

Hi, Georgette and Charlie. (Please forward this to other Planning Commission members.)

Thank you for your diligent work on the issue of Accessory Dwelling Units and the changes needed in Town ordinances should ADU's be allowed.

I have a couple of quibbles about the occupancy rules. I spoke with Councilperson Barbara Raimondo and she too is interested in your thoughts on these points.

First, I am troubled by the definition of Household.

A person living alone, or any one of the following groups living together as a single housekeeping unit and sharing common cooking, sanitation, and sleeping facilities:

1. *any number of people related by blood, marriage, adoption, or guardianship;*
2. *up to 5 unrelated people; or*
3. *2 unrelated people and any children, parents, siblings, or other persons related to either of them by blood, adoption, or guardianship.*

Household does not include any society, club, fraternity, sorority, association, lodge, federation, or like organization; any group of individuals whose association is seasonal in nature; or any group of individuals who are in a group living arrangement as a result of criminal offenses.¹

As written, I believe it rules out these possibilities as households, among others I'm sure.

- 1 married couple and a friend (a situation that exists in town);
- 1 married couple, an over-18 child and the child's over-18 friend (a situation the has existed in town);
- 2 married couples.

This could be repaired by changing #2 to "up to five related and unrelated people." Given the growing diversity in the nation, our culture now recognizes many "families of choice," and we should try harder not to exclude them.²

Secondly, I am unsure why we would allow 2 bedrooms in an ADU but would not allow more than 2 occupants over 18. I see that the County also has the 2-adult restriction³, but

¹ This language appears to have come from the County's zoning definition Chapter 59. Section 1.4.2.

² For interesting reading on this topic, see "Why Are Zoning Laws Defining What Constitutes a Family?" <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-06-17/zoning-law-shouldn-t-define-what-makes-a-family> and "Zoning for Families," an Indiana Law Journal article by a Cornell law professor. <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2823&context=facpub>

³ County Code [Article 59, Section 3.3.3 \(A\)\(2\)\(c\)\(iii\)](#). "The maximum number of occupants is limited by Chapter 26 (Section [26-5](#)); however, the total number of occupants residing in the Accessory Dwelling Unit who are 18 years or older is limited to 2;"

why disallow a couple with a college-aged child, for example, or a couple with an in-law? Occupancy rules based on health and safety, which depend on square footage, and so on, would still apply, and the Town will still be restricting the number of vehicles allowed.

Finally, I'd like to share some of the reasons I favor ADU's in Washington Grove:

- They are family-friendly. An ADU can be a granny flat or an apartment for a grown child, so multi-generational families can be accommodated.
- ADU's can mean extra income for the homeowner, who may then be more likely to afford a mortgage in an increasingly expensive community.
- ADU's can be good for the environment, using fewer resources to house people. Because they are small, they can be built with fewer materials and consume less energy for heating and cooling.
- ADU's can provide affordable housing. Washington Grove can do its small part to help alleviate the housing shortage in the county, especially because we are well-served by public transit.

Respectfully submitted,

Mimi Bolotin, 354 Ridge Road