



June 16, 2017

Mayor Tornek and Members of City Council
City of Pasadena
100 No. Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Dear Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers:

After reviewing the Staff Report and attending the Planning Commission hearing on the issue of incorporating Accessory Dwelling Units into our community, as required by State law, we offer the following comments for your consideration.

We fully understand and are sympathetic to the need for more housing options in Pasadena and the many challenges of achieving that goal. Three generations of our General Plan have provided for housing development but consciously directed it away from single family residential neighborhoods. Very recently this Council amended the General Plan to set development caps at higher levels in the Central District, along transit corridors and in transit "nodes" to protect neighborhoods while providing for more housing. This state mandate requires Pasadena to attempt to integrate its directives with our General Plan principles and policies.

The Staff Report (Attachment A) identifies where the incorporation of ADU provisions could be considered compliant with General Plan policies, however, in the larger sense, this state requirement runs intuitively counter to Pasadena's very carefully crafted plans to protect and preserve neighborhood character. It is frustrating to have this mandate imposed upon the community and we are concerned about the impacts on our historic neighborhoods and overall community character. Nonetheless, we understand there is little choice in implementing responsive code amendments, but ask that careful study and consideration be given at every opportunity to reduce impacts and maintain our community character.

Specific comments and questions:

We support the recommended architectural compatibility standards to be applied as they do now in historic districts.

The loss of tree canopy is a serious concern, and though the tree protection ordinance offers some assurance, we ask that further study and consideration be given to

06/19/2017

Item 17

potential loss of trees to new construction under the ADU zoning. What measures can be implemented to further protect trees and thus address energy efficiency as well.

Street parking is most certainly a likely by-product of more density and affects quality of life in our neighborhoods. An analysis of current street parking -- availability, current use, street widths, etc. in areas where ADUs will most likely proliferate is important to addressing the potential problems that could be generated.

Park land – Pasadena is “under-parked”, especially in certain parts of the city, and more residents will mean more park usage. Maps should identify current park land in the areas where ADUs are possible or most likely, park fees, etc. The acquisition of new park land should be a key considerations as part of this effort.

Will the additional thousands of units that could result from ADU construction be counted in the calculation of residential development caps? Will the caps still apply?

We appreciate the Council’s careful consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,



Susan N. Mossman
Executive Director



Jesse Lattig
Preservation Director

Jomsky, Mark

From: Chris Peck <chrisp@cmpeck.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 17, 2017 9:17 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Granny Flat Ordinance

Hi Mark,

I am sending a note to City Council in support of lowering the threshold for lot size to 5,000 sf for granny flats.

Starting 18 years ago, my wife and I lived in North Central Pasadena for several years as our first home in Pasadena. This lot contained a legal second residence at the rear of the lot. The existence of that second home allowed the front house to be offered at a more affordable rent. This made it possible for us to live there, and develop roots in this city. I would say that the lot was about 50 x 200 = 10,000 sf. The second dwelling unit was most likely existing non-conforming, as both structures dated back to the 1920s or 1930s.

I am not sure what is driving the high cost of rental housing in Pasadena, but it is clearly out of reach. I have architecture and engineering employees now, and in discussion with Heritage Housing Partners, one of my clients, they agree that the market rate rental housing is generally too expensive for the local work force. I believe that the granny flat concept is one that will allow moderate densification without altering the residential character of the neighborhoods, and will put a decent dent in the affordable housing supply that I feel is needed. It will do all of this organically without need for public funding, tax credits, subsidies and the like.

Chris Peck, AIA, PE

cm peck inc architecture + engineering
25 South El Molino Avenue Pasadena, CA 91101
t: 626-683-0708

06/19/2017
Item 17

Jomsky, Mark

From: Marge Nichols <marge@margenichols.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 17, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Granny flats

I'm strongly in support of reducing size of lots for building granny flats - a great approach to providing more affordable housing, as well as income opportunities for homeowners

Jomsky, Mark

From: Nancy Youngblut <blauhorse@live.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 17, 2017 4:00 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Yes to support Granny Flat lot size reduction

I can't make the city council meeting on Monday but I wanted to express my support for reducing the lot size for a granny flat, thank you.

Nancy Youngblut
945 Brentnal Road
Pasadena, CA 91105

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S7, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

06/19/2017
Item 17

Jomsky, Mark

From: Wesley Reutimann <wesleyreutimann@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2017 7:16 AM
To: Tornek, Terry, Madison, Steve, Jomsky, Mark
Cc: Kristin Chew Reutimann
Subject: Public Comment for 6/19/17 | Item 17 - Accessory Dwelling Units

Good morning Mayor Tornek, Council Member Madison and City Clerk Jomsky,

As we are unsure if we will be able to attend this evening's council meeting, we would like to submit the following comments regarding the City's efforts to update its ADU policy.

Our household supports local efforts to improve the City's diversity of housing options, including Accessory Dwelling Units. Having reviewed and read up on other City policies on ADUs, we specifically support the following parameters for the new policy:

- **establish a minimum lot size requirement of 5,000' or less** (e.g., Santa Cruz allows ADUs on properties of 4,500 square feet, Long Beach 4,800, Santa Monica 4,000 and some cities have no minimum lot size at all including Arcadia, Glendale, Monrovia, LA City and County and Burbank).
- **adopt a maximum height of 25'** to allow ADUs above garages
- **avoid affordability covenants** to facilitate the development of ADUs
- **allow impact fee waivers** in exchange for affordable housing agreements

By providing additional flexibility for and encouragement of ADU development, these recommendations would help increase the City's supply of housing for families, students, and persons on a fixed income. Providing more local housing for local students, families, and people who work in the City should also help support the City's climate action goals, specifically with regard to transportation and land use; the transportation sector remains the state's #1 source of GHG emissions, accounting for an estimated 40% of all emissions, trend increasing.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Wesley and Kristin Reutimann

06/19/2017
Item 17