



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 15, 2022

TO: Housing Advisory Committee

FROM: Pierce Macdonald, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Informational Report on Implementation of the Current
2015 Housing Element Goals Related to ADUs

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 2

RECOMMENDATION:

None. This report is informational. Comments from Committee Members and the public on this agenda item are welcomed and encouraged.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The supply of new apartments through the production of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) is a critical action by which the City can meet the goals of the current 2015 Housing Element. At the October 21, 2021 virtual Community Workshop on New Housing Programs, City staff and housing consultants Lisa Wise Consulting and Openscope Studio presented new incentives for rent-restricted ADUs (draft ADU Incentives Plan). Public comments received at the community workshop and via email have been reviewed by City staff, Lisa Wise Consulting, and Openscope Studio. Assembly Bill 83 (AB 83) has extended the deadline for completion of the new housing programs work until September 2023. This provides an opportunity to better integrate the ADU Incentives Plan with the new Housing Element programs. This report presents the ADU Incentives Plan project status, the public comment, the revisions to the ADU incentives that are under consideration, and the next steps in the process.

BACKGROUND:

The development of new fair housing programs has reached the following milestones:

In March 2021, the City launched the Fair Housing Community Survey and an online, interactive pinnable map tool, hosted on the Social Pinpoint app. Response to the survey was robust, consisting of 877 survey participants and 90 visitors to the map. Also in March, the City launched a Piedmont fair housing website at <https://Piedmontishome.org>. Public engagement with Piedmont residents, property owners, business owners and workers encouraged participation in development of new ADU programs and incentives.

On May 19, 2021, LWC and City staff presented the results of community engagement completed since November 2020 and what had been learned about community values and priorities. Survey results showed general levels of familiarity with state and federal housing law regarding ADUs and general design preferences.

At the Housing Advisory Committee meeting on June 15, 2021, City staff, Lisa Wise Consulting (LWC), and Openscope Studio, an architectural firm and sub-consultant to LWC, presented information on the implementation of the current 2015 Housing Element goals related to ADUs and a proposed approach to developing an ADU incentives plan specific to Piedmont. The presentation included results of stakeholder interviews and the Fair Housing Community Survey.

At this meeting, the Housing Advisory Committee also recommended City Council approval of a set of guiding principles for new housing programs.

On June 21, 2021, the Piedmont City Council adopted guiding principles for the new fair housing programs at a regular meeting of the Council. The guiding principles are, as follows.

1. Support equitable distribution of affordable units across the City. A diversity of housing choices, including new affordable multi-family housing, new mixed-income multi-family housing, new residential mixed-use development, converted units, ADUs, and Junior ADUs, should be considered throughout the City's neighborhoods, corridors, and zoning districts.
2. Promote and enhance community design and neighborhoods. Infill development should be compatible with the neighborhood context. Development and design standards should ensure that new construction enhances the area in terms of building scale, placement, and design; and is sensitive to impacts on the neighborhood, including impacts related to sunlight access, privacy, and roadway access. Each building must exhibit high-quality design and play a role in creating a better whole.
3. Remove barriers to development and access to housing through clear and objective standards. Development standards and procedures should guide development that is equitable and feasible and that lead applicants through procedures that are transparent and predictable.
4. Facilitate the development of new housing units through strategic partnerships between the City and the broader community. Partnerships to facilitate development include striving to reach community consensus for desired designs; and achieving community support for new incentives, standards, and tools to meet housing goals.
5. Social equity. Work with the Community to proactively facilitate greater social equity by considering City incentives and programs that will enable new homes and apartments for a range of income levels, creating opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, ethnic background, or financial ability.

On September 29, 2021, the Housing Advisory Committee and Planning Commission held a joint meeting to learn about the Piedmont Housing Element update process, the history of fair housing law, and statutory requirements for fair housing.

On October 21, 2021, City staff, LWC, and Openscope Studio, hosted a virtual community workshop on new housing programs for Piedmont, including incentives for affordable ADUs and new objective design standards for multifamily and mixed-use housing. Approximately 50 people participated. Opportunities for public comment were provided both during the workshop, in small group break-out sessions, and afterwards via email and mail. The public comment period ended on November 19, 2021, but comments received after this date were also compiled and considered. All of the public comment made during the workshop and received after are included in this staff report as Attachment B.

ANALYSIS:

This staff report will address:

- Revisions to the draft ADU Incentives Plan
- Response to public comments
- What is being asked of the HAC
- Next steps

California law and Health and Safety Code section 65583(c)(7) requires cities, towns, and counties to develop a plan that incentivizes and promotes the creation of ADUs that can be offered at affordable rent to very-low to moderate-income renters. In coordination with this report, LWC and Openscope Studio will provide a slideshow presentation about public comments received to date and proposed revisions to the draft new housing programs, regulations, and incentives designed to increase the production of ADUs in Piedmont.

Purpose of this Report

This report, augmented by the March 15, 2022, slideshow, presents information on the draft ADU Incentives Plan. The City of Piedmont New Housing Programs, including the ADU Incentives Plan, is included with this staff report as Attachment C. Staff seeks comments from Committee Members and the public, including the following topics:

- Amendments to the ADU Incentives Plan project timeline
- Proposed revisions to the draft ADU Incentives Plan
- Potential recommendations to study future Housing Element programs and zoning ordinance amendments
- Public comment and suggestions

Accessory Dwelling Unit is defined in the Piedmont City Code as “an attached or detached residential dwelling unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons and located on the same lot as a proposed or existing primary residence, which may be a single or multi-family dwelling, and has a separate, exterior entrance than that of the primary residence. It includes permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation. It may include (1) an efficiency unit as defined in Health and Safety Code section 17958.1 and (2) a manufactured home as defined in Health and Safety Code section 18007.” A permitted ADU can be either an ADU, allowed up to 1,000 s.f. if two bedrooms, or a JADU, allowed up to 500 s.f. within an existing building. Both are permitted on a lot containing a single-family home or multi-family residence.

Project Timeline

The California law, requiring that the City develop ADU incentives, took effect on January 1, 2021. In 2020, the City sought and received \$160,000 from the SB 2 grant program to develop incentives, programs, and regulations that facilitate the production of affordable housing. The grant deadline to develop ADU programs, described in this report, was June 2022. However, a new law, Assembly Bill 83 (2020), has extended the deadline for SB 2 planning projects. SB 2 requests for reimbursements are now required to be submitted to HCD by September 2023, and SB 2 grant projects must be completed by December 31, 2023.

