# REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

DATE: 10/10/2011 ITEM NO: 9.a

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

Item Description:

Request by Roseville City Council for approval of a **zoning text amendment** to allow accessory dwelling units in LDR-1 Districts as

permitted rather than conditional uses (PROJ-0017)

#### 1.0 BACKGROUND

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

26

27 28

29

30

31

At the regular City Council meeting on May 23, 2011, the City Council directed Community Development staff to prepare an amendment to the zoning code which would regulate accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as permitted uses (i.e., allowed with permits) rather than as conditional or interim uses. Council reviewed a draft proposal at its July 25, 2011 meeting and found it to be consistent with what they had envisioned, with a few modifications which have been incorporated into the revised amendment shown in **bold** and strikethrough text in Attachment B.

#### 2.0 SOME NOTES ABOUT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

- ADUs have been discussed until now as being limited to 600 square feet. Initially, this figure, which is really quite small for a 1-bedroom apartment, was chosen as a way to practically limit the number of occupants. Since the current proposal includes a codified limit of 2 occupants, holding to the small ADU size limitation becomes somewhat less important. After some research, Planning Division staff feels that 650 square feet is a more moderate (though still small) size for a 1-bedroom unit, and so this is the unit size that has been incorporated into the draft amendment.
- The format of the ADU address suffix is really just suggested as a possibility, but it attempts to address the desire to provide guidance for emergency responders and to standardize the format. The proposal would inform emergency responders that a "Unit A" is somewhere within the house structure, but not in the more obvious principal unit, whereas a "Unit B" will be found in a detached building. Suggestions for other possible address identifiers are welcome.
- Although the proposed TEXT AMENDMENT is fairly simple, it involves several pages of changes. For this reason, an ordinance summary is included with this staff report as Attachment C for approval to be published in lieu of the full ordinance.

#### 3.0 PUBLIC HEARING

The duly-noticed public hearing for this proposed zoning code TEXT AMENDMENT was held by the Planning Commission on August 3, 2011; minutes from the public hearing are included with this staff report as Attachment A. After reviewing the proposal, the Planning Commission voted (5–1) to approve the TEXT AMENDMENT. Although no members of the public were present for the public hearing, one person has occasionally

called Planning Division staff to inquire about the status of the proposed amendment because he has an interest in possibly creating an ADU in his home.

#### 4.0 RECOMMENDATION

34

Based on the comments in Sections 2–3 of this report Planning Division staff concurs with the recommendation of the Planning Commission to approve the proposed TEXT AMENDMENT to the Zoning Code.

#### 38 5.0 SUGGESTED ACTION

- Pass an ordinance adopting the proposed amendments to Chapters 1004, 1009, and 1011 of the Zoning Code.
- 41 5.2 By motion, approved the proposed ordinance summary for publication.

Prepared by: Associate Planner Bryan Lloyd (651-792-7073)

