
**CITY OF TEMPE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION**

Meeting Date: 01/09/2018
Agenda Item: 8

ACTION: Request for a Code Text Amendment for ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (PL170425) consisting of changes for accessory dwellings and amendments to the guest quarters regulations found in Section 3-402 and 3-411. The applicant is the City of Tempe.

FISCAL IMPACT: There is no fiscal impact on City funds.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve, subject to conditions

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (PL170425) consists of changes within the Zoning and Development Code that would allow a property, already zoned for additional dwelling units, to add an accessory dwelling that is not a typical multi-family (apartment) product, smaller in scale, and consistent with parameters of the district. The accessory dwelling unit provisions would allow a more streamlined process. This effort was directed out of the "Incentives to Limit R-3 Development" City Council Work Study Session. Additionally, this ordinance proposes expansion of the current Guest Quarters regulations, allowing such use from a minimum 15,000 sf. to a minimum 10,000 sf. lot size. The request includes the following:

1. Code Text Amendment within the Zoning and Development Code, adding new language in Section 3-402 and amending Sections 3-401 and 3-411.

ATTACHMENTS: Ordinance, Project File

STAFF CONTACT(S): Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director (480) 858-2393

Department Director: Chad Weaver, Community Development Director

Legal review by: N/A

Prepared by: Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director

Reviewed by: Chad Weaver, Community Development Director

COMMENTS:

Upon review with the City Manager's Humble Homes/Tiny Homes Working Group and further direction from the City Council on October 19, 2017, the Community Development Department staff has prepared a comprehensive report for new regulations pertaining to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and amended regulations regarding existing Guest Quarters provisions.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

ADU regulations would allow dwellings as an alternative means to satisfy residential housing demands in a less impactful way than traditional multi-family development. Standards and procedures are developed to streamline the process and encourage a secondary dwelling for Multi-Family zoned properties with an existing single-family use. An accessory dwelling (600 sf. or less) would still retain the property as a single-family use, thus granting relief from certain multi-family regulations. Accessory Dwelling Units or Tiny Homes can provide residences with an alternate housing style that is more affordable in an environment with rising housing costs. A smaller unit size can assist in minimizing the impacts of redevelopment demand on the established housing stock, while maintaining the standards of eligible neighborhoods that have a combination of single-family, duplexes, apartments and accessory dwellings today.

The intent of the proposed amendment is to provide the following:

- An ADU would be allowed as a secondary dwelling for multi-family zoned properties with one existing dwelling (single-family use)
- The property would still be deemed a "single-family residence", allowing a streamlined process with no required design review and no multi-family regulations imposed (reviewed the same as single-family). Submittals would apply for building permits and comply with the ADU provisions.
- Offers an alternative way to reinvest in your property with an accessory dwelling of up to 600 square feet of livable space, while maintaining the existing dwelling on the property.
- An ADU building must still comply with zoning setbacks and height requirements, etc.
- An ADU may be used as a mother-in-law unit, guest home, supplemental rental, multigenerational house, a tiny house designed model, or a downsizing option (owner live in the smaller home, rent out the main residence).
- As a single-family residence property, ADU's may be eligible for the [Residential Rebate Program](#)

As a reference, attached are maps of significant areas in Tempe where the proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance may apply with an existing single-family use (properties zoned R-2, R-3R, R-3, R-4 and R-5). For all potential zoning areas refer to the [City's Zoning District map](#).

Guest Quarters

In addition to the ADU regulations, City Council requested further exploration into expanding the guest quarters regulations in Tempe. Historically, guest quarters in Tempe were originally allowed in AG, Agricultural zoned properties, having a minimum lot size of 1 acre (or 43,560 sf.). In 2005, when the new Zoning and Development Code was introduced, new sections were prepared for both accessory dwellings and guest quarters. The Code was adopted with the respective sections reserved for future considerations. As a result, no single-family property was eligible to permit guest quarters until regulations were re-introduced and adopted October 22, 2009, under Section 3-411, Guest Quarters. The city at the time evaluated minimum lot sizes of 10,000, 12,000 and 15,000 sf. in area. The ordinance was approved, requiring a minimum lot size of 15,000 sf. for guest quarters, but noted there may be an opportunity in the future to explore expansion if appropriate. The main difference for guest quarters, from being considered an accessory dwelling unit, is that the guest quarters is prohibited from being rented independently from the main residence, as well as no separate metering or addressing. Its intended to house guests of the main residence.

