

On Monday, Dec. 11 a second ADU Update Open House was held at Shining Mountain Waldorf from 5-7 p.m. Eighty-nine people participated in an open house format that included a brief staff presentation followed by a 30-minute question and answer period. Twenty-nine people took advantage of communicating 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 additional affordable rental oppotunities*
3. *Support for not changing current requirements regarding owner occupany*
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 (primarily parking, but loss of views and solar access)*
6. *Disagreement over whether or not short-term rentals should be allowed in ADUs and OAU*
7. *Requests to address tiny homes, Homeowner Association restrictions on ADUs and OAU, and grandfathering of existing illegal units*
8. *Of the 29 comments submitted that evening, 23 are generally supportive of all or some of the incremental changes and 6 are opposed to the changes.*

| | 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 aspectcts include: size and.or height of house, good design, suffiecient yard or personal open space, parking, noise, lighting, and energy effieciency. What other factors should be considered? |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | This is a great idea | 1. I understand why you had not short-term in the recommendation, but just food for thought any increased income to the owner keeps them here maybe lets them house who is in ADU 2. Had someone mention to me they were interested in doing an OAU in the past but could not because thir property was held in trust. Please consider mechanisms for those propertieis held in trust 3. I very much like the ideas of incentives on various ares of town | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | | Get rid of saturation rules | If ADU unit is in a neighborhood with a HOA and the HOA has approval the addition of all ADU the city should | What about adding an ADU to a multifamily unit? Such as a caretaker suite within a larger unit owned by a |
| 3 | The draft purpose statement does not include short-term rental options yet part of the goal to achieve is allowing aging in place. Long-term rentals may be for business travelers who do not want to be in a hotel or are on long-term (=3 mos) project. The 10% guideline was set up in 1983. Boulder is VERY different today | 1. a. support it, b. yes, should be grandfathered, c. remove notice requirement 2. a. increase to 30% in areas of low density, b. remove, c. yes 3. a. not one-size fits all - larger house=larger ADU use the % 4. At least remove for specific areas 5. yes 6. ALLOW short-term rentals of ADU's 7. yes | Include ADU's in short-term rentals if the intent is to allow aging homeowners to stay in their homes. Try to understand the # of people who lived in the home as a family. If the proposed ADU doesn't increase that, it could be approved. The 1,000 limitation should go - use % of the home. It could be awkward to achieve that if you have a large basement | Parking - not one size fits all neighborhoods. My neighborhood (Keewaydin) on-street parking isn't the issue it is on the hill. |
| 4 | Good work! | I support all of the focused code changes They seem to be well considered! | | Our HOA, Parkside2, recently changed their covenants to prohibit ADU's. The size of houses in the HOA (3000' larger) and the abundance of available on-street parking, plus lot sizes make this neighborhood perfect for ADU's. I urge the city to find a way to OVER RIDE HOA covenants in a situation like this - clearly a legal issue. NOTE: I believe that state law has been able to over ride HOA covenants in the area of bluegrass requirements (water use issues) E. solar panels - why can't a home rule city over ride HOA's on specific land use issues. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 5 | | Be Business-like. | Get User | The city is responsible to deal with rules and licence fees! |
| 6 | Boulder has a nasty habit of getting all tied up in land-use restrictions. STOP IT! Make things simpler so that people will use them. Get rid of almost all restrictions on ADU's | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, simplify - Don't do the usual Boulder-jerk of complicating everything 2. No, saturation rates. This is too onerous, unfair, complicated 3. Size, Remove size restrictions. 1,000 + 50% are reasonable. Remove all complicated restrictions 4. Remove the requirement for additional parking spaces 5. No Location specific zoning make legal city-wide 6. Long-term rentals OK, but don't make too complicated 7. No lot size requirement. 8. ADUs + OU's in the same zone are fine | | |
| 7 | Why isn't the plan including tiny houses as backyard dwellings? | Can the codes change to allow tiny houses as well? Is would allow another option for low-income housing and the property owner would have to spend 60,000 + to build | I don't think that only ADUs & OAU's will be enough diversity in housing for Boulder residents. | Other affordable housing options. |
| 8 | It is a great start but it should include tiny houses. | 10% is not enough 20% would be better create codes for tiny houses | Look at Fresno CA and other cities that allow tiny houses. Property owner should have more choices, they own their land | Allowing young people to live in Boulder. There are tiny house this happen all over our state. Boulder is a community and shall look at all trends and creating affordable housing |
