

Carla Hoekzema

From: Darrin <darrinmh@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 4:17 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Written Comment re Housing Toolkit Draft for Nov 5 Meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Shoreline. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The current code capping DADU size at 50% of the main dwelling is not equitable and in many cases de-incentivizes the creation of this housing type, which is needed according to the Action Plan.

For example, if an owner has a 1000sq ft home on an 8200 sq ft lot and wanted to build an DADU for aging parents, why should they be forced to cram into a 500 ft ADU just because of the original house size. In this case, if the ADU was built to a more palatable 1000sq ft, it would still be 850 sq ft below the total allowable lot coverage.

What is the reasoning behind this? Especially when it is perfectly acceptable to demolish the main house and build a larger one, or add to the existing, and then be allowed to build a larger DADU? That would push the rent of the DADU higher for the project to be feasible and would negatively affect the most vulnerable population looking to rent this housing type.

Another example regarding equity: A BIPOC 1st time owner buys the same 1000sq ft house as in the previous example and would like to earn in income by building a DADU.

Is it equitable that this person can only reap the market of a 500 sq ft unit when the neighbor can have access to higher rent income just because they happened to purchase a larger house on the same sized lot.

I propose that if Shoreline is genuinely interested in creating this housing type that size restrictions are either based on total lot coverage, or are capped at 1000 sq ft to match Seattle and Kirkland. Those are fair. The current code is not.

Lastly, the elephant in the room that I do not see mentioned in the toolkit is impact fees. Roads, parks, fire dept, etc, these have been used by Shoreline to successfully limit the number of DADU's since 2012. Times have changed (again, refer to the report). If the city is serious about incentivizing this housing type, the fees should be eliminated from this housing type. This cost burden should be carried by professional developers/ multifamily projects.

Thanks for the opportunity to be heard.
Darrin Hyde

Sent from my iPhone