Goals and Benefits of ADU Programs and Incentives

In 2015, Piedmont was recognized with an award of merit by the California Chapter of the American Planning Association for its Rent-Restricted Second Unit Program. Piedmont's ADU Ordinance (previously called the "Second Unit Ordinance") has been as a tool for producing context-sensitive affordable housing. Other cities followed by adopting similar programs. Unfortunately, changes to California laws for ADUs in 2017 have made Piedmont's rent-restricted program much less effective, although these changes have been beneficial for the production of greater numbers of market-rate ADUs in Piedmont and throughout California.

Previously, the City permitted a property owner to deed-restrict the rent on their new ADU to low or very low rents for a period of 10 years in return for exemptions to City parking requirements or ADU size limits. The parking exemption was very effective in creating incentives to offer new ADUs to people earning low or very low incomes in Piedmont.

City staff, LWC, and Openscope Studio are actively seeking new incentives to encourage the development of new ADUs that are affordable to low and very-low-income residents. Examples of possible new incentives in the draft ADU Incentives Plan (Attachment C) include pre-approved architectural plans, new size allowances, new technical assistance and publicity campaigns, and a low-interest loan program.

The goals and benefits of proposed new ADU programs and incentives are the following:

- comply with California law
- affordable to build expeditiously
- encourage the production of affordable housing that is privately managed and maintained
- help publicize and market affordable housing in Piedmont
- promote the guiding principles approved by the City Council on June 21, 2021

Public Comment Informs Design Standards

Public comments about community values, design elements, and architectural styles will directly inform revisions to the draft ADU Incentives Plan. Since the close of public comment on November 19, 2021, City staff, LWC, and Openscope Studio have used community feedback, as well as Openscope's experience working in a range of cities and towns that have recently changed their ADU regulations to comply with California law, to develop recommendations and potential revisions to the draft ADU Incentives Plan. With Housing Advisory Committee feedback, these revisions will be incorporated into the final draft ADU Incentives Plan for review by the Planning Commission. Once recommended for adoption by the Planning Commission, the draft ADU Incentives Plan will be scheduled for public hearing before the Piedmont Council, tentatively scheduled for May 2022. The final draft ADU program will be made available for public review and comment for a minimum of 30 days.

CONFORMANCE WITH GENERAL PLAN:

Work to develop new ADU programs, regulations, and incentives is consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the 2015 Housing Element of the Piedmont General Plan, including the following:

Goal 1: New housing construction – provide a range of new housing options in Piedmont to meet the needs of all household types in the community.

Goal 3: Affordable Housing Opportunities – Create additional housing opportunities for moderate, low, and very low income Piedmont residents.

Policy 1.5 – Second units – Continue to allow second units (in-law apartments) “by right” in all residential zones within the City, subject to dimensional and size requirements, parking standards, and an owner-occupancy requirements for either the primary or secondary unit. Local standards for second units may address neighborhood compatibility, public safety, and other issues but should not be so onerous as to preclude the development of additional units.

Policy 1.6: Second units in new or expanded homes – Strongly encourage the inclusion of second units when new homes are built and when existing homes are expanded.

Policy 1.7: Housing in commercial districts – Ensure that local zoning regulations accommodate multi-family residential uses on commercial properties in the City, including the addition of apartment to existing commercial buildings.

Policy 1.10: Intergovernmental coordination – Coordinate local housing efforts with the California Department of Housing and Community Development, the County of Alameda, and adjacent cities. Where City-sponsored housing programs are infeasible due to limited local resources, explore the feasibility of participating in programs initiated by other jurisdictions.

Action 1.C: Market-rate second unit production – Maintain zoning regulations that support the development of market-rate second units in Piedmont neighborhoods.

CONCLUSION:

The draft ADU Incentives Plan is nearing completion. The extension of the deadline for completion of the new housing programs pursuant to AB 83 (2020) affords an opportunity to include some new ADU incentives as new Housing Element programs. The City will move forward with these new Housing Element programs, as well as the portions of the draft ADU Incentives Plan that do not require new Housing Element programs or zoning ordinance amendments. City staff is seeking Housing Advisory Committee feedback as the Piedmont ADU Incentives Plan is prepared for Planning Commission review.

ATTACHMENTS:

- | | | |
|---|---------------|--|
| A | Pages 6 to 7 | General Plan Housing Element Goals, Policies, and Actions, related to the scope of work funded by SB 2 planning grant program |
| B | Page 8 | Cities and Counties with Exemplary ADU Incentive Programs |
| C | <i>Online</i> | City of Piedmont Draft New Housing Programs, including the draft Piedmont Objective Design Standards, are available at the following link: https://www.piedmontishome.org/event/community-event-piedmont-is-home-housing-programs |
| D | Pages 9 to 23 | Public Comment, as of March 11, 2022 |

Attachment A

General Plan Housing Element Goals, Policies, and Actions

The SB 2 Planning Grants Program scope of work is consistent with the following General Plan Housing Element goals, policies, and actions:

Goal 1: New housing construction – provide a range of new housing options in Piedmont to meet the needs of all household types in the community.

Policy 1.2: Housing diversity – Continue to maintain planning, zoning, and building regulations that accommodate the development of housing for all income levels.

Policy 1.4: Context-appropriate programs – Participate in those state and federal housing assistance programs that are most appropriate to Piedmont’s character and that recognize the unique nature of affordable housing opportunities in the City.

Policy 1.5 – Second units – Continue to allow second units (in-law apartments) “by right” in all residential zones within the City, subject to dimensional and size requirements, parking standards, and an owner-occupancy requirements for either the primary or secondary unit. Local standards for second units may address neighborhood compatibility, public safety, and other issues but should not be so onerous as to preclude the development of additional units.

Policy 1.6: Second units in new or expanded homes – Strongly encourage the inclusion of second units when new homes are built and when existing homes are expanded.

Policy 1.7: Housing in commercial districts – Ensure that local zoning regulations accommodate multi-family residential uses on commercial properties in the City, including the addition of apartment to existing commercial buildings.

Policy 1.10: Intergovernmental coordination – Coordinate local housing efforts with the California Department of Housing and Community Development, the County of Alameda, and adjacent cities. Where City-sponsored housing programs are infeasible due to limited local resources, explore the feasibility of participating in programs initiated by other jurisdictions.

Action 1.C: Market-rate second unit production – Maintain zoning regulations that support the development of market-rate second units in Piedmont neighborhoods.