Attachments: A. 8/3/2011 public hearing minutes C. Ordinance summary

B. Draft ordinance

#### PROJECT FILE 0017

1

- 2 Request by Roseville City Council for approval of a ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT to allow
- 3 accessory dwelling units in LDR-1 Districts as permitted rather than conditional uses.
- 4 Chair Boerigter opened the Public Hearing at 8:34 p.m.
- 5 Associate Planner Bryan Lloyd highlighted and briefly summarized staff's proposed zoning text
- 6 amendments for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) in LDR-1 Districts as permitted rather than as
- 7 Conditional Uses (CU's). Mr. Lloyd advised that these recommended amendments were based on
- 8 practical application of the existing language with the two (2) applications having already come
- 9 forward; suggesting they be considered as permitted uses with applicable permits for their regulation
- to a higher standard without going through the CU approval process.
- Recommended amendments were included in the packet materials as detailed in the Request for
- Planning Commission Action dated August 3, 2011; and based on the comments of Section 2-3 and
- input received from tonight's public hearing.
- Member Boguszewski advised that his only question was related to Chapter 1011.12, Section B.6.b-d
- as it addressed a maximum occupancy of two (2) people (line 9), noting that the previous language
- used square footage guidelines, and those now seemed to be removed. Member Boguszewski
- questioned the rationale for that change; and why staff was recommending square footage guidelines
- and moving toward occupancy as the limiting number.
- Associate Planner Lloyd advised that the initial thinking had been specifically related to limiting the
- size of ADU's and noted that the size limitation had not been removed, but was addressed in lines 29
- 21 − 30 of the document. However, Mr. Lloyd advised that the 650 square footage was an arbitrary
- number and seemed to staff to be more moderate than a one-bedroom unit, and addressed the intent
- 23 to keep the ADU's smaller in size in order to limit the number of people without having to actually
- count how many people were residing in an ADU. Upon receipt of the two (2) applications to-date,
- staff found that one of those spaces applying for an ADU was already larger than the 650 square foot
- limit; and raised questions of how to limit the number of people at any one house; and make the
- 27 requirements be more explicit for that intent while allowing for some size limit.
- 28 Chair Boerigter questioned why the 650 square feet only addressed living area and why storage space
- 29 was excluded.
- 30 Associate Planner Lloyd advised that, while a more simple approach could be used to quantify the
- allowed unit size, he would recommend making it larger than 650 square feet if storage areas,
- hallways, and the like are to be included in the area figure, given staff's experience with applications
- received to-date. Mr. Lloyd noted that both of those applications had been for existing space above a
- garage, and questioned why a stairway should count against the ADU's living space; or knee-wall
- 35 storage areas that were not livable or usually heated or insulated spaces.
- 36 Chair Boerigter questioned if the applicant made that determination.
- 37 Associate Planner Lloyd advised that, previous to the new Zoning Code being adopted, if an
- applicant called the office and questioned the actual use for living space, it required staff to be aware
- of what was specifically being considered. With the new ordinance in place, Mr. Lloyd advised that it
- 40 was obvious upon staff's receipt of the application.
- Chair Boerigter addressed the revocation section (page 3, line 64) related to occupancy and sought
- clarification on implications for those two (2) applications received to-date. Chair Boerigter sought
- staff's rationale in making the permit expire if the home was sold.

- 44 Associate Planner Lloyd advised that the overall intent was that both units would no longer be
- available as an ADU until they made application for a new ADU Occupancy Permit as detailed. Mr.
- 46 Lloyd advised that the requirement for the ADU permit's expiration when the home was sold was to
- allow the new homeowner to be explicitly aware of what they were required to do, that it was not just
- an automatic ADU without them processing such an application and making it available as an ADU
- again. Mr. Lloyd noted that, obviously, while the ADU's physical space remained in place, it
- 50 couldn't be used as an ADU without following the process and could not legally be rented out. Mr.
- Lloyd noted that this was intended to serve as an educational opportunity for new property owners.
- 52 Member Boguszewski questioned staff's interpretation of the City Council's intent in requesting
- these revisions and what they were trying to achieve with these amendments currently being
- considered. Member Boguszewski questioned if a permit was less time consuming than the CU
- 55 process.
- Associate Planner Lloyd advised that he believed that the intent was to simplify the process for
- achieving an ADU on a property. Mr. Lloyd alluded to conversations among Councilmembers related
- to CU's and ADU's and whether an ADU was more appropriate than an Interim Use permit, at which
- 59 time staff clarified the distinct differences in the two and how the ADU could better achieve the
- 60 intent being desired by the City Council. Mr. Lloyd noted that the ADU permit approval process
- 61 would be handled administratively unless there was an appeal of the administration decision by staff
- to deny an ADU due to a proposed application not being consistent with code requirements. Mr.
- 63 Lloyd advised that the neighbors would be made aware of the permit process.
- Member Boguszewski questioned if the permit fee had been determined at this time and whether it
- would be reasonable.
- Associate Planner Lloyd advised that, at this time, the permit fee was yet undetermined, but that the
- 67 permit form was being developed, and would be determined by staff for presentation with the annual
- 68 fee schedule for review and adoption by the City Council.
- 69 Chair Boerigter asked staff to address the changed setback requirements (lines 38-39).
- Associate Planner Lloyd reviewed various scenarios for an ADU on a primary structure or on an
- attached garage, and advised that, for consistency, staff was recommending that since an ADU would
- be occupied, it be treated differently than setbacks for other accessory structures, such as an
- unoccupied garden shed; and in order to address its proximity to neighboring properties and to retain
- 74 their privacy.
- 75 Member Strohmeier questioned if staff was aware of any other municipalities that allowed ADU's as
- 76 permitted uses.
- Associate Planner Lloyd advised that some cities provided them as CU's and some by permit;
- however, he noted that the norm seemed to be some type of permit process to inform and involve
- neighbors in the process, especially as ADU's became more common as permitted uses in residential
- 80 districts.
- Member Gisselquist questioned the criteria used by staff to determine whether to approve or deny a
- permit; and what type of neighborhood notice was provided, or if approval was based on the
- applicant meeting ordinance requirements and staff approval of the permit without notification of
- 84 neighbors.
- Associate Planner Lloyd advised that the permit process was an administrative process by staff,
- similar to the process for a deviation or minor variance; and provided a series of conditions that must
- be satisfied for approval of a request. If criteria was met, Mr. Lloyd advised that the application was

