

Daniel Symer

From: Duffie Westheimer <dwestheimer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 8:50 AM
To: Jim McCarthy
Cc: Daniel Symer
Subject: proposed ADU revision

Good morning Jim,

I understand the idea to not require owner-occupancy in one of the units on a property with an ADU is an idea you have put forth.

I have witnessed the influx of ADUs into my neighborhood over the 33 years we've lived in our house. With two exceptions (which I'll get to) every time an ADU is developed on a neighborhood property the owner leaves and we end up with both being rentals. Nowadays, they are short-term rentals which should not be encouraged as they are terrible for neighborhoods.

With owners present there is a better chance they will require tenants to be more considerate of neighbors. And the people affected are not just next door. Party lights from a short-term rental deck on Santa Fe shine in our house all night long, more than a block away. This means we have to have curtains or shades closed at night even in the summer when it is hot which cuts down on air circulation.

With owners present there is someone to be accountable to neighbors--someone neighbors can talk with about any issues.

ADUs with alley access add traffic where it is most dangerous. In my neighborhood, the alleys are only 16' wide, and often there is a garage built ON the property line where the alley and street meet. Then because there is not sufficient parking on properties there are always vehicles parked next to the alleys. This results in horrible visibility and dangerous exits from the alleys.

In Townsite the alleys are required to remain unpaved to preserve the rural feel. Many people walk in the alleys. More traffic is not safe.

Neighborhoods are not commercial zones and short-term rentals are, honestly, a commercial endeavor.

There are two exceptions to the owner moving away. In one they did move away leaving us with two money-makers for them. Eventually because their historic house was about to fall down they embraced the rehab and made it a house where they wanted to live. Recently the ADU in back is reserved for their guests--no more tenants. My takeaway is that people really don't want to live with someone in their yard, and especially when the building is two stories.

The other example of the owner still on the property is probably because he is an extreme introvert and seems happy to live in his "shop." But, meanwhile he is probably raking in the bucks with his two (legal) short-term rentals.

This opportunity is mostly available to people with the resources to build more. That turns more of our neighborhoods into investments. Then when the properties are built out to the max that means

more impermeable land, more heat. Also, when properties are built out to the allowed entitlements the value is increased, making them too expensive for most Flagstaff residents.

The people with the money to build ADUs won't put them where they live. They will buy in my modest (yet expensive) neighborhood. This is partly because there is a myth that people who live downtown won't drive. That is untrue--most of my neighbors are in and out of their vehicles all day long. This is legal for them to do, and I will defend their right to do so.

Lastly, once an entitlement is provided to property owners, good luck taking it away even if it proves to create other or bigger problems. Prop 207...they only need to claim a financial loss not prove it.

Please require property owners with ADUs to live on site full-time--that it be their primary residence.

I am happy to discuss further if you'd like. (I cc'd Dan Symer.)

Hope you're staying well,
Duffie