

THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

Agenda Related Items - Meeting of May 30, 2017
Supplemental Packet Date: May 25, 2017

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed, typically a minimum of two—one available on the Thursday preceding the City Council meeting and the second on Tuesday at the meeting. The Thursday Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk Department, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2) Both the Thursday and Tuesday Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or other services in conjunction with this meeting, please contact the City Clerk Department at (805) 449-2151. Assisted listening devices are available at this meeting. Ask City Clerk staff if you desire to use this device. Upon request, the agenda and documents in this agenda packet, can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist City staff in assuring reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.



Community Development Department
MEMORANDUM

2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard • Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
Planning Division • Phone 805/449.2323 • Fax 805/449.2350 • www.toaks.org
Building Division • Phone 805/449.2500 • Fax 805/449.2575 • www.toaks.org

To: Andrew P. Powers, City Manager
From: Mark A. Towne, Community Development Director *mt*
Date: May 30, 2017
Subject: Supplemental Information – MCA 2016-70540

The attached material was received concerning the above case.

2017 MAY 25 AM 10:18
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-25-2017
AGENDA ITEM NO. 8.B.
MEETING DATE 5-30-2017

toaks.org

Lilia Vaudreuil - E-mail from Andrew Kastner

From: Marjan Behzadi
To: Vaudreuil, Lilia
Date: 5/24/2017 12:07 PM
Subject: E-mail from Andrew Kastner
Cc: Towne, Mark

From: "Andrew Kastner" <wonderboy2005@mac.com>
Date: March 30, 2017 at 12:02:57 AM PDT
To: "" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>
Cc: "Al Adam" <AAdam@toaks.org>, "Joel Price" <JPrice@toaks.org>, "Rob McCoy" <RMcCoy@toaks.org>, "" <cnclmanfox@aol.com>
Subject: ADU proposal

Dear Thousand Oaks Mayor and City Council members. Soon The Planning Committee will present you with their proposal for the City of Thousand Oaks Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance. As you probably know Senate Bill SB1069 passed in 2016 and nullified all local cities ordinances on Jan 1, 2017. Now each city in the state of California has the right to modify their own policy (or not). I am a long time resident of Thousand Oaks. I went to the Planning Committees meeting on March 13th and in my opinion the committee members were not given all the facts so I wanted to make sure that the City Council was given some more background and information. I also feel that the proposed ordinance falls short of where it should be. I think it is important for you to look over the attached document(s) that was prepared by the California Department of Housing and Community Development who had a hand in writing SB1069.

The Thousand Oaks city planners who wrote the proposed attempted to convince the planning committee members that the maximum size limit of an detached ADU should be 600 square feet. The State law states that ADU's can be 2 bedrooms and that they are supposed to be suitable for small families and individuals. At the Planning meeting I spoke and pointed out that Small families cannot comfortably live in a 600 Square foot ADU. Their ordinance used the rationale that the average size of 1-bedroom apartments in Thousand Oaks is 784 square feet. From this they somehow came up with the proposal that based on that size an ADU should be 600 Square feet. What they failed to mention was that the State law allows for 2 bedrooms ADU's. In Thousand Oaks the average 2-bedroom apartment is 1058 square feet. Why is this average size not being used for ADU size baffles me?

My Fiancé, who also spoke at the meeting, pointed out to the committee that ADU's are perfect for new families, college students who graduate and are starting out their new lives back home or for our parents or grand parents. Do we want to create tiny ADU's for these family members? If your parents needed to move back in with you I would hope, like me, you would want to give them a decent size home? 600 square feet is pretty small. considering the averages mentioned above. The State says a detached ADU should be up to 1200 square feet, which is the size of a small 2-bedroom cottage. I urge you to consider using the States size as they put a lot of thought into it when they wrote and passed SB1069.

I believe the city's biggest fear is that if they let everyone build an ADU in their backyard then the city will be too dense, (too many cars and too many people). Please keep in mind that most of ADU's will be hidden from view and will mostly be used for housing family members. I truly believe that not most homeowners will not want to put a stranger in their backyard. With building costs averaging \$200 a square foot, a 1200 square foot ADU will cost approximately \$240,000. I don't think these will be popping up all over town. The largest percentage of the ADU's that will be built or converted will be for

family members and if not for the ADU these family members might end up living in the main residence anyway which does not change the density.

At the March 13th meeting, Committee members after much discussion agreed that 600 square feet was too small and raised the detached size limit to 700 square feet but I believe they did so without considering what I have mentioned in this letter.