- approved. Mr. Lloyd noted that the application process would address any contextual problems that
- staff may not be aware of, allowing the neighbors an opportunity to be notified and provide
- comment, as well as allowing the property owner seeking an ADU permit to work with their
- 91 neighbors toward resolution of any issues in advance of issuing the permit. If there were more serious
- 92 problems needing addressed, Mr. Lloyd advised that staff could then deny the permit.
- 93 Chair Boerigter closed the Public Hearing at 8:50 p.m.; no one appeared for or against.
- Member Gisselquist expressed curiosity as to why the City Council was seeking these revisions,
- noting that to-date only two (2) applications had been received and while not minding the process for
- an ADU, he questioned if this revised language would cause more people to apply or make it easier
- 97 when an occasional ADU came forward. Member Gisselquist rhetorically questioned if an ADU
- 98 permit expired for a unit built above a garage, and whether expiration of the permit upon sale of the
- 99 home helped or hurt the resale opportunities and values for a homeowner.
- 100 **MOTION**
- 101 Member Boguszewski moved, seconded by Member Cook to RECOMMEND TO THE CITY
- 102 COUNCIL approval of amendments to Chapters 1004, 1009 (for the deletion of the existing
- 103 CONDITIONAL USE standards) and Chapter 1011 of the City Code; as detailed in the
- 104 Request for Planning Commission Action dated August 3, 2011; and based on the comments in
- 105 Sections 2 and 3 of the report.
- 106 **Ayes: 5**
- 107 Nays: 1 (Gisselquist)
- 108 Motion carried.