| 9 | Where is the public benefit? 1. a goal must be to achieve affordable housing therefore there should be dean restrictions for affordable rent with an OAU/ADU is granted over & above current 10% saturation. 2. Alternatives in control older neighborhoods link higher saturation to presaturation of neighborhood charactor through landmarking. | | Consider cost of construction if an ADU/OAU is added. If now constrution then owners who can afford to build have financial means and do not need to supplement income in order to afford to live in Boulder or age in place. 500SF=\$125,000, 1000SF=\$250,000, renovation | allowing larger detached OAU is probelmatic for historic preservation program which seeks to maintain historic development patterns of openings from ally into rear yard. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 10 | Remove parking space requirements for ADU Increase % to be more than 10% saturation (25% is necc initaly) (ADU) | Permit both short-term and long-term rentals as that provides maximum flexibility for the tax paying howm owner. Please limit neighbor notice for ADU. Allow ADU to be transfrrred with the property. | On average I would venture to guess the 50% of all homeowners would like to do an ADU if possible. Restrictions that eliminate that possiblity and reduce it are intended to benefit whom? Chances are that only very wealthy folks would not need/desire and ADU. That means a high percentage of Boulder homeowners are being disenfranchised by wealthy homeowners which seems irrelevant, | |
| 11 | | | | Parking! Must require off street parking. |
| 12 | I support ADUs and OAU. Wee live in Newlands and have no parking issues but have an issue with off-street parking as we live on a hill. | So I'm thrilled you're thinking of getting rid of the extra parking spot. Keep simple and supportive so we can easily comply :) | Let us age in place :) | |
| 13 | I think this is the best way to expand housing in Boulder | Generally agree with these. I don't understand 2C. Saturation rates should be increased even beyond 20%. Requireing off-street parking reduces green area. | | Use a total occupancy limit rather than a family-based (relatedness) criterion. Otherwise unconventional relationships can reduce the feasibility of an ADU. Consider requiring rent limits, as a tradeoff for the financial benefit to the owner. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 14 | They sound good. Parking requirements definitely block a lot of ADUs. Not being able to transfer ADU permit at sale is really problematic for home buyers. | They all sound good except the elimination of short term rentals. Short terms can help people stay in their homes, "age in place". Short terms will go underground if city outlaws them. | The location-specific implementation seems like it would be complicated. Nimby neighborhood associations will create a bunch of battles for the city that will tie its hands moving forward with this. ADUs in new housing is good. I imagine it's harder to change the minds of old neighborhoods but get it in new housing for sure. | Neighborhoods with the highest current negative impacts from illegal ADUs will fight against ADUs. These are probably the neighborhoods that need to legitimize and regulate ADUs the most. We risk driving underground or eliminating with location-specific changes. City planning is probably a good place to collect data we required prior to buying our home about density and other obstacles to creating ADU. |
| 15 | Allow short term rental. Do not restrict opportunity to create revenue. | Larger percentage (>30%) of available homes. | Average age and income of people needing short term rentals ADUs and OAU. People need to raise money to | |
| 16 | We should incentivize ADUs and OAUs and discourage mansion building. We do the opposite currently. | 20% is not enough, at least 50% should be allowed, plus amnesty for existing ADUS. | Look at the potential for increasing affordable housing, and reducing traffic by reducing in-commuting. | That's plenty of aspects. Consider reducing requirements, but it is good to consider the differences between neighborhoods. |
| 17 | | Parking - getting existing owners to use their garages rather than park on the street will open up street parking, ADU and OAU better than short term for community. Simplifying rules still notifying neighbors is important. Remove 5 year requirement ok but not for developers to start building duplexes and building out property. Grand-father in | | |
| 18 | Good Job! | Do not remove the parking requirement! Too great an impact on the infrastructure. | Allow OAUs w ADUs in the same zones. Strike a balance, do not overbuild. Reduce lot size requirement | Permit only long term rentals in ADUs/ OAUs |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|