Action 1.E.: Allowing multi-family housing and mixed-use in in the Commercial Zone – Amend the Piedmont Zoning Ordinance to add multiple family housing and mixed-use development to the list of conditionally permitted uses in the Commercial Zone (Zone D).

Action 1.G: Facilitating multi-family development – Develop incentives which would facilitate multi-family development on land zone for multi-family or commercial uses in Piedmont, including modifications to lot coverage requirements for multi-family uses in Zones C and D, and modifications to permitted and conditionally permitted use requirements for Zones C and D. The City will also consider potential ways to streamline environmental review in the event future multi-family uses are proposed in these areas.

Action 2.E: Streamlining design review – Conduct a Planning Commission study session to identify steps that might be taken to expedite and improve the design review process. Following this session, develop amendments to the Design Review process consistent with Action 28.C of the General Plan (Design and Preservation Element).

Action 2.F: Update Design Review Guidelines – Update the 1988 City of Piedmont Residential Design Guidelines consistent with Action 28.E of the Piedmont General Plan.

Goal 7: Equal access to housing – Ensure that all persons have equal access to housing opportunities in Piedmont.

Policy 7.1: Housing choice – Promote the development of housing for all persons regardless of race, religion, ethnic background, or other arbitrary factors.

Policy 7.3: Fair housing enforcement – Implement and enforce relevant State and federal fair housing laws.

Action 5.A: Shared housing program – Consider participating in ECHO Housing’s shared housing program as a way to improve housing opportunities for lower income seniors and extremely low income households.

Action 5.C: Assistance to non-profit developers – Provide assistance to non-profit entities interested in developing housing for low and moderate income Piedmont residents, including elderly and others with special needs.

Action 5.H: Faith Community participation – Work with local faith community to serve residents in need within Piedmont and the greater East Bay, and to identify potential partners for meeting local extremely low income housing needs.

Action 5.I: Second units for extremely-low income households – Maintain an inventory of second units that are available at rents that are affordable to extremely low income households. Explore ways to expand this inventory and encourage the development of additional extremely low income second units through the City’s affordable second unit program and other means.

Action 5.J: Housing for extremely low income families – Develop incentives to meet the needs of Piedmont’s extremely low income households potentially including modified development standards for new multi-family buildings that include units for extremely low income families.

Attachment B - Cities and Counties with Exemplary ADU Incentive Programs

California Department of Housing and Community Development (CA HCD) provides a technical assistance webpage for local jurisdictions, such as Piedmont. CA HCD lists the following ADU programs as references for other jurisdictions seeking to develop ADU incentive programs:

City of Clovis: ADU Finance Program – provides financing to eligible property owners seeking funding to build or repair ADUs on their existing single-family lots.

Santa Cruz County: ADU Forgivable Loan Program – offers forgivable loans up to \$40,000 to homeowners who rent ADUs to low-income households at affordable rents for 20 years.

San Mateo County: One Stop Shop Program – provides no-cost support from Hello Housing with design, permitting, and project management involved with building an ADU. San Mateo also offers an ADU amnesty program for ADUs built without permits.

Monterey Bay: My House My Home Program – creates affordable ADUs for low-income senior homeowners.

City of San Jose: ADU Program – provides pre-approved ADU plans and support for ADU construction.

City of Chico: ADU Program – provides pre-approved ADU plans and support for ADU construction.

Housing Trust Silicon Valley – provides funding to support homeownership, rental housing, development financing, and offers programs for homeowners.

Compiled Public Comments – March 11, 2022

Draft Objective Design Standards and ADU Incentives New Housing Programs

Ms. Jane Lin:

I have gone through the draft and made comments on the PDF. Please see below. I hope that the LWC Team finds these suggestions helpful. Generally, the approach is good, and the team has done some nice work.

Page 5 – Does 70% frontage standard adequately allow for variation of projections and recesses and open space?

Page 6 – Part 3., top of page, how was a break of 6 feet arrived at? This is a very deep break recess or projection, the size of a balcony. Suggest allowing breaks with less dimension.

Part 4.c., i. – 30% orientation - this is a hard standard to interpret. What does it mean?

Part B.1.a.c. “porches of decks over a minimum 25 percent of the façade” How is this interpreted?

Part B.1.a.ii. change 25 ft façade bay to 30 feet façade bay which is typical of structural bay in multifamily development. Suggest that they match.

Page 7, top of page roof line changes of 8 feet are a full story. Is that necessary? The illustration below shows roughly a change of 2 feet in height can provide the change, which is more typical.

Bay articulation standard seems unnecessarily prescriptive.

Page 8, top of page, omit roof-line balustrade which is not commonly found in Piedmont. Consider allowing roof decks that are completely private and partially or completely enclosed on sides. Is there a way where roof decks are permitted if concealed from ground floor visibility? There are many delightful roof decks that are still designed as private.

Part 3.a., why should buildings not have lobbies serving more than three units? Make the policy distinction clear. This is intended to encourage townhouse type building form?

Page 9, Part d., Forecourt – consider allowing forecourt to be partially enclosed on three sides, meaning not the entire length of the forecourt.

Page 10, Part 6.d., Common Open Space - Consider adding privacy for adjacent units next to common spaces (with a buffer, perhaps). Increase minimum dimension to greater than 15 feet.

Page 12, Part C., Façade Design – why limit blank walls to 8 feet? What is the basis? Existing Piedmont design elements?

Part 2 EIFS is prohibited in many cities – why does Piedmont allow it?

I think stating primary color percentage is fine, but secondary and tertiary seems a little more excessive. Do applicants need to prove the facade coverage?

Page 13 – Parapet Design “...exhibit a combination of steps and/or curves”

Ornamental Features – these ODS standard should specify that security features like window or door bars should have their own standards.

Apply comments above to Zone D, Mixed-use Multifamily standards.

Page 24. For commercial spaces, require a minimum height or depth of the spaces. This is common for many other cities. Perhaps these would be in development standards. But generally, 16 feet minimum clear ground floor would be leasable retail space. Also, depth should be 50 feet minimum for at least 50% of depth.

Mr. David Hobstetter:

In reviewing the design standard documents I did not have any issues with it with the exception that perhaps I would like to see a little bit more flexibility in allowing good quality modern design in addition to the traditional approach.

Mr. Houlands:

Per your suggestion, here are my comments on ADU. Hope it helps

With considering neighborhood harmony and minimizing adjacent neighbor impact in mind, lift height limit from 16 to 18 even 20 feet, it not only improves the architectural appearance of an ADU, resulting improve overall existing community beautification, but also improves land use efficiency, reduce the challenges of lot coverage and provide nature living for those loving outdoor space, more home growing veggie option and improve overall healthy living of the community.

