

Input session summaries: (apologies for name misspellings from sign-in sheets)

Thur., Jan. 21 from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., Espresso Royale - 2603 Plymouth Road Ann Arbor

Attendees:

- Sonja Karnovsky
- Prashanth Gururaja
- Jane Lumm
- Diane Giannola
- Kathy Griswold
- Jack Eaton
- Dave Diephuis
- Richard Norton
- Sam Olson
- Last commenter on way out – didn't want to provide his name.

Staff

- Teresa Gillotti, County OCED
- Chris Cheng, Ann Arbor Planning Department

Summary of discussions:

There seemed to be agreement around requiring owner-occupancy, but questions about how well that could be enforced. The idea of a deed restriction seemed appealing, although it was noted that enforcement would still be necessary. Concerns were also raised about the potential for an ADU used for Air BnB. Staff offered the idea of a minimum lease of 30 days to address this as has been applied in other jurisdictions, and that seemed to be preferred. Some owners in the R4C were interested in it being available in that district as well. There was also concern about current violations and code enforcement. In the 4th ward, it was noted that there are extra cars parked already on properties, and in the street. For detached units, some discussed allowing them to be converted only in the primary building envelope. However, some were ok with detached ADUs where the wall facing the neighbor had no windows, to limit light and sound traveling onto adjacent properties.

Written Comments:

Prashanth Gururaja

- ADU developments should be allowed also for “non-conforming” lots in the R4C and other non-R1 districts.
- For R1, ADUs of any kind (attached or detached) should be allowed.
- In general, there seem to be too many restrictions on property owners to make modest, incremental additional to their property/homes
- ADUS can be good to increase housing supply in A2, possibly leading to more affordable housing.

- Should consider removing owner-occupancy requirement for R1
- Not requiring parking spot near bus stop is good. Can consider increasing radius to ½ mile or greater.

Diane Giannola - Love the concept of ADUs in general. I would like to have an extension of this idea for R4C. I would like to see Garages considered for ADU in R4C areas. That's garages only! If Old garages were allowed to be used as an ADU using its identical footprint, it would be a way to clean up some of the student areas that have garages.

Richard Norton - We are very much in favor of allowing detached ADUs in neighborhoods that already allow multiple units. Our old garage was collapsing so we are currently building a new garage with a 2nd floor office. The space is sufficient to eventually convert to a small efficiency apartment. Both my wife's and my parents are still living and we fully expect that we will eventually need to care for at least one of them. Having the ability to house them in a true "granny flat" would be tremendously helpful to us (we don't have sufficient room in the house itself). Using the garage this way would be entirely consistent with our neighborhood which already has multiple duplex homes.

Mon., Jan. 25 from 10 a.m. to Noon., Espresso Royale - 2264 S. Main Street, Ann Arbor

Attendees:

- Ann R (Superior Township)
- Casey Pennisi
- Jesse Pennisi
- Sharon Ongaro
- Chuck Warpehoski

Staff

- Teresa Gillotti, County OCED
- Nathan Voght, County OCED

Summary of discussions:

Most were just interested in how ADUs might be allowed. There was favorable talk about the how ADUs can promote sustainability by further utilizing existing structures, and/or allowing for small additions or conversion of garages or carriage houses for housing. It was also brought up how this has worked well in other communities and seems like a good fit for Ann Arbor.

Written Comments:

Sharon Ongaro: Ann Arbor is extremely lacking in affordable housing options. I'm particularly interested in having housing options especially for Ann Arbor workers who can't afford to live here. Also, I'm very interested in having the city allow for housing in unattached buildings. I'd be happy to share my thoughts as needed.

Tues., Jan. 26. from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m., Juicy Kitchen - 1506 N. Maple, Ann Arbor

Attendees:

- Stephen & Deborah Burling
- Tony & Nancy Stokes Veit (see e-mail below)
- Karen Hart

Staff

- Teresa Gillotti, County OCED
- Nathan Voght, County OCED

Summary of discussions:

Two groups of homeowners had questions about what was being proposed. Both had interest in detached ADUs, in one case, including the conversion of a Carriage House in the Historic District. In the case of the Carriage House, it's location at the rear of a deep lot, made the idea of separate sewer line make seem infeasible. Both parties were also interested in the potential for the areas in consideration to expand to R4C for single-family structures there.

Related e-mail comments: **Nancy Stokes Veit**

Teresa, thanks for meeting with Tony and I at the ADU drop in session on January 26, 2016. As we read the literature about the proposed revisions to the accessory dwelling ordinance, I had posed several questions which you asked us to recap and send to you for your records.

