



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 22, 2013

TO: Standards for Single Family Residences in Multifamily Zoning Districts Subcommittee

FROM: Lilly Schinsing, Administrative Analyst

SUBJECT: Follow-up from March 25, 2013 Subcommittee Meeting

At the March 25, 2013 Planning Commission Subcommittee of the Standards for Single Family Residences in Multifamily Zoning Districts meeting the Subcommittee directed staff to provide additional information regarding specific parcels in various City neighborhoods. The subcommittee also directed staff to revise the draft ordinance to resolve inconsistencies and provide feedback on a number of issues. This memo outlines each subcommittee question/direction followed by a staff response. Staff has updated the list of regulation changes (see **Attachment 3**) and drafted an Ordinance for the subcommittee’s review (see **Attachment 4**). Please note that the Ordinance provides the development standards in a table format with a break of 250 square feet between parcel sizes. Within each category the sliding scale was adjusted to provide a smooth transition between categories.

1- Subcommittee Question: *How many single family residences are there on R-2-2.5 and R-3 parcels in Old Town/New Town vs. other neighborhoods organized by parcel size (over/under 3,000 square feet):*

Staff Response: **Table 1** below summarizes the number of single-family residence only parcels by City neighborhood and Zoning District (R-2-2.5 and R-3).

Table 1: Single-Family Residence Only Parcels by Neighborhood and Parcel Size

Number of “Single Family Residence only” Parcels	Old Town/ Hurricane Gulch		New Town		The Hill		Spring Street Valley		Nevada Street Valley		Total	
	<3,000	3,000+	<3,000	3,000+	<3,000	3,000+	<3,000	3,000+	<3,000	3,000+	<3,000	3,000+
R-2-2.5	67 (16%*)	149 (36%)	17 (10%)	56 (31%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (5%)	52 (34%)	0 (0%)	16 (7%)	92 (10%)	273 (28%)
	216 single family of 412 total (52% single family only)		73 single family of 178 total (41% single family only)		0 (0% single family only)		60 single family of 155 total (39% single family only)		16 single family of 215 total (7% single family only)		365 single family of 960 total (38% single family only)	
R-3	25 (21%)	54 (46%)	14 (10%)	37 (26%)	8 (3%)	36 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	47 (9%)	127 (25%)
	79 single family of 117 total (68% single family only)		51 single family of 142 total (36% single family only)		44 single family of 244 total (18%)		0 single family of 1 total (0% single family only)		0 single family of 119 total (0% single family only)		174 single family of 503 total (35% single family only)	

* All percentages are of the total parcels in that particular Zoning District in that particular neighborhood

See **Attachment 1** for a neighborhood map with these statistics.

2- Subcommittee Direction: Provide a table outlining the draft parking requirements in comparison to the ADU parking requirements.

Staff Response: See **Table 2** below:

Table 2: Summary of Current and Proposed Parking Standard

No. of Units	Size of Unit	Current Parking Standard		New Parking Standard (for parcels which provide which propose the maximum number of units allowed for parcels in the R-2, R-3, or PR residential zoning districts)	
		Number of Spaces	Location	Number of Spaces	Location
ADU	<700 s.f.	1	On site or off site with CUP or deed restriction	--	--
	700-1000 s.f.	2	On site or off site with CUP or deed restriction	--	--
1	All	2	On site	2	On site
2	750 s.f. of less	4	On site	3 spaces (2 for first unit and 1 space per additional unit)	On site or off site if street parking is available nearby
	>750-1,200 s.f.	4	On site	3 spaces (2 for first unit and 1 space per additional unit). Parking must be on-site.	On site
	>1,200 s.f.	4	On site	4 spaces (2 per unit).	On site
3+	All	2 per unit for 2 bedroom+ 1.5 for 1 bedroom and less	On site	1.5 spaces per unit regardless of bedrooms	On site

Staff discussion: The draft regulations specify that parcels that can only support two units would require units between 750-1,200 square feet to provide 2 spaces for the first unit and 1 space for the additional unit (see item 4). The ADU regulations require ADUs over 700 square feet (to a maximum of 1,000 square feet) to provide 2 parking spaces. Therefore the draft regulations are more relaxed for primary units than the ADU regulations for ADUs.