As you know a lot of homes in Piedmont were tiny vacation homes back century ago, lift size limitation from 800 sf to 1000 sf before all subject limitations kick in, which provide opportunities to improve living quality as entire community, provide a decent, possible living style people can dream about, reduce average square foot cost, and in resulting improving affordability.

Strongly recommend the City provide standard, good architectural design, pre-approved, ready to build plans to save work and cost for the city residents, most important is that to avoid overwhelmed city building and planning staffs to plan check and simplify inspections, like the city of San Jose, even Stockton, which provides free architecture and structure drawings and is ready to build with a city logo on the plans. That is the way to achieve a common goal for all citizens. With high city local taxes, residents deserve to have some incentives.

Lift some restrictions on size and income qualification, let people decide their lives. It is not a good idea to put too many political restrictions on people's lives. We are all good citizens and caring people, plus this is a free country, sorry, although I don't even know if we still are.

Thank you all for your reading and support.

Mujahid Mahmood:

I'm glad to see movement on loosening Piedmont's historically restrictive building rules. But ADU restrictions are still too burdensome - specifically, there is an existing restriction on front yard setback that limits ADU placement. This should be removed immediately. Design considerations could still be reviewed to ensure designs elements are in keeping with the neighborhood. We had presented an application for an ADU that built forward by 5-6 feet, had a wonderful design by a prominent Piedmont architecture firm, location chosen for it's specific use (flat entry for elderly parents) - but was denied because of this short-sighted restriction. Please either remove this restriction or, at least, be willing to make exceptions to this restriction. Please let me know when the City is more open to this so we can resubmit our ADU plans.

I would recommend re-aligning to the minimal setback requirements per the ADU handbook (4ft, though currently it only places this limit on side/rear setbacks). Could keep design review to ensure overall design is in keeping with the neighborhood. At a minimum be open to approving ADU applications and making allowances for variances regarding front setback (this is currently not the case). I've been told by the City that there is no chance of our proposed plan being approved because of the front setback issue. We went through design review, etc. Very frustrating and costly process to only be denied a permit in the end.

from page 13 of the ADU handbook: "... setbacks must not unduly constrain the creation of ADUs..."

Elise Marie Collins:

I am concerned that the Objective Design Standards are too restrictive. I wonder why there is no modern or modular designs to choose from.

In addition, I have concerns regarding the pre-approved ADU plans. I agree with all the recommendations of PREC experts especially those I have copied below.

I love ADUs, but we need to really study them to understand what part they play in our community. I am personally interested in ADUs that help households that wish to house multiple generations.

I encourage the city to consider developing pre-approved plans that enable modular or kit construction. This is a step many other cities have taken, including the City of San Jose. I generally support the recommendations for creating incentives to owners to create deed-restricted limitations on rents. These ideas include allowing two-story ADUs or an additional ADU in exchange for deed restrictions.

At the same time, I believe we need accurate data on the effectiveness of ADUs as a path to affordable housing production in Piedmont in order to create more effective policies for the future.

Thank you for considering my input as well as the input of other community members.

Anita Stapen:

There is a huge amount of information to absorb in the new housing (programs). I would like to address one of these elements: the development and requirements for ADUs. Because I have no background in these areas, I will limit my comments to general concerns.

We all know that change is coming concerning the types and density of housing in Piedmont and indeed in California. Piedmont is taking a considered and active review process to meet the additional housing units, and I commend all the parties involved as we update the Building laws.

There is a lot of pressure to fulfill the state requirements, and I think the City is opening the door too wide to incentivize ADUs. The State does not allow a design review process for ADUs, but raising overall roof heights or increased area may have a big impact on neighbors' light, views, and privacy. As much as possible, I urge the City to prioritize concern for the impact on neighbors, who in these cases have no recourse if a tall or two-story ADU is built next door, compromising their privacy, light and view.

Related to this concern is the question of how many ADUs can be built in a given part of town? Will the City have a limit on ADUs per 10 block area, for example? Or some other measure? I haven't seen any data on how many ADUs have been built, or are being planned, or a mechanism to spread out the ADUs evenly over town.

Another issue is that many people would like to build ADUs not for additional housing stock, but to offer to friends and relatives who visit. How will this issue be addressed? Will the City require that new ADUs must be rented at low or very low market rates? What is the mechanism to regulate that?

In the pressure to create housing, Piedmont is overriding longstanding and very important aesthetic and privacy considerations that will negatively impact both the overall milieu, and impact neighbors. As we adapt to changes, I hope you keep these issues in mind and develop guidelines to minimize the impact of ADUs.

Irene Cheng:

I am writing to offer comment on Piedmont's draft Multi-Family Design Standards and ADU Incentives. The statements below represent my views as an individual, as an almost decade-long resident of Piedmont, and as a professional architectural historian and tenured professor of architecture.

The draft Multi-Family Design Standards are, in my view, conservative and overly restrictive. Many of the measures impose excessive costs on new multifamily development, placing burdensome obstacles in the way of new construction, and particularly new construction of affordable housing. They are also out of line with best practices in architectural design today, which operate under the guiding principle that each era should produce an architecture appropriate for its time rather than create faux-historicist built forms. The historicist perspective often equates ornament and variety with "good" or "appealing" design, but requirements for curved parapets, recesses, and brackets are no guarantee of beautiful architecture. In fact, they often lead to just the opposite.

By law, design standards must be objective not subjective. By this measure, there is no justification for “promoting development in a general Mediterranean architectural style” as the draft standards claim to do on page 3. Piedmont is fortunate to have architecture in a variety of styles, including Arts & Crafts, Mediterranean, Colonial Revival, modern, and contemporary. Why should the city elevate one style over another? Doing so suggests a conservative cultural and aesthetic attitude rather than an embrace of diversity and openness to change. Moreover, although the politics of architectural style is a complex and nuanced subject, recent research has explored the troubling racial politics underlying the popularization of Spanish Colonial Revival architecture (a variant of “Mediterranean”) in early-20th-century southern California, a period of white Anglo migration and settlement. (See Phoebe Kropp’s *California Vieja: Culture and Memory in a Modern American Place*, University of California Press, 2008.) This complex cultural history is just one more reason not to enshrine one style over any others. Instead, I hope the City will adopt objective design standards that concern themselves with universal concerns such as light, air, density, and privacy, while leaving aside subjective and culturally fraught questions of style and aesthetics.