1. Is it possible to permit ADUs for properties zoned R4C?

We live at 535 South Ashley St. I have owned the property since 1979. The old carriage barn in our backyard was falling down. The Old West Side Historical Commission permitted the demolition of our old carriage barn in 2002 and the city of Ann Arbor approved plans to construct a new accessory building in 2002. Currently that rebuilt carriage barn is framed and finished on the outside. The inside walls remain unfinished. There is no insulation, wiring, plumbing, heat or drywall. It has tubing for a radiant floor, all new triple pane windows, and 2x6 stud wall framing to accommodate a large insulation cavity. Once completed this building was meant to be energy efficient. The new carriage barn was originally designed to be my art studio. Now with the ADU discussions revived, we would like to consider its possible use by us, or some other artist, as a residence and studio.

2. Is it possible to improve the accessory building over time and not change the 100% Homestead Exemption until we actually rent the accessory building or our house?

We would prefer to pay for the improvements over time and not mortgage our house to fund the improvements. Under the current zoning we could complete the radiant floor, wire the building, apply insulation and drywall. This would be a significant investment and would make

more sense if we knew that one day it could be inhabitable.

3. Expand the 600-800 sqft limit?

Our existing carriage barn has a 693 sqft footprint on the ground floor. We are not sure how the current storage area on its 2nd floor will be treated. Would it be possible to expand the proposed ADU area limits, or at least allow exemptions for existing structures?

4. And of course this all hinges on whether the ordinance would allow ADUs in existing buildings such as garages or carriage houses.

Thanks again for the time you and Nathan Voght spent discussing and exploring these issues. Please keep us posted as the ADU process evolves.

Old West Side Board Meeting - Wed., Feb. 3 starting at 7 p.m.

Attendees:

- Christine Brummer
- Eric Boyd
- Allison Stupka
- Barb Hall
- **Missing one!**
- Eppie Potts (guest)
- Ray Detter (guest)

Staff

- Teresa Gillotti, County OCED
- Chris Cheng, Ann Arbor Planning Dept.

Summary of discussions:

The board and guests were generally supportive of ADUs with a few key caveats:

- The biggest concern was how the Historic district would interact with Accessory Dwelling units, in particular additions and changes to existing accessory structures.
- Some were not for detached units, while others felt there were fine if they met accessory structure setbacks
- Opinions varied on parking with several individuals interested in no parking requirement while others felt requiring off-street parking would be essential.
- There was a question about how ADUs impact housing values. Staff will make info available at neighborhood meeting.
- All agreed that owner-occupancy is essential and were interested in adding in the deed restriction requirement.

- They requested that there be a neighborhood meeting with a special emphasis on Historic Districts and including the City's preservation planner. That meeting is scheduled for Mon. March 7 at Bach Elementary from 6:30-8 p.m.

Thurs., Feb. 11 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., Morgan & York - 1928 Packard St, Ann Arbor

Attendees: (does not include a few who stopped in and didn't sign in)

- Gwen Nystuen
- John D. Nystuen
- Ethel Potts
- Gary Supanich
- Peter Naganvney
- Deb Odoms
- David Diephuis
- Julie Herrada
- Gretchen Suchre
- Zack Ackerman
- Lorna Hurl
- Lev Linkner
- Jean Carlberg
- Arthur Nusbaum
- Ellen Ramsburgh
- Jeff McCullugh
- Sue Maguire

Staff

- Teresa Gillotti, County OCED
- Nathan Voght, County OCED
- Chris Cheng, Ann Arbor Planning

Summary of discussions: This session had the most attendees and a series of conversations. Several residents of Burns Park were very concerned that ADUs had been discussed previously in 2003 and were shot down, and were concerned that it was coming back. In particular, they were concerned that if the goal is more affordable housing, then why isn't City Council doing more to bring more affordable housing to Ann Arbor, rather than have ADUs bring affordable housing on the backs of existing residents. Others felt that the concerns were not as severe as described on the neighborhood list-serve. Another couple was surprised that anyone was against ADUs.

- Who's problem is affordable housing? The successful downtown businesses that need lower-wage staff who can't afford to live close to work? Other employers, the city? Who should be responsible for making more affordable housing (no dispute that it's needed)
- If ADUs are permitted, can rental inspection and code enforcement keep up? Several individuals felt it was currently inadequate. Any increase should require a similar investment in additional inspectors.
- If ADUs are permitted, there is concern that individuals will not understand related costs, including construction, maintenance and change in assessment and taxes, insurance, etc.
- There was a concern about strangers living in tightly-knit neighborhoods
- There was interest in providing means for aging-in-place for seniors, and for those with family members with disabilities, as well as those with lower incomes who might be able to keep their house by supplementing it with rental income.

