

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT APRIL 20, 2016

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

5.1 Companion Unit Regulations Update

RECOMMENDATION

That the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) review and provide recommendations to the City Council on proposed text amendments to the City's companion unit regulations (Section 36.12.70) and Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee (Section 41.6).

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The Commission's agenda is advertised on Channel 26, and the agenda and this report appear on the City's website. Courtesy notices of this meeting were mailed to the City's Housing Element interested parties list. Staff will send a separate notification of the upcoming City Council meeting regarding this item.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting is to present draft City Code text amendments to the EPC for a formal recommendation to the City Council.

Staff notes that if the companion unit standards are modified, additional companion units could potentially be built in the City. However, the number of potential new companion units is not expected to make a significant contribution to the overall number of housing units in the City or their affordability.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The City Council included a priority goal (for Fiscal Years 2015-16 and 2016-17) to update the City's companion unit regulations as a strategy to increase the number of housing units in the City.

Several City policies support an update to the companion unit regulations; for example, the 2030 General Plan (Policy LUD 3.5) encourages residential

developments serving a broad range of diverse households and incomes. The 2015-2023 Housing Element also includes Program 4.3, to review the companion unit ordinance, and study the options, benefits, and impacts of modifying the ordinance to remove constraints that may limit the construction of companion units. The Housing Element also states that the City will evaluate the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee to determine if the current fee is appropriate for the encouragement of companion unit development, or whether the fee constrains the development of companion units.

State Law

Government Code Section 65852.2, also known as the Second Unit Law, requires that the preparation, adoption, amendment, and implementation of local second-unit ordinances be carried out consistent with Government Code Section 65852.150:

The Legislature finds and declares that second units are a valuable form of housing in California. Second units provide housing for family members, students, the elderly, in-home health care providers, the disabled, and others, at below market prices within existing neighborhoods. Homeowners who create second units benefit from added income, and an increased sense of security.

It is the intent of the Legislature that any second-unit ordinances adopted by local agencies have the effect of providing for the creation of second units and that provisions in these ordinances relating to matters including unit size, parking, fees and other requirements, are not so arbitrary, excessive, or burdensome so as to unreasonably restrict the ability of homeowners to create second units in zones in which they are authorized by local ordinance.

Companion Unit Policy Background in Mountain View

The City's companion unit regulations were last updated in 2003 to be consistent with State law and to further encourage companion unit development (see Exhibit 2 for the City's current companion unit regulations). Since 2003, thirteen (13) companion units have been permitted and eleven (11) have been constructed.

ANALYSIS

In early May 2015, the City began the companion unit ordinance update process to identify the constraints in the current regulations and to study possible modifications to the City's existing regulations while preserving neighborhood character.

Previous City Council and EPC Direction

June 3, 2015 EPC Study Session

At this meeting, staff brought a number of topics to the EPC for consideration and discussed the pros and cons of potential modifications to some of the City's regulations and fees related to companion units. From that discussion, the EPC directed staff to do further research into the following topics:

- Minimum Lot Size
- Parking
- Unit Size
- Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee
- Rent-Restricted Units
- Amnesty Program for Nonpermitted Units

Staff also surveyed second-unit regulations from neighboring cities and provided this information to the EPC (see Exhibit 3).

September 15, 2015 City Council Study Session

At this meeting, staff presented the Council with the information provided to the EPC, as well as information on the topics they requested additional research on. The City Council directed staff to further explore two key topics: (1) reducing the minimum lot size requirement for companion units; and (2) reducing the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee. The City Council supported maintaining all of the other development standards. The City Council also supported reducing the parking requirement to one space per unit and directed staff to study the

possibility of companion units on substandard lots. The results of the study are discussed later in the report.

Public Outreach

Staff conducted two workshops on November 19, 2015 and January 28, 2016 to seek public input on several key topics. The community workshops included a staff presentation, public discussion, and a “poster session” to collect feedback on the key topics (Exhibit 4). The workshops were attended by a total of 30 participants. This included one property owner who had built a companion unit in the City and other property owners who were interested in adding a companion unit on their property. Overall, workshop participants wanted to see a relaxation in the current companion unit regulations and the creation of more affordable housing options in the City.

An online survey was also posted on the City’s website to collect additional community input. The survey included similar questions to those discussed in the two community workshops.

