



AIA
Santa Barbara

AIA Santa Barbara Advocacy Committee
FEBRUARY 23, 2018

This is a summary of ADUs activities for the week –a truncated version of previous, longer reports:

- - - -

City of SB ADU ordinance update

On Tuesday 2/20 and Wednesday 2/21 staff introduced their proposed design review criteria –a checklist of architectural standards to be verified by staff administratively without a hearing- to SFDB and HLC in anticipation of the Draft presentation to the City Ordinance Committee next Tuesday. The minutes covering the 6-hour Planning Commission hearing and the extensive public testimony were not available; both review bodies seemed unaware of the complex issues involved.

This Committee is composed of three members of Council (Sneddon [chair], Murillo and Rowse) that will review the Draft before it goes to the full Council for adoption. The PC minutes will not become public until AFTER the Ordinance Committee meeting.

The shotgun approach used by staff to ramrod this very important ordinance without public workshops and without the opportunity for the public and decision makers to review comments by other decision makers is absolutely unacceptable. The rationale given that this is needed to avoid an avalanche of ADUs without any local control flies in the face of a majority of ADU applications that remain stuck in permitting limbo.

The main issues in the staff report are:

1 Owner occupancy:

- a Staff reminds Council that they voted on favor of retaining the covenant in October.
- b Staff states that owner-occupancy “provides additional assurance that the ADU will be located and designed in a manner that is sensitive to existing development and the neighborhood.” (It does not say “maintained” or “upkeep” after construction.)
- c Staff mentions that the planning commission was divided and options discussed, such as “requiring owner-occupancy only in the single-unit zone districts... and a sunset clause... after a certain period of time”.
- d Staff recommends retaining the covenant, with a minor modification to the hardship waiver.

2 High Fire areas:

- a Staff mentions that “a majority of the Commissioners were in favor of revising the draft ordinance ... with additional safety-related provisions...such as parking...”
- b The report should have listed the 5-1 vote tally to show “a super majority of Commissioners” and a lone dissenter.
- c Staff recommends keeping the original draft language intact.

3 Open Yard requirement:

- a PC recommended that ADUs be allowed to encroach into the required open yard and “also asked staff to look into options for allowing flexibility”.
- b Staff recommends allowing ADUs to encroach a maximum of 20% into the conforming or non-conforming open yard area, or 150 sf, whichever is greater.
- c $20\% \text{ of } 1,250 = 250 \text{ sf.}$ For lots under 5,000 sf, $20\% \text{ of } 800 = 160 \text{ sf.}$

- d This would allow to build a stairway to reach an ADU above an existing garage (Everett's example at PC) or convert a garage with a minor addition (Attachment #4).
- e Other options considered were: reducing the minimum dimensions from 20' to 10' or 15'; and applying the multi-family open yard requirement.
- f Staff offers a very weak and vague rationale for not pursuing the options listed above.

4 FARs and Total maximum Accessory Buildings:

- a Staff recommends retaining FARs, consistent with PC direction but not with the direction of State pending ADU legislation (SB 831).
- b Accessory Buildings: Staff proposes to increase the maximums allowed in the NZO for lots 5,000 sf and larger.
- c Staff make this requirement easier to grasp with a chart that includes the maximum ADU sizes envisioned.
- d This revision assumes the existence of a 400 sf garage in small lots (under 5,000 sf); a 500 sf garage in medium-size lots (5,000-20,000 sf); and a 750 sf garage/workshop in 20,000+ sf lots.