Written Comments:

Gwen Nystuen - R2A is already very dense. Need detailed information on what currently exists. Please provide census block data mapped out so we can see the existing density. Provide copy of our ordinance with proposed occupancy.

Lorna Hurl

- 1- Our area already suffers from too many cars and too little parking. This would only increase the problem.
- 2- Adding a ADU , especially detached, reduces yard size. This discourages young families (no play space). Already we have lost single family homes to rental and therefore lost the potential for young families. This would make this worse. We would potentially lose our current profile.
- 3- In our area, any rentals would be created with students in mind. We already have many rentals, frats and sororities.
- 4- Already there is poor enforcement of existing noise, occupancy, and cleanliness by laws. This increase the potential for more problems in our area.

Jeff McCullugh – Don't want increased traffic/parking at curb. Rental units are not as well maintained. Property values will drop with houses split into separate units – not good! Neighborhoods will become student ghettos - believe it! Lack of enforcement is the rule now. It will be far worse with the encouragement of ADUs.

Community Meeting

Thurs., Feb. 25 from 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. - Ann Arbor Downtown library

Attendees: (does not include a few who stopped in and didn't sign in)

1. Ryan Hudson
2. Lynn Borset
3. Matan Singer
4. Julie Tschirhart
5. Cassie Hackel
6. stacey Lee
7. Kate Lazuka
8. Lisa Jevens
9. Jerry Schulke
10. Kathy Boris
11. Trish Koman
12. Marc Zimmerman
13. Paul Girard
14. Monique Mzaelar
15. Valerie Benta
16. Hala Shehadeh
17. Joyce Deren
18. Jarod Malesrein
19. Laura Livingston
20. Ben Grabil
21. Joel Batterman
22. Prudence Heikkinen
23. Jordan adema
24. LaShawn Courtwright
25. Mary Browning
26. Julie Gagne
27. Joe Vas
28. Edward Naines
29. Barbara Sturgis-Everett
30. frank Commiskey
31. Norm Cox
32. Karen Hart
33. Gwen Nystuen
34. John D. Nystuen
35. Gary Svanich
36. Peter Nagourney
37. Zack Ackerman
38. Ellen Ramsburgh
39. Jack Eaton
40. Dave Diephuis

Staff

- Teresa Gillotti, County OCED
- Nathan Voght, County OCED
- Brett Lenart, County OCED
- Chris Cheng, Ann Arbor Planning
- Jill Thatcher, Ann Arbor Planning
- Ben Carlisle, Ann Arbor Planning

Summary of discussions:

There was a wide range of sentiment from strong support to strong opposition. Highlights of some of the concerns/questions follow:

- Several residents were interested in allowing newly constructed accessory buildings to include an ADU (subject to existing requirements). There was also interest in additions to accessory structures.

- Related, there was concern about costs for a separate sewer line. These costs tend to vary in communities with some requiring, some waiving, and others not requiring a separate sewer line.
- Enforcement was brought up several times, including means to enforce owner-occupancy through rental inspections, homestead status and through complaints.
- Several were interested in the minimum 30 day lease – there was a question of enforcement. Staff suggested checks of the Air BnB website after complaint would be a likely means of checking.
- Several residents are concerned about increased costs to the city for implementing an ADU program, and if there are enough rental inspectors.
- Parking came up and was a concern for some, while others expressed the desire to not have a parking requirement for ADUs.
- Several residents in R2A feel that ADUs should not be included in the district as duplexes or a second unit is already allowed.
- Another concern in the R2A is the proximity to existing student rentals, including noise, traffic and overall density, in particular when fraternities, sororities, or coops are present.
- Several attendees commented that not all renters are students, and that for financial sustainability, families could use the option of having a separate unit for family, friends and/or rental income. Another suggested that having an ADU would help in cases of supporting those with sudden life changes such as divorce.
- The influx of renters in general was a concern for some, while others felt that owner-occupants creating the units will have a greater investment in tenant selection than a standard rental property, and this should minimize impact.
- There was concern by some that ADUs would be exploited by developers looking to make money off a new housing product. Others felt that while this could happen, many would definitely benefit households by allowing owner-occupants more options and means to support their income and assist family members.
- The idea of a cap on the number of annual ADUs was suggested by several, as well as means to distribute them throughout the city and not just in a handful of neighborhoods.
- Several noted that if the city was serious about Affordable Housing then affordable units should have been required for the library lot proposal, for example.

Written Comments:

Jarod Malestein - What about new construction of detached ADUs? For example, building a new detached garage with an apartment or even a standalone “pool house”? It’s nice that the ordinance will allow conversion of existing structures but it would do much to address housing affordability & availability if ADUs could be allowed in new construction too.