

HPC comments on ADU draft

Christine Dibble <christinedibble@outlook.com>

Wed 10/11/2023 9:03 PM

To: Christine Dibble <christinedibble@outlook.com>

 1 attachments (19 KB)

5 - Proposed HPC revisions to the ADU Ordinance 09.docx;

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

From: boohfamily@comcast.net <boohfamily@comcast.net>

Date: Fri, Sep 22, 2023 at 2:58 PM

Subject: HPC comments on ADU draft

To: Georgette Cole <georgettewg@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilynn Frey <marilynnf@comcast.net>, Wendy Harris <wharris.cragsmoor@gmail.com>, Jeff McCrehan <mccrehanj@outlook.com>, David Stopak <dstop4@gmail.com>, Mimi Styles <mimistyles6464@yahoo.com>, Rob Gilmore <robertbrucegilmore@gmail.com>, John Compton <johncompton@me.com>

Georgette:

Here are comments and attached are suggested revisions to the draft under consideration but the PC.

- In general, the Commission felt incorporation of ADUs into our zoning is a feasible task, but also carries with it an increased risk to the modest scale of the housing stock and thus to the integrity of the Historic District.
- We feel that a maximum size for the ADU is needed, as our current zoning limits in many cases are not sufficient to preclude out-of scale construction. For example, I have a 22,500 sf lot and a 1650 sf house. The FAR limit would allow me to construct a detached 2500 sf ADU and the setbacks would not limit that area. I could presumably build a 2 bedroom house with living, dining, kitchen, multiple baths, a library, den, office, music room, etc. The height of the structure would be slightly less than my house but the mass (bulk) would be 150% larger. Though "subordinate" to the main building, in physical terms it would be the dominant one.
- The current apparent limit in area contained in the % of rear lot coverage is not an effective limit as there is no definition of rear lot and it is not clear that the % listed for each zone is a useful quantity.
- There are actually 3 types of ADUs as illustrated in the explanation provided: one that is completely contained within the existing envelope, one that is partly or fully attached, and one that is separate (detached). The impacts of each differ. For our purposes, the first type has no additional risk to the scale of the house, the second carries that additional risk (becoming too big), and the third carries the risk of a separate out-of scale structure.
- We feel that the added risk brought to the modest scale of our neighborhoods must be thoughtfully managed so that the impact is an improvement. To that end we are proposing the Town develop a review process that mitigates the risk. This would most likely take the form of the HPC advising the PC on whether the proposed project is compatible with the existing structure, the neighborhood and the integrity of the Historic District.

There are other questions of owner-occupancy, number of occupants, room definitions, parking etc that we presume will be examined in this process but are not direct concerns of the HPC.

Thanks for taking this on. See you at the meeting.

Bob