I am a homeowner with no intention of building an ADU but I think it adds another option for housing. I wouldn't mind if my neighbors had one.
21		Eliminating the distinctions between ADUs and OAUs to the greatest degree possible is a huge improvement. Eliminating the 5 year waiting period for ADU/OAU development is also very positive since the development process can be much more cost-effective than a retro fit.	Understand that huge swaths of residential areas are covered by HOAs who either preclude or could preclude ADUs through their CC&Rs. The city should consider adopting ordinances that prevent the applicability of covenants that ban ADUs.	"neighborhood compatibility" is a minefield of subjective judgement. Please adopt only the minimum number of objective measures when making the determination of "neighborhood compatibility."
22	They could include additional justifications: reducing in-commuting, facilitating aging in places, reducing displacement, etc.	Allow ADUs to be nonconforming use; Eliminate 2-person residential restriction; Change restriction based on concentration (currently 10%) to a limit on number of permits issued per-year.	Survey current rental rates for ADUs; Survey current car ownership rates for ADUs v primary units.	Stylistic and material compatibility requirement for OAUs should be eliminated. Diversity is great!
23	Yes - just counting ADUs is a blunt instrument - since some may be used for family members, some may be used for long term rental, and some may be used for AirBNB style rentals. If there is one category that is NOT desired by the city and its residents, considered a tiered approach, i.e 1) Family member ADU (no limit); 2) Long Term Rental (25% concentration); 3) AirBNB (10% concentration)..... or whatever. But counting ADUs without caring about how they are used, is like counting cars on the road regardless of the number of people in them and where they are going - blunt instrument			
24		Work on a variance for saturation		

25	Boulder is growing, there are corporations building companies here + job demands have increased dramatically. We need to make housing change that reflect sensativity to the growth. I am in support of increasing diversity of housing, to allow for more people to be able to live here	Concerned about the 10% saturation - if the licence remains with the property then those homes will get grandfathered in and very quickly no one else will be able to get a licence. This will also unlikely increase the value of those 10% homes	I think we need to place priority on family - the elderly parents and adult children, and having more flexibility to accomodate family on our own property	
26			Yes, OAU should be allowed in same areas as ADUs	
27			My neighbors and myself would like to see priority to seniors and people living in Boulder for many years	
28			Please make parking an essential requirement for any and all ADUs in Boulder. Thank You.	
29	I think it is a great idea, BUT it should ... include alternative housing such as tiny houses	ADU should transfer with the sale of a property	Create a Tiny House analysis of impacts on Boulder and the benefits of affordable housing	Affordable for Boulder residents
30	I completely support the WHY and purpose statements. if anything, the proposed changes do not go far enough. As a Boulder homeowner, I am eager to build an ADU (or multiple) on my lot	The zoning restrictions on ADUs vs. OAUs needs to be abolished. I whole heartedly support the proposed code changes and would love to see the city take them further. Why not allow every house to have an ADU? Why not multiple OAUs? Why not allow (or incentivize) the construction of townhomes on a single family lot?	No, I think the planners have done a nice job laying out the benefits and (very, very marginal) impacts.	The city should also consider to what degree it makes sense to incentivize single family homes, particularly in neighborhoods packed with post-wwII "boxes". Why not allow homeowners to instal multi-story duplexes/triplexes on single family lots
31		It seems to me that eliminating the requirements for ADUs to have their own parking is a recipe for much problem + outrage in neighborhoods		
32			Parking for ADUs seems to be a must!	
33	Can you seriously be thinking of NOT requiring of street parking for ADUs?			
34	I am opposed to detached ADUs - we have one at our back property line. Right now it is permitted as an office/ studio but is still encroaches on our enjoyment in our backyard - There have been renters in it with the previous owner. The land noise, bright lights & fould language arguments we had to endure are not acceptable. if someone wants to add an apartment in their basement or other space in an existing structure, that is fine - please DO NOT allow encroaching on existing yards by having detached ADUs constructed in neighborhoods.			Allowing AirBNBs in ADUs DO NOT help the housing shortage in Boulder