I urge the City and its consultants to revise the proposed standards to ensure that new housing can feasibly be built, and that our city’s architecture reflects an embrace of the present and future rather than remaining unduly tethered to a singular version of the past.

Cynthia Kroll:

Here are a couple of concerns I would like to see considered:

1) Will ADUs and JADUs add affordable housing to the city? How will this be ensured, to avoid them becoming simply Airbnb's or granny flats? How will building requirements take this into account (eg. high cost of new building vs manufactured units)?

2) What about parking? There are already neighborhoods grappling with parking congestion and overflows from nearby districts. Is the plan considering the parking needs generated by a) ADUs, b) changing a SF lot into a 2 plex or 4 plex, or c) building larger apartment buildings in our more commercial areas. It would be nice for the neighborhoods to know these things are being taken into consideration. That doesn't mean every ADU needs a garage, but what about ensuring the lot has enough parking area in a driveway before allowing still more driving adults to be added? Will approaches to parking requirements depend on proximity to transit, so we don't assume just because Piedmont is seen as a transit accessible high opportunity area that transit is a realistic option in all parts of the city.

3) I would like to see as much new housing as possible added to the Grand Ave area and the Highland commercial area, so that we are not accommodating all of our RHNA through ADUs and JADUs.

Will Adams:

Thank you all for the work you are doing on the housing mandate! The work done to date is impressive. Clearly the issue is complicated and interconnected to virtually all planning requirements, not the least of which, is preserving (and even improving) the beauty and charm of this place.

My comments center around two main concerns: cars and urban design.

1. Cars: Adding the required 575 (+-) units in Piedmont could, at 1.5 cars/unit, add ultimately 860 + cars to the city. I think any viable city expansion solution requires, for aesthetic, cost, congestion and parking reasons, a creative, innovative approach to reducing the number of and expenses associated with cars. This is part and parcel of 1a below.

1a. Parking: at \$45,000/structured parking space, \$68,000 (1.5 cars/unit) will be added to the average unit's building cost. Unfortunately, this is the exact opposite of what is needed for affordable and low cost housing. I found the thinking in the following report a good outline of issues with a number of possible mitigations: <https://www.vtpi.org/park-hou.pdf> Also, there are some thoughts in Piedmont Post Sept 21, 2021, p. 21; Feb 10, 2021 p. 23. I wonder why the draft section on parking reduction only applies to non-residential use? Do you know if it has ever been a condition of lease or sale that vehicle ownership be limited? I would hope that with the state mandated huge, fast changes that are a part of getting new housing built, we could add new reasonable conditions that differ from current formulas.

2. Urban Design: because of its location and (assumed) availability, the Civic Center Subarea test site is certainly the most important development parcel in the Civic Center. Currently, it contains the essential Mulberrys and its parking lot, which, however lacking, function as the chief public outdoor space, certainly the most active, of the center. The building shown in the site massing study is nicely done, but I think the associated urban design needs development. Some sort of small replacement plaza should be incorporated into the plan (complementing/relating to the city hall plaza across Vista). Where do I sit to drink my coffee I just bought? Where is the student backpack pile located? Where do I park my bike? I also wonder if more of the parking could be buried behind even a minimum of additional commercial space at the sidewalk level. Although I think the addition of residential (and increased commercial) in this area will improve the center (and city) by adding activity and vitality, maybe this is not a good test parcel because of its unique prominence and required urban design/civic duty to the center of town. Whatever is done it needs to be an integral part of an overall urban design concept. See P.Post Dec 10, 2020 p.22. I understand that this is only a test and not a design proposal, but worry it could become one (a fixed design proposal).

2a. ADU's: the ADU work looks very impressive and appropriate. It's not clear to me though how exactly it works. The siting of the units can make all the difference. How is this regulated/determined without a design review process? Also I imagine there are a fair amount of ADU's possible within larger houses, maybe with small modifications—same question as above. There doesn't seem to be any mention of parking for ADUs in the draft, either for new units or vacated garage conversions....bringing us back to 1a above.

3. Building Costs: who knows, but the residential \$195/sf figure seems very low.

I hope these thoughts are in some way helpful.

Garrett Keating:

Below are my comments on the draft document, "Multi-family Design Standards and ADU Incentives".

Is difficult to assess the need for the ADU incentives in the draft without an analysis of the existing ADU program in Piedmont. That analysis would include the number ADUs that have been permitted, the number that are actually rented, the size of the added ADU and the number that are rented to low/very low-income tenants. Given all the analysis that went into other aspects of the report, it is surprising that so little has been done of existing and proposed ADU in Piedmont.

The impacts of ADU on neighborhoods is another analysis missing from the report. Piedmont has a long tradition of preserving the light, views and privacy of new development on neighboring properties but the report makes no acknowledgement of that. To the contrary, the report ignores these variables when proposing garage conversions, structures that are usually in close proximity to the property line.

“While noted as a potential affordable incentive in our report, relieving the height limit for an ADU constructed over an existing garage, assuming the footprint remains the same, would enable residents to maintain on-site covered parking while adding a dwelling unit to their property. This Carriage House model is a traditional way of providing an additional dwelling unit over a garage or storage building, and would seem consistent with much of Piedmont’s existing residential fabric. Other California jurisdictions (Santa Monica and Orange County, for example) have adopted this option to encourage retaining existing parking counts. A similar limit on overall building height, and/or accommodation of roof pitch, as noted in the previous recommendation, would be appropriate.”

Suggesting that a residential unit within 4 feet of the property line is consistent with Piedmont’s residential “fabric” demonstrates an ignorance of Piedmont’s neighborhoods, particularly Zone A.

The only two controls that Piedmont has on ADU are building height and design compatibility and these controls should be preserved. Do not consider any increase in allowable ADU height at this time. Instead, incentivize ADU in other ways, most notably through increasing the allowed square footage of ADU and the raising of the FAR. The draft proposes modest increase in these two parameters but square footage and FAR should be expanded further before the city proposes height increases that impact neighbors. If at all, these incentives rightfully impact the ADU applicant and not the privacy and light of neighboring properties. Raising the height limit on ADU is an attempt to shoe-horn in units of sub-optimal housing while horizontal expansion would create better housing. If a height incentive is to be considered, then limit it to 18 feet for rent-restricted units only.

Incentivizing ADU development to increase available housing in Piedmont is an accepted community goal. But so is preservation of the city’s residential character and some of these ADU incentives are a real threat to that. Absent any analysis of the efficacy of the existing ADU program or a projection of how these incentives will help achieve the RHNA target, limit the current incentives to horizontal expansion only. With SB 9 and tax incentives, the city has other resources with which to incentivize additional and affordable housing.