Public Input Summary

Over 100 comments were received covering three major topics through all of the City’s outreach efforts. Residents expressed a wide range of sentiments during the public outreach process. Community members indicated that companion units could provide additional affordable housing opportunities and represent a way to get additional income or support extended families. A majority of the responses (84 percent) indicated that some element of the existing companion unit ordinance should be changed.

Residents who had obtained approval of a companion unit or were exploring the possibility of such a unit requested that more flexibility be provided regarding larger unit sizes and required parking. Regarding the issue of Parkland Dedication In-Lieu fees, most favored a reduced fee that would not place an undue financial burden on the construction of these smaller units. A complete summary of the public outreach feedback received through the outreach efforts is included in Exhibit 5.

The following are key summary points from the public outreach efforts:

- The current companion unit regulations should be more flexible to encourage more companion unit development.

- The minimum lot size requirements for companion units should be reduced.
- The Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee is a costly burden and should be reduced or eliminated.
- The City should consider regulations for rent-restricted companion units.
- The City should adopt regulations regarding Airbnb-type (short-term rental) uses because they impact the availability of affordable housing stock and adversely impact residential neighborhood character.

Key Amendments

In response to community feedback, and City Council and EPC direction, staff has identified the following proposed changes to the existing ordinance. See Exhibit 1 – Attachments A and B for the recommended amendments to the City Code.

1. Minimum Lot Size

Minimum lot size requirements are one of the most significant regulatory requirements that restrict companion unit development. The current code requires a minimum lot size that is 35 percent larger than required by the applicable zone. For example, for an R1-zoned parcel, the minimum lot size required for the zoning district, is 6,000 square feet, and the minimum lot size for a companion unit for that zone would, therefore, be 8,100 square feet. Based on these current regulations, only 1,020 (13 percent) of R1-zoned parcels meet the companion unit minimum lot size requirement.

Substandard Lot Prototype

At the September 2015 Study Session, the City Council directed staff to study companion unit prototypes on substandard lots. A substandard lot is one that does not meet the minimum lot size required by the applicable zoning district. Exhibit 6 shows five companion unit development scenarios on a substandard lot that meets all other development standards (such as setback, unit size, location, floor area ratio (FAR),¹ etc.). It should be noted that the

¹ Floor area ratio (FAR) is the relationship between the amount of floor area on a lot and the size of the lot expressed as a ratio (for example, 0.5:1, or just 0.5). FARs are used in most zoning districts to establish the maximum allowed floor area. In the R1 Zone, FARs range between 0.40 and 0.45.

total floor area in the main house and companion unit together cannot exceed the allowable FAR for the zoning district.

Staff Recommendation: Eliminating the minimum lot size requirement for companion unit development will allow companion unit development on any single-family, residentially zoned property irrespective of the lot size (including substandard lots). Other development standards such as FAR, companion unit size, setbacks, and building height will help regulate new companion unit development to ensure they do not significantly impact existing neighborhood character.

2. **Parking**

The City requires one parking space (covered or uncovered) per bedroom for each companion unit. Most companion units in Mountain View have one bedroom, though it may be possible to have two small bedrooms in a unit.

At the initial June 2015 Study Session, the EPC acknowledged the current on-street parking issues in some residential neighborhoods and suggested that current companion unit parking requirements remain. Initial Council direction (September 2015) supported reducing the parking requirement to one space per unit. It should be noted that this parking requirement is specifically for the companion unit and is separate from the parking required for the primary dwelling unit.

Staff Recommendation: Reduce the parking requirement for a companion unit to one space per unit. Maintain the flexibility for required parking to be covered or uncovered.

3. **Definition of a Companion Unit**

Staff recommends adding the following definition of a “Companion Unit” to City Code Section 36.60.09 to provide greater clarity:

“Companion unit”: A secondary dwelling unit located on the same parcel of land as a primary dwelling unit which meets the requirements and development standards for a companion unit as described in this Chapter. Accessory structures are separately defined in this Chapter.

This definition will help distinguish a companion unit from a primary dwelling unit and other accessory structures. A companion unit is different

from an accessory structure, such as a detached office or garage, as accessory structures cannot be used as a separate dwelling unit and cannot include a kitchen.