| 19 | <p>yes - this is far more than just simplifying code. It changes the zoning. Your proposals make constructing duplexes in single family neighborhoods. There is no enforcement so this will result in more expensive.</p> | <p>Yes, housing, more cars, less parking, no neighborhood communication (opportunity) more airBNBs, no community benefit, no preservation of old houses. It is not enabling compatible anything.</p> | <p>Yes, you can change the ADU/OAU and update it but this is not "incremental" or simplification. It is not as written, making affordable housing which is your goal.</p> | <p>1. why X the 5 year requirement? You can build a duplex w your proposal. 2. Why increase sq footage? 3. If a neighbor wants a unit, they can do it when the property sells. So, automatic transfer is not fair. 4. Why do you want less transparency in neighbors? why can't neighbors object esp since enforcement is lax in the town? 5. how can you make it more difficult to just develop and sell a house for more money? 6. Why do you / we need larger units? 7. why do you call this an "incremental" change when it, in fact, completely changes to extent of the original ordinance? 8. why are you opposed to neighborhood input? 9. why are you not considering the community</p> |
|----|---|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | I am fully in support of the modest code changes that are being proposed. | Reasonable. Common sense. Necessary to save the character of our community. | Look at other cities and how proposed changes have worked for them. | Changing demographics in our city and dire need for additional housing opportunities. Character of city in addition to character of neighborhoods. Nothing prevents developers from bulldozing small homes and building mansions but there are a million barriers to building a granny flat (for long term rental-not short term). End notice to neighbors. Oh, and don't come down on current non-conforming ADUs - have some sense! If one has a small house (less than 1,000 sf) there should be an exception for size of ADU. What if you had an 800 sq.ft. house, one should be able to build an ADU that's livable. I support waiving impact fees and other incentives. |
| 21 | Boulder has a housing shortage for working people that is a crisis. ADUs are an important part of the solution. | Please change regulations to encourage ADUs not the current de facto prohibition. Remove concentration requirement. Remove parking requirement. Remove area requirements. | Benefits are huge, additional desperately needed affordable housing, additional income for homeowners. Impacts are negligible | All of these "factors" above are B.S. Nobody is owed on street parking. Why does any neighbor care about somebody else's "sufficient yard or personal open space?" |
| 22 | | Please reconsider the option for short-term rentals to allow some use of ADUs or OAU's for short and long-term rentals | | Location of neighborhood (i.e. closer to more urban areas, etc.), neighborhoods with alleys |
| 23 | I support these but they may be too timid and/ or limited. More action to increase ADUs/ OAU's may be needed beyond incremental changes | Generally in favor. I think that some short term rental should be allowed | | The city's overall affordability goals. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 24 | They are very clear. Perhaps consider more background info including more specifics related to the need for affordable housing close to where people are employed in Boulder. | clearly organized and explained | Include input from potential renters regarding how it would change their driving patterns, their quality of life (being able to live in the community in which they work) | Encourage input from affected neighbors on the issues, especially if new construction impacts views, solar shadow, privacy, etc. |
| 25 | Unfreeze PUDs | Flexibile stems bend in the wind. Rigid ones snap | Adds affordable housing income for seniors. Better land use | I'll believe it when I see it. This contradicts all P&DS standard operating procedure |
| 26 | | How about a little consideration for neighbors. My developer/ neighbor betrayed my afternoon sunshine, views with their monstrosity | | |
| 27 | I believe that Boulder should demonstrate more willingness to house lower income people by defining "incremental" changes differently | Permit larger ADUs so that families with children qualify. Permit a higher percent of the total sq ft. so that older houses with equal size above and below will qualify | Grandfather all existing, subject to life and safety rental inspection. Make ADUs easier and bigger and more prevelant | |
| 28 | | Incremental changes should be done only once after each neighborhood sub-plan makes their views known. As with other regulatory issues on residential housing, such as solar impact, direct neighbors should be | Specify an area as a test area, take community survey, then re-examine in 1-3 years | neighbors should have the right to comment on direct neighbors. Serious enforcemnt and dedicated people full time |
| 29 | Allow second kitchens without the ability to rent. Move parking restrictions to a per house basis limit rather than specifically target ADUs | I am supportive of making ADUs easily accessible. The parking restrictions are arbitrary | Focus on affordability on housing for low-income communities | not parking (or apply it equally to all houses). Make housing safer. Make all ADUs generally legal, but meeting safety code. |