Finally, one recommendation needs clarification. The report raises the possibility, not the requirement, of a 6 – 8 ft setback when a height limit of 20-22 feet is allowed and suggests this will mitigate impact on neighboring properties. That statement needs a lot more valid planning analysis.

Mr. Randolph Wu:

As Piedmont plans for multi-family and mixed-use project design in the next housing cycle, consideration should be given to integrating net zero energy housing designs into Piedmont's traditional building design standards. There is an important intersection between affordable multi-family housing and climate change. Higher density multi-family housing built near mass transit not only can be compliant with Reach Code standards but designed as net zero energy housing. This will be affordable and not reliant on the utility grid. Allowing architects, builders and homeowners to maximize renewable energy through nontraditional roof designs should be a high priority in Piedmont. Continuing improvements in solar panel efficiency and dramatic cost reductions in battery storage systems will make net zero energy housing feasible and cost effective for affordable multi-family housing projects in the next RHNA cycle.

There are two proposed standards (repeated in both the multi-family and mixed use building standards) that should be amended to enable cost effective, solar energy production:

Building Design Standard B.2. Roof Form and Design

An exception should be created for solar roofs or Building Integrated Photovoltaic (BIPV) roof designs. Net zero energy housing will require roof designs that will maximize solar energy production. This may not conform to traditional roof forms and designs in Piedmont, but it will help us reduce carbon emissions. This exception should be added as B.2.e as follows: "Solar roofs and other Building Integrated Photovoltaic (BIPV) roof designs are exempt from these standards if needed to achieve a net zero energy result on site." It is important to tie this exception to net zero energy on site as otherwise the homeowner may use more energy than is produced on site and defeat the overall purpose to add housing with zero emissions.

Building Design Standard B.8.a. Equipment Screening

The second sentence which reads: "If solar panels are mounted on a flat roof and cannot be parallel to the roof surface, building parapets . . ." should be clarified. This sentence may be read to require a parallel mounting of solar panels on a flat roof unless it is physically impossible or "cannot" be done. This would be unfortunate as solar arrays in Piedmont should face south with a 38 degree tilt or angle to maximize annual solar energy production. A requirement for parallel or flat mounting will reduce energy production by as much as 10%. While this may not be intended, the standard should not suggest there is a requirement for parallel or flat mounting. This sentence should be amended to read: "If solar panels are mounted on a flat roof and are tilted or angled to maximize solar energy production, building parapets . . ." Tilted or angled solar arrays can be screened by a parapet from public ROW viewing. This seems to be the primary intent of B.8.a. (Please note that even a low parapet can create shade around the roof perimeter during the winter months and reduce the roof area that may be used for solar panels.)

Piedmont's building design standards should enable affordable multi-family housing and climate change initiatives.

Thank you for considering my comments

Ms. Susan Miller Davis:

Thanking Randy for weighing in and providing his expertise.

Ms. Diana Edgerton:

Can this affordable housing be restricted to Piedmont teachers and Piedmont City employees? A 2-bedroom apartment cannot accommodate a family. Currently, Piedmonters pay high taxes to support our own Police, Fire, other city services, etc. and, particularly, our excellent schools. How will these renters pay their fair share for these services?

Ms. Mary Louise Morrison:

I live on Moraga Ave. It already has buildings two deep.

Why not build in the land near the corporation yard, where the goats cleared the grass?

I just lost two oak trees - one 150 years old because of building over roots. Once you start housing in the old trees you are setting up either direct or indirect deforestation.

Street parking is impossible on Moraga and there really is no good public transit for Piedmont, especially for the elderly.

At this time in my life, I vote for the trees and high-rises in the center of Piedmont so all Piedmont shares the consequences.

Mr. Alexander Czarnecki:

I write to you today as the CEO of Cottage Technologies to encourage the Committee to implement a program for designer-owned, preapproved ADU plans, in order to encourage the production of additional housing units in Piedmont through faster, cheaper, and more streamlined ADU creation.

As Piedmont looks to promote ADUs, a well-structured preapproval program provides several important incentives at once: 1) a less daunting experience for homeowners, 2) time savings, and 3) cost savings.

1. Streamlined process. Cottage supports a preapproved ADU program like those in San Jose and Cupertino, that allow designers and architects to submit non-site-specific ADU plans for preapproval and then work directly with homeowners throughout the course of their projects. We would also support a program that lets site-specific projects be concurrently processed for preapproval, similar to the program recently started in Fremont. Designer-owned preapproved plans, in contrast to city-owned preapproved plans, create a more streamlined experience for homeowners. In the latter type of program, homeowners must still seek out general contractors, consultants, and other professionals on their own, and challenges can occur when requests for information arise or the homeowner desires small modifications to the plans. In designer-owned

plan programs, ADU experts are able to walk homeowners through the process from start to finish and assist homeowners through minor design changes, unforeseen site conditions, handoffs to contractors, and more.

2. Reduced turnaround time for permitting ADUs. In many municipalities, it can take over a year for a homeowner to receive a permit for and build an ADU, at a time when having additional rental income or a safe place to house elderly family members is more important than ever. And as rental prices rebound post-pandemic, an adequate supply of affordable rental units for local workers is critical to ensuring that cities and their economies can thrive upon reopening. An upfront guarantee of a fast permit process will help Piedmont more quickly meet the needs of its residents.

3. Reduced costs. Selecting a preapproved plan not only guarantees homeowners a faster permit turnaround time, but could also offer cost savings to both homeowners and Piedmont through less time spent in review. And when designers are able to offer homeowners an ADU cost estimate that includes both city fees and construction pricing for a preapproved plan, homeowners can rest easier knowing that their project will be within their budget and can pass some of these savings on to ADU occupants.

Fear of a cumbersome and costly permit process should not be a hindrance to homeowners looking to expand Piedmont's housing supply by building an ADU. An end-to-end, cost-effective preapproved ADU program would go a long way in broadening access to affordable housing opportunities for the elderly, local workers, and more. We're excited by Piedmont's engagement on this issue, and we look forward to continuing to work with you and the community's homeowners.

PREC Housing Committee:

Attached please find feedback from the Piedmont Racial Equity Campaign Housing Committee on the draft Multifamily Design Standards and ADU Incentives.

Please contact us if you have any questions about our comments. Thank you!

