

Daniel Symer

To: Duffie Westheimer
Subject: RE: Summary of our discussion regarding ADU

On Thu, Aug 8, 2019 at 11:23 AM Daniel Symer <Daniel.Symer@flagstaffaz.gov> wrote:

Duffie,

Please review the summary of our discussion and your concerns. I did not include questions items of clarification. Please let me know is this accurate, or please incorporate/modify it.

Meeting on August 6, 2019

Summary of comments from a one-on-one meeting with Duffie Westheimer:

- Access to an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) should not be from an alley. The alleys are too narrow **for vehicles (especially large trucks) to back up (neighbor's fence has been hit 3 times with no one taking responsibility)** and have bad visibility **where they meet the street due to being narrow and historic development on the alley**. Also, alley oriented ADU development typically cause a lack of presence of the inhabitants and minimizes their interaction with rest of the neighborhood residents that have homes that are oriented to the street. This style of ADU development tends to break down the neighborhood relationships. ADUs should be allowed to face a street **(should face and have access off the street)**.
- If the ADU is accessed from an alley, how is garbage handle if the pick-up is from the street.
- The widths of alleys are too narrow to have alley accessed parking.
- The ADU's have caused the value of housing and property in some neighborhoods to escalate to levels that are too high (not "affordable") since the ADUs are considered money generating investments. **Also the values are pushed up because even small houses must have all the services of a larger house--rooms just won't be as large and open.**
- The height of ADUs should reflect the context the neighborhood and the heights of the structures on abutting properties. A two story ADU adjacent to, and among, existing one and one and one-half story existing primary structures is too tall. Since these structures are taller, the lights from these structures impose on adjacent properties. Also, the taller structures allow for views into abutting properties – minimizing the abutting property owner's ability to the right of privacy and quiet enjoyment of their property. The fences that are allowed on the property lines are not tall enough to adequate to minimize the impacts of taller ADUs on adjacent property. **I'd like to add that this seems like a question of Uniformity--keeping every property on a level playing field. It is more likely, as my experience has shown, that the people who build ADUs do it for income and where we had one owner-occupied home we then get two rentals as they don't want to live in their house anymore. Taller ADUs and especially when close to the property line could block a neighbor's light and limit their ability to have a successful garden.**
- The lot coverage of an ADU should be included in maximum allowed lot coverage of a property.
- The allowance of ADUs above an existing garage that encroaches into the setbacks impedes on neighborhood privacy.
- Enforcement of the number of persons and animals living in an ADU and whether to property owner lives on the property is a concern. More active enforcement should be utilized to ensure compliance. In addition, there are concerns about the allowance for animals (foul, etc.) associated with an ADU. **What happens here is that the additional dwelling makes it difficult for adjacent residents to do legal things they**

would like, such as having chickens (ADU is too close to the property line and so, leaves little locations for neighbors to use.

- Alleys should not be utilized for parking. The parking spaces off an alley should be completely on a property.
- The 600 square foot allowance of an ADU on lots less than an acre is to large.
- The 6000 square foot lot area requirement to have an ADU should be enforced in a manner that when a lot is subdivided, the lot with an ADU is required maintain 6000 square feet, and the other lots need to comply with the zones requirements.
- Consider incorporating windows, with respect to privacy, and lighting into the findings for the Approval of and ADU.
- Excessive noise and suitable proportions need to be defined.
- The addition of an ADU should enhance the scale of either "New town" with the modern scale, and "Old town," with the historic scale. The two are best not mixed.

Dan Symer, AICP
Zoning Code Manager
City of Flagstaff
Planning & Development Services
928-213-2613
daniel.symer@flagstaffaz.gov

From: Duffie Westheimer <duffie@westheimers.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 3:16 PM
To: Daniel Symer <Daniel.Symer@flagstaffaz.gov>
Subject: Re: Summary of our discussion regarding ADU

Hi Dan,
Thanks for the opportunity to edit so that my experience and perspective is clear as you move forward with ADU code. You did a really good job noting my concerns and observations. I have inserted my comments into your text in this blue color.

The only thing I'll add is that enforcement is a big issue. It should not be up to complaints. We want to get along with our neighbors, not turn them in to the City. So what happens is that people let things slide until they can't take the impacts anymore and then there are problems between neighbors because being turned in makes people angry. Better to write the code to minimize or eliminate situations where people would not follow the rules everyone is to follow.

Please let me know if there is any additional assistance I can provide.

Thanks,
Duffie