Staff recommendation:

1- Staff recommends that the draft regulations allow for parking relaxation similar to the ADU regulations (for parcels with two units only: units 700 square feet or less provide 1 space and it can be provided off site contingent on a CUP and a parking study; units 700 square feet or greater must provide 2 spaces per unit and they can be provided off site contingent on a CUP and a parking study). See the changes in **Table 3** below, in track changes. The subcommittee should discuss the change and provide direction to staff.

2-Additionally, staff would recommend the subcommittee discuss what is meant by the size restrictions—with regard to parking reductions, is the first unit subject to the size restriction or any subsequent unit? (i.e., what happens when the first unit is 700 square feet and the additional unit is 600 square feet—is the parking requirement still 3 spaces?)

Table 3: Summary of Current and Proposed Parking Standard (with revisions)

No. of Units	Size of Unit	Current Parking Standard		New Parking Standard (for parcels which provide which propose the maximum number of units allowed for parcels in the R-2, R-3, or PR residential zoning districts)	
		Number of Spaces	Location	Number of Spaces	Location
ADU	<700 s.f.	1	On site or off site with CUP (parking study required) or deed restriction	--	--
	700-1000 s.f.	2	On site or off site with CUP (parking study required) or deed restriction	--	--
1	All	2	On site	2	On site
2	700 50 s.f. of less	4	On site	3 spaces (2 for first unit and 1 space per additional unit)	On site or off site if street parking is available nearby (<u>include language from ADU ordinance regarding a CUP and a parking study</u>)
	> 700 50-1,200 s.f.	4	On site	3 spaces (2 for first unit and <u>2+</u> spaces per additional unit). Parking must be on-site.	On site or off site if street parking is available nearby (<u>include language from ADU ordinance regarding a CUP and a parking study</u>)
	>1,200 s.f.	4	On site	4 spaces (2 per unit).	On site
3+	All	2 per unit for 2 bedroom+ 1.5 for 1 bedroom and less	On site	1.5 spaces per unit	On site

- 3- **Subcommittee Question: Should a substantial voluntary remodel of a residence made non-conforming by the draft regulations be subject to a different threshold (i.e., greater than 50% demolition) than other residences made non-conforming due to other regulations?**

Staff Response: The Council interpreted that the 50% calculation was based on exterior walls only—not interior walls. **Therefore, staff recommends that the 50% threshold not be modified at this point in time.**

- 4- **Subcommittee Direction: Draft language which indicates that an ADU counts towards satisfying the “maximum density” regulation.**

Staff Response: Staff made the changes to the draft regulations as directed by the subcommittee. See **Attachment 3** and **Attachment 4**. The subcommittee should verify the intent that this change affects the changes to the development standards section as well. For example, a parcel which is zoned R-3 and 3,400 square feet can only have two units. A single family home plus and ADU would count as satisfying the “maximum density” requirements and therefore, *the changes to the development standards would not affect this parcel* (i.e., the single family home would not be subject to the new size restrictions).

- 5- **Subcommittee Direction: Remove the reference to “Accessory Dwelling Unit-1 bedroom” as a preferred unit type.**

Staff Response: Staff made the changes to the draft regulations by using the terms “Small Dwelling Unit-1 bedroom” and “Small Dwelling Unit-2 bedroom”. See **Attachment 3** and **Attachment 4**.

- 6- **Subcommittee Direction: With regard to changes to the development standards, prepare tables which compare the committee’s “sliding scale” approach to the “straight percentage” approach.**

Staff Response: See **Attachment 2** for comparison tables. Staff compared the “sliding scale” approach to three “straight percentage” approaches—limiting the floor area to 80%, 75% and 70% of the allowable floor area. Staff found that the 70% approach came the closest to approximating the limitations crafted by the committee in the sliding scale approach; the straight percentage method did not track closely enough with the carefully crafted standards which were tailored for different parcel sizes in different districts. Staff recommends that the committee continue with the sliding scale approach.

- 7- **New Issue: Should the new development standards regulations apply to only those parcels that provide only one unit or all parcels that are not developed to the maximum density allowed?**

Staff Comment: The current draft regulations (see **Attachment 3** and **Attachment 4**) are drafted such that parcels that are not developed to the maximum density allowed are limited by the regulations. For example, a 10,000 parcel in the R-2-2.5 Zoning District has a maximum density of 4 units allowed. The first unit would be limited in size pursuant to the new regulations. If two additional units were added, the first unit would not be allowed to expand beyond the single family standard because only three units are on the parcel, not the maximum of four. Staff would like to confirm the subcommittee’s intent on this issue.