

Comments for the Planning Commission meeting on the ADU and rental room amendments

Christine Dibble <christinedibble@outlook.com>

Wed 10/11/2023 8:46 PM

To: Christine Dibble <christinedibble@outlook.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **William Earl** <william_j_earl@me.com>

Date: Tue, Oct 3, 2023 at 6:21 PM

Subject: Comments for the Planning Commission meeting on the ADU and rental room amendments

To: Washgrove <washgrove@comcast.net>

Cc: Cole Georgette <georgettewg@gmail.com>

Kathy,

Please include my comments below in the public comments on the ADU agenda item for this month's Planning Commission meeting. I will attend the meeting if possible.

Comments on the ADU zoning amendment proposal from the 21 September 2023 Grove Alert:

I support the ADU proposal, as specified in the draft "Ord 2023-xx DRAFT Sept 6 (ZTA) Modifying - Accessory Dwelling Units.pdf", which was shared by the Planning Commission. I do have some comments and suggestions for improvement. I consider that it is critical to resolve my comment on section 7.2, due to the probably unintended consequences of the current wording.

In the interest of full disclosure, my house does have an apartment over the garage which was used as an ADU by the previous owners, Kathy and Charles Kershaw. Since moving in, we have since removed the stove which was previously installed, meaning it is no longer an ADU within the proposed definition, and my wife, Marion, now uses the space as an art studio and office, and we use a bedroom in it for occasional guests. While the apartment could be converted to an ADU with minimal effort, by installing a stove and exhaust hood, we have no interest in or intention of doing so.

In regard to the definition of "Household", I recommend adding to the end of the last sentence,

... or as a residential facility for people with mental health or substance abuse disorders

While it may be unlikely, I would like us to preclude the siting of "community mental health centers" and the like of any size in our town.

In regard to the changes to "Section 5.32 Definition of Degree of Non-Compliance", change the last part of the last sentence to

... the maximum number of required on-site parking spaces may be no more than four (4), and developments which would require more than four (4) spaces based on other rules, are

not permitted.

That is, we should be clear that developments which would increase the number of required on-site parking spaces to more than four are not permitted, not that the parking space requirement is capped at four, even if other requirements would imply that it should be more.

In regard to the changes to "2. Use Standards for all Accessory Dwelling Units", subsection "c", add to the last sentence

... including any parking spaces required for the primary dwelling unit, any accessory residential room rentals, and the ADU, and developments which would require more than four (4) spaces based on other rules, are not permitted.

In regard to "Section 6.2224 Schedule of Minimum Requirements", in the third "Note", add

... including any parking spaces required for the primary dwelling unit, any accessory residential room rentals, and the ADU, and developments which would require more than four (4) spaces based on other rules, are not permitted.

In regard to "Section 7.2 Use Regulations", subsection "(e)", change

per lot or contiguous lots under the same ownership

to

per set of contiguous lots associated with a single primary dwelling unit

The current wording would limit the number of vehicles on adjacent lots with two or three primary dwelling units, merely because they were under common ownership. My own house has four associated lots, which as reasonably treated as one for planning purposes. If I were to on some future day purchase the adjacent primary dwelling unit and its lot or lot, the total parking for each primary dwelling unit should not change, merely due to my common ownership of both.

In regard to "Section 8.2 Use Regulations", I would personally like the following added:

(i) Restaurant, subject to a Use Permit approved by the Planning Commission

I realize that the above is not part of the current charge from the Town Council to the Planning Commission, I suggest that a neighborhood-oriented restaurant with creative food would be a fine addition. Requiring a "Use Permit" would allow the Town to limits uses to a restaurant which would be appealing without creating issues for the neighborhood.

Regards,

Bill Earl