Yours truly,

Irene Cheng
irene.cheng@gmail.com

Sarah Karlinsky
sarah.karlinsky@gmail.com

On behalf of the PREC Housing Committee

--:/--

The members of the Piedmont Racial Equity Campaign Housing Committee have reviewed the draft "City of Piedmont Multifamily Design Standards and ADU Incentives." We appreciate the opportunity to review this important document. We have several specific comments, detailed below, but also an overall preliminary suggestion: Since the City is currently engaged in a thorough review of its Housing Element policies, and will probably revise its zoning regulations

after that process is complete, we are concerned that many of these recommendations may soon be obsolete. For example, if Zone C is amended to allow for more density, in order to make multifamily housing feasible, the requirement that entrances serve no more than three units may no longer make sense (p.8). That is just one example. For that reason, we recommend that the City consider keeping these objective design standards in draft form for now, and come back to them after the Housing Element update is complete. It seems unnecessary to adopt detailed objective design standards that would be in place for only a little more than a year.

If the City decides to move forward with the standards, below are our comments on the draft document:

Part 2: Objective Design Standards

The proposed standards are overly prescriptive with regards to architectural design and style and will lead to excessive and unwarranted expense in multifamily construction.

Many of the provisions will increase the cost of multifamily housing without ensuring high quality design. The standards may also restrict developers from being able to utilize modular design construction strategies. While we appreciate the desire for new buildings to match the character of the existing building stock, we believe the standards hew to an overly narrow definition of architectural character, especially given the rich diversity of architecture that exists in Piedmont.

Overall, we recommend reducing the number of prescriptions and requirements to ensure that multifamily housing development will be viable. We encourage the City to solicit further feedback from local affordable housing developers and architects to understand the feasibility and impact of the design standards on affordable housing development.

Note: We understand that the City and LWC will be studying further changes to the zoning requirements for Zones C and D (such as potentially increasing allowable density, FAR, and building height, and reducing parking requirements) as part of the Housing Element process. Therefore, we are limiting our comments to feedback on the draft Objective Design Standards. In the proposed guidelines for Division 17.24 Zone C: Multi-family Residential:

1. A1a. - Remove requirement for front and street side facade setback (mirroring the proposed standards for Zone D). Keep requirement for interior and rear facade setback when abutting Zone A. (p. 5)
2. B1a.i. - Revise requirement that buildings have two of the following: bay windows, frequent recesses, or porches/decks--to requiring just one of these features. (p.6)
3. B1a.ii. - Eliminate requirement that building facades longer than 45 feet incorporate a change in roof parapet, form, or building height (p. 7)
4. B1b. - Eliminate requirement that balconies and porches be integrated into recesses or overhangs on at least one side of the porch or balcony. (p. 7)
5. B2b. - Regarding the requirement that the pitch of the roof must be 3:12 to 5:12 ratio: Please clarify that flat roofs are permitted. (p. 8)
6. B2d. - Eliminate prohibition on roof decks (p. 8 and 11)
7. B3a.i. - Delete requirement that shared entrances may serve no more than three units. (p. 8)
8. B3b. - Eliminate prohibition on external stairs to upper units. (p. 8)

9. B3c-d. - Reduce prescriptions on frontage types. (p. 9) Note that the terrace frontage is inconsistent with accessible design standards. To be accessible, entrances should be level at grade.
10. B4. - Eliminate requirement that ground floor finish floor elevation be 24 inches above sidewalk. This is not consistent with accessible design standards. (p. 10)
11. B5b. - Revise requirement that windows be recessed from outer wall surface. (p. 10) This is not aligned with current window design and installation practices.
12. B5c. - Eliminate prohibition on vinyl windows. This entails significant additional cost.
13. B5g. - Eliminate requirement for “residential signifiers” (such as window bays or doors with balconies) every 10 horizontal feet. (p. 10)
14. B6c. - Delete minimum requirement for private open space. (p.10) Consider increasing per unit amount of shared open space instead.
15. B7d.ii. - Change maximum width of entrance to shared parking facilities to 20 feet. (p. 11)
16. C1a. - Increase limit on blank walls from 8 feet to 16 feet (p. 12)
17. C2a. - Why are facade materials limited to stucco stone, brick or EIFS? Why not allow wood and fiber cement siding? (p. 12)
18. C2c. - Eliminate maximum percentages of secondary and tertiary colors or otherwise make building color requirements less prescriptive. (p. 12)
19. C2e. - Why specify change in exterior building must occur a minimum of 8 feet beyond an outside corner? (p. 12)
20. C2i. - Why are roof materials limited to composition shingle, spanish tile, or cool roof membrane in grey? Why not allow standing seam metal roofs, concrete roof tiles, or solar roofs? Also, standard white cool roof membranes should be permitted in areas where they are not visible. (p. 13)
21. C3a. - Delete requirement that structural elements visible on exterior frame building apertures and modules. (p. 13)
22. C3b. - Eliminate requirement that parapets exhibit a combination of steps and curves (p. 13)
23. C3d. - Eliminate requirement that downspouts be concealed within building walls. (p. 13)
24. C3f. - Reduce or eliminate requirement that buildings exhibit two of the following ornamental features for 15 percent of each facade: patterned accent tiles, carved insets, stucco or tile decorative vents, decorative chimney top. (p. 13)
25. D2b.i. - Revise requirement that landscape be planted maximum of 1 foot on center, or clarify if this is intended for ground cover, since shrubs can be planted farther apart. (p. 15)

In the proposed guidelines for Division 17.26 Zone D: Commercial and Mixed-Use:

1. A2a. - Eliminate requirement that building facades longer than 65 feet incorporate a change in roof parapet, form, or building height (p. 18)
2. B1a.ii. - Eliminate requirement that building facades longer than 65 feet incorporate a change in roof parapet, form, or building height (p. 18)
3. B1b. - Eliminate requirement that balconies and porches be integrated into recesses or overhangs on at least one side of the porch or balcony. (p. 19)
4. B1d. - Eliminate requirement for articulation of building massing at corners. (p. 19)
5. B2b. - Regarding the requirement that the pitch of the roof must be 3:12 to 5:12

ratio: Please clarify that flat roofs are permitted. (p. 19)

6. B2c. - Eliminate requirement for brackets, rafter tails, or beams on roofs with deep eaves (p.20)

7. B5b. - Revise requirement that windows be recessed from outer wall surface. (p. 22) This is not aligned with current window design and installation practices.