### **City of Roseville**

		OR	DINANC	E NO			
DISTRICTS)	, 1009 (PRO	OCEDURE	S), AND 10	11 (PROPE	RTY PERFO	S 1004 (RESIDENT DRMANCE STANI CITY CODE	
THE CITY O	F ROSEVII	LLE ORDA	AINS:				
SECTI accessory dwel		_		•	•	d to allow and regula	ate
SECTI	ION 2. Sect	tion 1004 is	hereby am	ended as fo	llows:		
<b>Table 1004-1</b>				Access	ory building	3	
Minimum rear	yard buildin	g setback			5 feet <sup>b</sup>		
b Accessory buildings containing an Accessory Dwelling Unit shall have the same rear yard setback as required in Table 1004-3 for principal buildings.							
<b>Table 1004-2</b>		LDR-1	LDR-2	MDR	HDR-1/ HDR-2	Standards	
Dwelling unit,	accessory	<del>C</del> P	<b>CNP</b>	PNP	NP	Y	
SECT1 1009.02 Cond	ION 3. Sect		hereby am	ended as fo	llows:		
D. Specif	ic Standar	ds and Cr	iteria:				
<del>1. Ac</del>	cessory Dv	velling Uni	its (ADU):				
<del>a.</del>	— An ADI	<del>J shall be l</del>	ocated on a	1.4	ed by a one f	amily dwelling.	
<del>b.</del>			ocated on a	<del>- 101 occupi</del>	ed by a one i		
	No more	e than one		•	•	g.	
e.			ADU shall	<del>be allowed</del>	•	•	
e. d.	The one A detacl	-family dw	ADU shall relling on the	be allowed ne lot shall ted above a	on a lot. be owner oc detached ga	<del>cupied.</del> wrage of the one-far	
e. d.	The one A detacl	-family dw hed ADU r g or within	ADU shall relling on the may be located a separated	be allowed ne lot shall ted above a	on a lot. be owner oc detached ga	<del>cupied.</del>	
e. d.	The one A detacl dwelling accessor	-family dw hed ADU r g or within ry building	ADU shall relling on the nay be local a separate as.	be allowed ne lot shall ted above a	on a lot. be owner oc detached ga	<del>cupied.</del> wrage of the one-far	
e. d.	The one A detacl dwelling accessor Dimensi	-family dw hed ADU r g or within ry building ional Stand	ADU shall relling on the may be local a separate of se	be allowed ne lot shall ted above a accessory b	on a lot. be owner oc detached ga	<del>cupied.</del> nrage of the one-far ing the standards f	or
e. d. e.	The one A detacl dwelling accessor Dimensi	family dw ned ADU r or within y building ional Stand	ADU shall relling on the nay be located as separate as	be allowed ne lot shall ted above to accessory be	on a lot. be owner och detached grouilding meet	<del>cupied.</del> wrage of the one-far	<del>a</del>
e d e	The one A detacl dwelling accessor Dimensi i. i. I ga ii. ii.	family dw ned ADU r or within y building ional Stand Maximum rage: 30 fe Maximum	ADU shall relling on the may be local a separate is separate is separate is separate is separate is separate is the ight of a et (as typical unit size: 7	be allowed ted above accessory be detached A ally measur	on a lot. be owner och detached grouilding meet	cupied.  brage of the one-far- ing the standards for the standards	<del>a</del>

for accessory buildings.

28

29 30	f. The entryway to a detached ADU shall be connected to a street frontage with a paved walkway.
31 32	g. The appearance or character of the principal building shall not be significantly altered so that its appearance is no longer that of a one-family dwelling.
33	h. Design Standards for Detached ADUs:
34 35	i. Material: The exterior finish material shall match in type, size, and placement, the exterior finish material of the principal dwelling unit.
36 37	ii. Roof pitch: The roof pitch shall match the predominant roof pitch of the principal dwelling unit.
38 39	iii. Details: Trim shall match the trim used on the principal dwelling unit.  Projecting eaves shall match those of the principal dwelling unit.
40 41 42	iv. Windows: Windows shall match those in the principal dwelling unit in proportion (relationship of width to height) and orientation (horizontal or vertical).
43	2.1. Animal Boarding, Animal Day Care, Kennel
44	3.2. Bank, Financial Institution
45	4.3. Bed and Breakfast Establishment
46	5.4. Building Height Increase
47	6.5. Caretakers Dwelling
48	7.6. College, Post-secondary School
49	8.7. Communications Equipment - Shortwave Radio and TV Antennas
50	9-8. Community Residential Facility, State Licensed, Serving 7-16 Persons
51	10.9. Day Care Center
52	11.10. Day Care Facility, Group Family
53	<del>12.</del> 11. Dormitory
54	13.12. Drive-through Facilities
55 56	44.13. Garden, Public or Community (flower or vegetable), greater than 10,000 square feet
57	15.14. Grocery Store
58	16.15. Health Club, Fitness Center
59	<del>17.</del> 16. Hospital
60	18.17. Learning Studio
61	19.18. Liquor Store
62	20.19. Live-work Unit
63	21.20. Maintenance Facility
64	22.21. Manufactured Home Park
65	23.22. Manufacturing and Processing, Outdoor Activities/Storage

