

Open House Public Comments On Proposed Amendments to the Springfield Development Code to Encourage ADUs

The Open House was held on September 28, 2017 from 4-7 pm in the Library Meeting Room at City Hall. Thirty-five people signed in (excluding staff). The following comments are compiled from sticky notes placed on a poster of proposed code amendments and from comment forms.

What positive opportunities do you see from the proposed code amendments?

- The obvious - incentive to add more affordable housing without expanding into open land and forests.
- More interesting, creative homes NOT designed en masse by a developer.
- Increased housing
- More affordable housing
- Housing that requires/uses fewer resources, including less drain on the grid
- Potential for seniors to live in their homes longer
- The young being housed without going into debt
- Potential to shift from a life focused on accumulation of stuff to a life focused on community (less space = less stuff)
- Affordable housing for owner
- Affordable housing for renters
- Muy buena idea para ayudar a familias de pocos recursos. Translation: Very good idea to help low income families.
- Yes to all proposed changes. All are barriers to entry.
- Yes to allowing an existing smaller dwelling to become an ADU. Wonderful.
- Yes, allow ADUs in the Washburne Historic District.
- Same opportunity for historic district
- I love removing min. size requirement.
- Yes, remove the minimum size requirement. Yes, Definitely! Absolutely! Wonderful!
- Yes, remove the ratio requirement while keeping the max size of 750 sq. ft.
- I love entrance flexibility.
- Yes, allow more flexibility in the location of the entry door.
- I love allowing unpaved or on-street parking.
- Yes, yes, waive the on-site parking requirement if on-street parking available.
- Yes, allow an unpaved parking space.
- Yes, remove the requirement for the property owner to live on site. It's important to me to be able to leave my property to travel . . . and at the same time know that someone is there to keep an eye on things. I don't want to be restricted just because of a 2nd unit.
- I love increasing options for design standards.
- Yes, yes! Allow more options for meeting design standards.
- Allowing more options for meeting design standards is especially important for steeply sloped lots ($\geq 8\%$ diagonal) and riverside lots, where the best building style for one section of the lot may not be the best for another section.
- Yes! (and again yes!) for allowing manufactured homes and approved towable structures.

What concerns do you have about the proposed code amendments?

- None
- I do not agree with accepting mobile homes (cheap construction, always ugly, doesn't promote local business & construction)
- ? on manufactured homes and approved towable structures
- I do not agree with non-owner occupied (promotes people flipping houses, focused on money not quality, encourages wealthy to buy up available good family homes and charge more than necessary)
- I think it best to keep the requirement to live on site.
- Make the max. size 750 sq. ft. or 10% of lot size, whichever is greater.
- I support the proposed amendments and applaud the city for taking these steps to allow people to live in smaller, more affordable ways! My concern has to do with the process of hearing everyone's ideas – my hope is that all concerns will be heard/considered, rather than the loudest voice or the voice with the most money being valued over others.

What else would you like the City to know regarding ADUs?

- Thank you! Great idea & incentive to do something I was already considering.
- Please consider tiny house villages (similar to mobile home park with multiple units, but different in layout where units are circled around a common space and resources are shared.)
- It seems people are afraid of their neighborhood changing; I think that it's important to keep in mind that given the current housing shortage, things WILL have to change.
- Way to go!