8. B5h. Eliminate requirement for “residential signifiers” (such as window bays or doors with balconies) every 10 horizontal feet. (p. 22)

9. C2a. - Why are facade materials limited to stucco stone, brick or EIFS? Why not allow wood and fiber cement siding? (p. 24-25)

10. C2c. - Eliminate maximum percentages of secondary and tertiary colors or otherwise make building color requirements less prescriptive. (p. 25)

11. C2i. - Why are roof materials limited to composition shingle, spanish tile, or cool roof membrane? Why not allow concrete tile, solar or standing seam metal roofs? (p. 25)

12. C3b. - Eliminate requirement that parapets exhibit a combination of steps and curves. (p. 25-26)

13. C3f. - Eliminate requirement that buildings exhibit two of the following ornamental features every twelve horizontal feet: patterned accent tiles, carved insets, stucco or tile decorative vents, decorative chimney top. (p. 26)

Part 3 Test Massing Studies

The Zone D test massing and financial feasibility studies offer interesting and helpful analysis. However, the costs estimated in the analysis are far too low. The study assumes a land cost of \$240/sf and a construction cost of \$195/sf. In the East Bay, residential construction starts at \$400/sf. Since only one of the three test cases LWC evaluated was deemed financially feasible (and barely so), it seems that none of the test projects would be feasible. This suggests that the City will need to consider higher densities, allowable heights, reduced parking requirements, and other measures to make housing development in Zone D feasible. The financial feasibility analysis needs to be revised with higher construction costs based on credible recent sources, so that the City and LWC can develop policy recommendations that are more likely to succeed in spurring multifamily residential development. We also recommend that an analysis be done on financial feasibility using all of the state authorities pertaining to density bonuses and streamlining for affordable housing development. Finally, we note that the estimated cost of parking is too low, and that the assumption of a parking ratio of 1.5-1.7 is too high. As the City studies moves forward on its Housing Element and related zoning amendments, we encourage a shift to developing parking maximums rather than minimums, as other cities are beginning to do.

Part 4 ADU Recommendations

Regarding the pre-approved ADU plans. In addition to the plans supplied here, we encourage the city to consider developing pre-approved plans that enable modular or kit construction. This is a step many other cities have taken, including the City of San Jose.

We generally support the recommendations for creating incentives to owners to create deed-restricted limitations on rents. These ideas include allowing two-story ADUs or an additional ADU in exchange for deed restrictions.

At the same time, we believe we need accurate data on the effectiveness of ADUs as a path to

affordable housing production in Piedmont in order to create more effective policies for the future. We want to better understand whether the city's past deed-restricted ADU program (in which deed-restrictions were exchanged for parking requirement waivers) or the current affordable ADU incentive (allowing for an increase in area to 1000-1200 sf in exchange for low and very-low-income rent restrictions) succeeded in creating housing units that were rented out at affordable rates during the 10-year deed-restricted term, and after the 10-year term.

We are concerned that incentivizing ADUs at the expense of other forms of small-site housing production may reinforce some of the challenges to affordability in a city like Piedmont--for example, by gradually diminishing the stock of smaller homes and creating larger, higher-price homes out of reach to more and more homebuyers, while not significantly increasing the affordable rental housing stock (if the created ADUs are not rented out). Anecdotal evidence suggests that a fair number of ADUs built in Piedmont are not used as housing. The City collects business taxes on rental receipts and should be able to share how many ADUs in the city are being rented out. We urge the City to transparently share data on the rate of ADU production and rentals, so that it can craft effective housing production policies moving forward.

October 21, 2022 Community Workshop on New Housing Programs Public Comments

The following reports were made at the conclusion of the workshop after the small break-out groups reconvened:

Ellen Greenberg – Helpful clarification that the zoning map was an image of the existing zoning map. Important to confirm that there are no planned rezoning. Thoughtful comment about architectural style. Is it appropriate to lean into traditional styles? Irene referenced recent contemporary designed development on Piedmont Avenue near Mountain View Cemetery. Useful reference and example of high-quality design. We need to understand how the design standards could influence the cost of development and our ability to achieve affordability aims and affordability objectives under state law.

David Bergman – Small group spent a lot of time with the concept of objective design standards. Intelligent question about why they need to be there. Suggestion to circulate this information widely throughout the community. How is the objective standards process different from the current process? Concern about ODS being too prescriptive. Team is struggling with this question under state law. One can always go to a voluntary process as an alternative to the ODS process. Why are we only showing four stories in the site testing illustrations?

Stefano Richichi – Small group wanted more time to discuss. Residents and others had difficulty finding the public review copy of the objective design standards. Make the presentation available online. Some were dismayed that Zone D building envelope is subject to the existing street yard setback. Several liked the “stepbacks” to make buildings less imposing. Arleta Chang, Maria Morga and John Malick amended the report as follows:

Arleta Chang – Regarding the small group discussion about not having a front setback for multifamily, the ODS examples in the presentation are similar to Piedmont Avenue which do not have street yard setbacks. These buildings are built right to the front property line.

Maria Morga – There are questions about height limits for Zone C and D properties that are adjacent to and close to single-family residences. Are stepbacks appropriate in these cases? Consider a difference in the height maximums between Zone C and Zone D. Consider a distinction between Grand Avenue and Civic Center height standards for Zone D.

John Malick – Want to point out that as a developer, the prices and rental rates in the presentation are not the cost of construction and rental rates needed to convince someone to build in Piedmont. Minimum \$350 per s.f. construction cost. Rents \$3.50 per s.f. for normal rental market housing. \$3.50 per s.f. for a 9 x 20 parking space also. Feasibility analysis is off by 75% (too low). Willing to share an appraisal/proforma that is necessary to get a bank to loan.

Mary Davis – This small group discussion raised questions about why the specific styles for ADUs. These are predominant styles in Piedmont. The pre-approved ADU styles do not preclude residents from building other designs so long as they meet the normal requirements (that do not specify style). Comment that ADU standards should be dependent on whether or not the ADU is visible from the street. Concerns about privacy. Concerns that current setbacks are insufficient and that the standards could include more measures to maintain privacy. Incentive to encourage renting ADUs out.

Ian Dunn – This small group discussion started with where do we get these plans? When can I get them? Clarify how the height of ADUs is measured. Adapt for hillside sites. How much customization is permitted? Dimensions, roof orientation, etc.? Contemporary or Modern prototype? If there are state-approved ADUs, include these are resources in the ADU incentives doc.

Mark Hogan – The last small group discussion questioned Do we really need to match the style of the existing residence? Does the pre-approved ADU need to match the existing house? Current standards are too rigid. PG&E metering and new meter is a burden. Question about is anyone looking at manufactured housing? Prototypes looks expensive to construct. How to maintain affordability longer than 10-year deed restriction? More Modern design options.