66	24.23. Motor Fuel Sales, Motor Vehicle Repair, Body Shop
67	25.24. Motor Vehicle Rental/Leasing
68	26.25. Motor Vehicle Dealer
69	27.26. Multi-family, Dwellings with 8 or more Units per Building
70	28.27. Nursing Home/Assisted Living Facility
71	29.28. Off-site Parking
72	30.29. One-family Attached Dwelling (townhome, rowhouse)
73	31.30. Park and Ride Facility
74	32.31. Pawn Shop
75	33.32. Place of Assembly
76	34-33. Renewable Energy Systems
77	35.34. Transit Center
78	SECTION 4. Section 1011 is hereby amended as follows:
79	1011.12 Additional Requirements for Specific Uses in All Districts
80	B. Residential Uses, Accessory:
81	1. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU):
82	a. An ADU shall be located on a lot occupied by a one-family dwelling.
83	b. No more than one ADU shall be allowed on a lot.
84	c. The one-family dwelling on the lotEither the principal dwelling unit or the
85 86	ADU shall be owner-occupied and both dwelling units shall be under unified ownership.
87	d. Maximum occupancy of an ADU shall be limited to 2 people.
88	e.e. An ADU shall be assigned a unique address identifier to differentiate it
89	from the principal dwelling. An attached ADU shall be identified by "Unit
90	A" and a detached ADU shall be identified by "Unit B" following the primary property address (e.g., 1234 Elm Street Unit B).
91	
92 93	f. A detached ADU may be located above a detached garage of the one family dwelling or within a separate accessory building meeting the standards for
94	accessory buildings established in §1004.02 of this Title.
95	d.g. A property shall have a minimum of 1 additional, conforming, off-street
96 97	vehicle parking space above and beyond the number of parking spaces required for the principal dwelling unit in the zoning district.
98	h. Home Occupations: Home occupations are permitted in ADUs, provided
99	that the combined impacts of home occupations in the ADU and the
00	principal dwelling unit conform to the standards and limitations established in §1011.12B2 of this Title.

102	e.i.	Dimensional Standards for All ADUs:
103		i. Maximum height of a detached an -ADU, including one built above a
104		garage: shall not exceed 30 feet (as typically measured to mid-point of
105		pitched roof) the standards for principal or accessory buildings, as
106		applicable.
107		ii. Maximum unitUnit size: An ADU shall include at least 300 square feet
108		of living area up to a maximum of 650 square feet of living area, but
109		in no case shall an ADU exceed 75% of the principal dwelling's floor
110		four season living area (exclusive of the ADU), up to a maximum size of 600 square feet of living area. For the purposes of this provision, "living
111 112		area" shall include kitchen areas, bathrooms, living rooms, bedrooms
113		(including the closet which defines the bedroom), and other rooms,
114		and shall exclude utility rooms, hallways, entryways, storage areas,
115		and garages.
116		iiii. An ADU shall include a maximum of 1 bedroom.
117		iii.iv. Setback requirements: Attached All ADUs shall meet the standards for
118		principal buildings; notwithstanding this requirement, detached ADUs
119		shall-meet the setback requirements for accessory buildings not be located
120		closer to the front property line than the principal building.
121	£.j.	The entryway to a detached ADU shall be connected to a street frontage with a
122	3-	paved walkway.
123	g.k.	Design Standards for Attached ADUs: The appearance or character of the
124	Ü	principal building shall not be significantly altered so that its appearance is no
125		longer that of a one-family dwelling.
126	<del>h.</del> l.	Design Standards for Detached ADUs:
127		i. <b>Material:</b> The exterior finish material shall match in type, size, and
128		placement, the exterior finish material of the principal dwelling unit.
129		ii. <b>Roof pitch:</b> The roof pitch shall match the predominant roof pitch of the
130		principal dwelling unit.
131		iii. <b>Details:</b> Trim shall match the trim used on the principal dwelling unit.
132		Projecting eaves shall match those of the principal dwelling unit.
133		iv. <b>Windows:</b> Windows shall match those in the principal dwelling unit in
134		proportion (relationship of width to height) and orientation (horizontal or
135		vertical).
136	m.	Permit Required: A lifetime, non-transferrable ADU Occupancy Permit
137		shall be required from the Community Development Department to allow
138		an ADU to be rented. For the purposes of this provision, a "rented" ADU is
139		one that is being occupied by a person or persons other than the family (as
140		defined in §1001.11 of this Title) occupying the principal dwelling unit.
141		Each property owner seeking to rent an ADU, or occupy an ADU while
142		renting the principal dwelling unit, shall apply for a new ADU Occupancy
143		Permit according to the procedure established herein. In addition to
144		receiving an ADU Occupancy Permit, the property shall be in compliance
145		with the City's rental registration requirements.