4. **Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee**

Staff notes that the EPC, under its purview, can only recommend changes to the Zoning Ordinance, and not to other chapters of the City Code. Staff is, however, seeking EPC comments on the proposed amendment to the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee (City Code Section 41.6), which will be presented to the City Council at a later meeting.

The current Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee requirement adds a significant cost to developing a new companion unit. New companion units pay a Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee to be used for park or recreational purposes. This ranges between \$15,000 and \$30,000 per companion unit.

Park Land Fee Calculation

The formula for calculating park land dedication in-lieu fees is governed by State law (the Quimby Act). Fees are based on the amount of park land required to serve future City growth at a level of three acres per 1,000 residents based on population projections. Persons per dwelling unit (ppdu) is based upon the average number of persons occupying the housing types listed in the most recent U.S. Census. The value of an acre of land is based on the fair market value in the proposed residential development at the time the building permit is pulled.

$$\text{Required Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee} = A \times B \times C$$

Where,

A = the park land dedication acreage required per dwelling unit (DU) within the proposed residential development for park and recreational facilities.

B = the number of net new dwelling units in the proposed residential development.

C = the fair market value per acre of land in the proposed residential development.

The park land dedication acreage requirement (A) is based on the density for each housing type as shown in Table 1 below. A detailed description for calculating park land dedication in-lieu fees can be found in Mountain View City Code Sections 41.6 through 41.9.

Table 1 – Density Table

Dwelling Density	DUs per Acre	Density of Persons per Dwelling Unit	Acreage Requirement per DU within Subdivision
Low	1 to 6	2.7	.0081
Medium-Low	7 to 12	2.3	.0069
Medium	13 to 25	2.0	.0060
Medium-High and High	26+	2.0	.0060
Mobile Homes	7 to 14	1.5	.0045

Based on the current code, staff applies a density of 2.7 ppdu and a 0.0081 acreage requirement per dwelling unit for both a single-family residence and a companion unit, even though a companion unit will most likely house only one or two persons.

A survey of other second-unit ordinances shows that most neighboring cities do not require any additional park land dedication or related in-lieu fee for a companion unit. It should be noted that these cities have other regulations such as minimum lot size requirements which restricts companion unit development.

Reducing the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee would reduce a significant barrier to new companion unit development. It would also reduce the amount of Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee generated with new companion unit construction. Staff presents two options for EPC consideration.

Staff Recommendation: Provide comments on a preferred option of the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee for companion units.

Option A: Reduce the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee for companion units to 45 percent of the fee applicable to a new single-family home. This would align the density consideration for companion units with a mobile home (1.5 ppdu) which is already established in the density table (refer to Table 1). This recommendation reflects the limited occupancy characteristics of companion units which would not have a significant impact on park resources.

Option B: Alternatively, the City could eliminate the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee requirement entirely for companion units.

Fiscal Impact of Option A and Option B:

Option A yields a Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee in the range of \$6,750 to \$13,500 (2016) per unit. Assuming that the number of companion units developed over the next 10 years is doubled (approximately 30 units), Option A would yield \$405,000 based on the maximum per unit in Park Land Dedication In-Lieu fees compared to no revenues with Option B. To provide the EPC with some context, a total of \$4,650,000 in Park Land Dedication In-Lieu fees was collected for a recently approved 150-unit apartment project (2015).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Adoption of revisions to a second-unit ordinance to implement the provisions of the Government Code is an action that is statutorily exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Section 15282(h)).

NEXT STEPS

Following a recommendation from the EPC, the item will be scheduled for a City Council public hearing in June 2016 for consideration of the adoption of new companion unit regulations.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends the EPC recommend that the City Council adopt an ordinance to amend the Zoning Code Section 36.12.70 Companion Unit Development Standards as per Resolution _____.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend not adopting the proposed text amendments.
2. Modify the proposed text amendments for Council consideration.

Prepared by:

Diana Pancholi
Assistant Planner

Martin Alkire
Principal Planner

DP-MA/7/CDD
807-04-20-16SR-E

Approved by:

Terry Blount
Assistant Community Development
Director / Planning Manager

- Exhibits:
1. Resolution for EPC Recommendation
 2. Proposed Companion Unit Development Standards
 3. Summary of Research on Other Second-Unit Ordinances
 4. Community Outreach Posters
 5. Community Outreach Survey Summary
 6. Substandard Lot Prototypes