35	1) The WHY statement is biased by stating the "relatively small number" of legal ADUs, at 230. Why aren't 230 units considered a lot, or even excessive? 2) the PURPOSE statement states the goals of simplifying regulations & removing apparent barriers. Neither is a valid reason to change regulations	The neighborhood notice requirement should be retained. Increasing the resident population equates to a change in zoning, density. Keep the saturation at 10% for now, until effects of other changes can be evaluated/ Increasing saturation to 20 percent is too much too soon. Size! keep to 1/3 the original house for homes less than 1,500 sq. ft. Parking: maintain current limits - this has the largest visual effect in most neighborhoods.	Agree with prohibiting short term rentals. Discourage construction of detached OAU's, although allow remodeling of existing detached structures. Do not allow short term rentals which will not help our housing problem. Have surveys requesting citizen input. Let citizen groups define community impacts	If aging in place is a goal, explore ways to reduce property taxes. Also include floor area ratio for a property
36	I am strongly in support of the city utilizing the resource of ADUs to alleviate some of the strain of Boulder's housing situation.	In support of even more relaxed regulations	I think cities like Portland and Seattle offer excellent examples. I think the city may need to do more outreach to younger residents to hear a more balanced viewpoint. Young working people amenable to creating or living in an ADU seem grossly underrepresented in the comments.	ADUs have a smaller impact on neighborhood character than is feared. Currently 2 houses on our block have undergraduate renters that have many cars, another house is abandoned. I fail to see how our ADU would negatively effect the character.
37	I think these are well thought out.	I believe that the 20% limitation on the density or saturation of ADUs should be eliminated. In other words, no saturation limit.	I believe that you should find a way to discover how much demand exists of property owners who either have (an illegal ADU) and want to make it legal, or don't have a legal ADU that want one.	Lost size, FAR, coverage and other such limitations to reduce impacts were already dealt with in the compatible development ordinance. Let that be enough: we should eliminate the 6,000 sq ft lot size restriction, as people who want an ADU on a small lot will still be subject to compatible development's coverage and FAR restrictions.
38	extend ADU/OAU to RH2 areas - especially if ample parking can be provided or already exists. Ensure that buildings or structures (i.e., accessory structure) built to the city codes already can go through a straightforward, simple transition to an OAU/ADU. Putting up barrier to these will only result in more illegal OAU/ADUs. Allow for a variance process if a zone isn't included. If a homeowner can provide adequate space then ultimately more money for the city. Removing barriers and keeping the process simple and open communication will be a win-win for all parties. Owner financial need should also be considered. Especially for those on a fixed income but also if a situation changes with a working/younger home owner. Allow grandfathering of existing structures. If a city code was how a structure was built then accept that and work with existing homeowners. Eliminate the proposed change that will make all ADU/OAUs illegal should the city change their mind down the road.			
39	Doesn't go far enough to include tiny houses.	10% will be taken up in no time.	Make more housing options available.	450 size should be smaller.
40	PUDs remain frozen in time. No ADU's allowed because of ultra restricting zoning ordinances.	Incremental change + not more change toward achieving a set goal. It took 133 years for women to get the vote because men resisted change.	Do you folks understand supply and demand? More plentiful supply means more affordable housing. The goal should be revised to target X number of additional units.	Unfreeze PUDs and include PUDs in the ADU Update process.

41	City needs to allow ADU or OAU. Laws irreversible if they allow more OAUs. In order to stay in my home of 25 years - having an OAU would allow me to age in place. I would rent out my family home and live in the OAU.	OAUs seem like a fair solution to being able to age in place with rising property taxes and home costs.	I wonder if there could be a criteria for allowing OAUs. I have live in my home for over 25 years and this is the only way I can imagine to keep my home in Boulder.	I strongly believe the home owner needs to reside in one of the structures on the proerty. Criteria could be for people who are over 60 and lived in the house for over 10 years.
42	The proposal to remove the neighborhood notice requirement seems contrary to the city's state intention of improving community within neighborhoods. Discovering a neighbor is planning on building an ADU when someone starts digging a foundation is not a good way of enhancing community.			
43	Yesterday, my seriously mentally ill nephew lost control of his reasoning abilities. This happens every 2 or 3 months. He quit his job and went off drinkin. He has had many therapies and intervention that have seemed promising. He lives with my sister but if he could not she would be homeless. Homeless because of an illness. Sometime my sister has to lock hersolf into her bedroom until his rage subsides. if she could have a garage apartment for hime ehy could have the separation they need while he could get some support. Meintally ill and addition disordered people need love and support in order to try to get well. Part of this love and support can be given through stable housing. I understand that many people are frustrated about parking, but the parking problems will not go away if people can't live where they work. Allowing people to love and support family members or friends in need seems humane and will very likely have little or no impact on parking and noise.			
44	Make it clear that the goal is more affordable housing not just more diverse (i.e. could include big/expensive houses)	Yeah, do it!	Have you done anything to understand if the things you are thinking of changing are actually the carrier to building?	Less is more.
45	The saturation requirement seems really unfair and punitive. Future homeowners would not be allowed to do something that folks can do now.			
46	Why are tiny houses not included in the discussion? They are another option fo affordable housing with less of an impact on the land.			