This proposed ordinance is a one size fits all approach. I would like to recommend to the council to consider what other California cities are doing such as Santa Cruz, which is to use lot size to determine the ADU size. It really doesn't make sense for a 25,000 square foot lot to be limited to have the same size ADU as a 5000 square foot lot. Please consider some type of lot size formula. For example: 0-5000 square foot lots can have up to a 600 sq. ft. ADU, 5000 - 10,000 sq. ft. lots can have up to an 800 sq. foot ADU's, 10,000 to 15,000 sq. ft. lots can have up to 1000 sq. foot ADU's and anything larger then 15,000 sf can have up to 1,200 sq. ft. ADU's. This is what many other cities are doing.

Another major point to consider is that there is a big difference between new construction and existing buildings, when it comes to ADU's. If the city puts a max size limit on a detached ADU at for example, 700 or 800 sq. feet and a resident has an existing accessory building or garage etc. that is 885 sq. feet; it is placing a huge burden on that property owner to change the structure to fit the one-size fits all rule. But if someone is building a brand new ADU they can make it any size they want based on the cities ordinance. When one-committee members posed this question and a similar this scenario the answer they received was, "the person with the existing building would not be given a permit for their ADU conversion even if it was 30 sq. ft. too big and that they would have to chop off part of the building. To me this is excessive and burdensome and can be remedied in a very easy way. Treat new construction differently then existing buildings. For example; A detached ADU that is new construction can be no larger then X based on lot size however an existing building that is being converted to an ADU where there is no new square footage being added can be up to the state maximum of 1200 square feet. A flexible ordinance that considers that existing buildings are an entirely different animal will make some homeowners lives a lot easier.

Please consider the positive affect ADU's can have on the community. It brings in people, which help the local economy. It gives people a more interesting non-cookie cutter place to live, it gives homes to parents that want to move back home with their children and it gives a homeowner a place to live when they want to downsize.

I will be at the City Council meeting, as I will probably have something to more say on the subject. Thanks for taking time out to read this and thanks for keeping an open mind.

Yours truly

Andrew Kastner

Andrew Kastner

songman2000@gmail.com
[818 917-0200](tel:8189170200)

Mark Towne - Accessory Dwelling Unit question re: square footage allowances

From: Christina Ireland <christina@flannerygroup.com>
To: <mtowne@toaks.org>
Date: 4/4/2017 12:47 PM
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Unit question re: square footage allowances

Mr. Towne,

I have been a resident of Newbury Park for ten years and have been following the developments of the Accessory Dwelling Unit law. Thank you very much for your consideration of this important state law and I applaud the intent of tackling the problem of lack of housing in the state and in Thousand Oaks. I read an article in the March 30, 2017 issue of the Thousand Oaks Acorn about one of the reasons why Amgen was moving employees to Tampa, Florida. One of the factors was lack of housing options. The article quoted an Amgen email, "It has been a focus to provide more moderate market-rate housing units that could be more affordable, especially for young employees".

Also, there are many aging citizens of the city who need affordable places to live as well. The cost of elderly care is very expensive and many families like my own would love to have a place to house our aging parents where we can care for them and they are able to be with their family. My father-in-law is in a residential care home in Newbury Park and the cost of the care and separation from him has taken a toll on our family. My parents are also getting up in years and I have always wanted the option of having them live with us if they needed care.

I also have young children and look to the future when they will need housing while they are in transition to becoming self-sufficient adults and start their own families. So all around ADU's are a much needed asset in the City. I also understand the concern of this additional housing changing the character of the City, increasing the amount of people, cars and noise. I appreciate the Planning staff's careful consideration of these issues and the Commission's balancing all these concerns with the housing needs of the people that live here.

With that said, I had a question regarding the Commission's ADU recommendation to City Council:

In watching the discussion by the Commission, I didn't catch the reason the larger square footage was only considered for the detached unit versus an attached unit. In my opinion, the attached should have a larger square footage allowance as well. I don't believe an attached unit is more intensive than a detached unit. A detached unit would have to follow setback requirements from the existing house and therefore would extend more into the lot area than an attached unit, which would not require those setbacks. I think this should be addressed. I would like to see the square footage allowance for the attached option to be the same as the detached option.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Christina Ireland, AIA
FLANNERY GROUP
- Architecture - Engineering -
- Forensic Investigations -
14556 Hamlin Street
Van Nuys, CA 91411
(818) 997-4100 office
(818) 635-4843 mobile
www.flannerygroup.com