145

146	1.	Application: The owner of property on which an ADU is proposed
147		shall file a permit application by paying the fee set forth in Chapter
148		314 of this Code and submitting a completed application form and
149		supporting documents as set forth on the application form. The
150		Community Development Department will review the application to
151		determine whether the application is complete and the subject
152		property is eligible to receive the requested ADU permit.
153	ii.	Notification: Upon the determination that a complete application has
154		been submitted and that the property is eligible to receive the
155		requested ADU permit, property owners within a radius of 100 feet
156		shall be notified in writing by the Community Development
157		Department of the application and that they have 7 days in which to
158		share comments or concerns about the application before the
159		Community Development Department issues the permit.
160	iii.	Conditions: The City may impose conditions on the issuance of an
161		ADU permit. Such conditions must be directly related to, and must
162		bear a rough proportionality to, impacts created by the ADU.
163	iv.	Revocation: If a permitted ADU or the property for which an ADU
164	IV.	permit has been issued should fail to meet the requirements of the
165		permit, and/or if a property for which an ADU permit has been issued
166		should become ineligible for such permit, the issued ADU permit may
167		be revoked upon the determination by the Community Development
168		Department that the noncompliance and/or ineligibility issue(s)
169		cannot or have not been resolved. If an ADU permit is revoked,
170		occupation of the ADU by a person or persons other than the family
171		(as defined in §1001.11 of this Title) occupying the principal dwelling
172		unit shall cease within 60 days of the date of the revocation.
		•
173	V.	Appeals: Determinations pertaining to the continuing compliance
174		and/or eligibility of an ADU permit or the property for which an ADU
175		permit has been issued are subject to appeal according to the procedure for appeals of administrative decisions established in
176		Section 1009.08 of this Title.
177		
178	vi.	<b>Expiration:</b> An ADU permit shall expire upon transfer of the property
179		to a new owner. Continued use of an ADU on a property which has
180		been transferred to a new owner shall require the new owner to apply
181		for a new ADU permit.
182	<b>SECTION 5.</b>	<b>Effective Date:</b> This ordinance amendment to the Roseville City Code
183	shall take effect upon	passage and publication.
104	Passed this 10 <sup>th</sup> day o	f Oatobar 2011
184	rassed tills 10 day 0	1 October 2011

## **City of Roseville**

1	ORDINANCE SUMMARY NO
2 3 4	AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SELECTED TEXT OF SECTIONS 1004 (RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS), 1009 (PROCEDURES), AND 1011 (PROPERTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS) OF TITLE 10 "ZONING CODE" OF THE ROSEVILLE CITY CODE
5 6	The following is the official summary of Ordinance No approved by the City Council of Roseville on October 10, 2011:
7	The Roseville City Code, Title 10, Zoning Code, has been amended to allow and regulate accessory dwelling units as permitted uses in the LDR-1 zoning district.
9 0 1 2 3	A printed copy of the ordinance is available for inspection by any person during regular office hours in the office of the City Manager at the Roseville City Hall, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, Minnesota 55113. A copy of the ordinance and summary shall also be posted at the Reference Desk of the Roseville Branch of the Ramsey County Library, 2180 Hamline Avenue North, and on the Internet web page of the City of Roseville ( <a href="www.ci.roseville.mn.us">www.ci.roseville.mn.us</a> ).
	Attest: William J. Malinen, City Manager