Staff has prepared a mapping analysis of Single-Family zoned properties in Tempe based on the three property sizes. The proposed ordinance amendment for Guest Quarters recommends expanding the use to properties having a minimum 10,000 sf. lot size. The amended regulation also addresses a prior zoning interpretation that allowed a lot to also calculate half of an adjacent public alley in order to meet the area requirement. The regulation now defines the lot as being the "net site area", which by Code definition excludes in right-of-way or public alley from the calculation.

Below is a comparison of the number of parcels eligible for Guest Quarters, based on a minimum lot size:

Parcels > 15,000 sf. – 2,196

Parcels > 12,000 sf. – 3,731

Parcels > 10,000 sf. – 6,595

There is a total of 31,360+ parcels in Tempe with single-family residential zoning. Since the original ordinance was adopted (October 22, 2009) under Section 3-411, Guest Quarters, the City has permitted a total of nine (9) structures classified under the current provisions. The proposed amendment (min. 10,000 sf. Lot) would allow an additional 4,399 parcels to be eligible to seek future permits, or approximately 21% of the total properties.

PUBLIC INPUT

The ordinance proposal for ADUs culminated from a yearlong process consisting of five public meetings, including two with the City Council, Neighborhood Advisory Commission, and the Development Review Commission. Multiple meetings were also held with the City Manager's Humble Homes/Tiny Homes Working Group. Please refer to the History & Facts section of this report for dates. The city also initiated a one week online Tempe Forum to review and respond to the draft ADU concept, draft regulations, a survey, view areas of eligibility, and an opportunity to provide comments. Refer to attachments 7-22 for results and comments. While there were certainly two viewpoints expressed in the public feedback and comments, most of the responses in the survey supported the concept intent and draft proposal. Surprisingly, the survey response also supported the idea of ADU regulations in single-family zoning properties as well. Although this ordinance draft does not contemplate such a change, most cities that have adopted an ADU concept typically allow accessory dwellings within certain single-family zoned properties. Additional public involvement and a different set of regulations would be necessary to pursue this subject any further.

Below are responses to Frequently Asked Questions received during the public input process:

- What is the typical size for ADU's?
The unit will first need to comply with the Residential Housing Code. Units meeting the minimum living area may have a unit as small as 145 sf. The proposed draft ordinance allows a maximum area of up to 600 sf. of livable space (excluding garages).
- Is an owner required to reside on the premises? Could both the main home and the ADU be rented out separately?
There is currently no owner occupancy requirement. The ADU concept is being presented within the Multi-Family zoning districts, where typically a unit or units are rented. Bottom line, the main residence or the ADU can be rented separately. This would be allowed today.
- Could each bedroom in each dwelling unit be rented separately? How many bedrooms are allowed in a single-family property? How many cars are allowed for a single-family property?
There are no limitations in single-family or multi-family zoning that would prevent someone from renting a bedroom out of their residence. Similarly, the State of Arizona has allowed the use of Air BNB home or short-term rentals. Currently, there are no limitations on the total number of bedrooms within a single-family or multi-family unit. After further consideration, the draft ordinance has been amended to limit the total number of bedrooms within an ADU. A single-family property requires at least two parking spaces, if constructed after 1976 (1 vehicle space prior to 1976). There is no maximum. The proposed draft ADU ordinance is not requiring additional parking and is leaving it up to the property requesting an ADU whether more parking necessary.

- Could the two units have separate water and other utility meters? Or do they have to share one?
The ADU could have separate water and utilities metered independent from the main residence, as well as a separate mailing address.
- Currently parking is only allowed adjacent to the driveway or within a garage. Any changes?
There are no changes proposed to the parking designs if proposed. The City Code will continue to limit no more than 35% of the front yard to be used for improved parking surface in single-family.
- What is the difference between a TINY Home, a camper and a mobile home?
A Tiny Home is typically known as a small and transportable home built on platform or chassis. There are many more variations of tiny homes, which by nature are identified by their size and ability to house someone in a smaller living environment. By definition in the Zoning and Development Code, a Tiny Home on wheels would be defined as a mobile home unit or recreational vehicle, and are subject to separate standards. Because those categories have different classifications for zoning and building Codes not allowed in most other residential districts, the ADU draft ordinance requires any Tiny Home to have the suspension/axle components removed and placed on a permanent foundation with city utility connections.
- If my property is not eligible for an Accessory Dwelling Unit, what options do I have?
If you have a single-family property you may be eligible to build a Guest Quarters; which is an attached or detached building used to house guests of the occupants of the main building, not rented or leased independently from the main building. Guest Quarters currently only allowed in Single-Family districts with a minimum 15,000 square feet lot. This proposed draft ordinance is recommending lowering the lot size to 10,000 square fee.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:

Based on the information and analysis prepared, staff recommends approval of the code text amendment ordinance, allowing accessory dwellings in multi-family zoned districts, and expanding the guest quarters regulations. This ordinance supports the General Plan 2040 goals and strategies, including the following:

- Under the GP2040 Neighborhood Preservation and Revitalization Element, NP3(6), *Allow for flexibility in house-types and configurations, as well as infill (cottage houses, accessory dwelling units, etc.).*
- Under the GP2040 Redevelopment Element, RED1(2), *Encourage affordable housing initiatives in redevelopment planning.*
- Under the GP2040 Housing Element, H1(2), *Encourage diversity of housing type (such as accessory dwelling units, dormitories, condominiums, townhouses, apartments and single-family houses) to provide residents with product choice; and H6, Increase affordable rental housing and rehabilitation of existing rental housing.*

HISTORY & FACTS:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| January 5, 2005 | City Council adopted the Zoning and Development Code (Ordinance No. 2003.36) which included reserved sections for Accessory Dwellings (Sec. 3-402) and Guest Quarters (Sec. 3-411). Public input at the time was not comfortable with initial proposed regulations for their respective sections. |
| October 22, 2009 | City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2009.15, which included new regulations allowing guest quarters in single-family districts with a minimum 15,000 sf. lot size. |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| January 5, 2017 | City Council Issue Review Session, staff presented a requested topic on "Incentives to Limit R-3 Zoning Development", which included the concept of developing Accessory Dwelling regulations. From this meeting Council provided direction to work with the Humble Homes Working Group to develop an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance, in order to combat the concerns of redevelopment pressure of multi-family zoned properties that have a single-family use |
| August 5, 2017 | Neighborhood Advisory Commission, staff presented proposed ADU concepts and received general questions and input. The Commission suggested seeking additional outreach and community feedback with the Tempe Forum and other social media means. |
| Sept. 5-12, 2017 | Staff conducted a one week online survey that included some information about the ADU concept, a revised draft ordinance, maps of areas that may be eligible for an accessory dwelling, and a questionnaire. Attached are the results and cumulative feedback. |
| October 3, 2017 | Neighborhood Advisory Commission, staff presented the online survey results and received additional feedback from the Commission. No specific recommendation was provided. |
| October 19, 2017 | City Council Work Study Session, staff presented the research/survey and received direction from Mayor and Council to proceed with the hearing process for the proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance, as well as explore extending the Guest Quarters regulations for eligible properties. |
| November 14, 2017 | Development Review Commission Study Session, staff presented the City Manager's Working Group background on ADUs and the draft ordinance prepared at the time. |
| January 9, 2018 | Development Review Commission public hearing for this request. |
| February 8, 2018 | City Council Introduction and first public hearing for this request. |
| February 22, 2018 | City Council second and final public hearing for this request. |
| March 24, 2018 | Proposed ordinance effective date, if adopted. |

ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE REFERENCE:

Section 6-304, Zoning Map Amendments and Code Text Amendments

ORDINANCE NO. O2018.xx

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMPE, ARIZONA, AMENDING THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, PART 3 – LAND USE, SECTIONS 3-401 AND 3-402, PERTAINING TO SPECIAL STANDARDS FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS, AND SECTION 3-411, GUEST QUARTERS.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMPE, ARIZONA, as follows:

SECTION 1. That Section 3-401 subsection (C)(1) of the Zoning and Development Code, pertaining to accessory buildings, is hereby amended to read as follows:

C. Accessory Building. Buildings that exceed two hundred (200) s.f. in area or eight (8) feet in height are *accessory buildings* (e.g., freestanding garages, large sheds, workshops, etc.). Such buildings are permitted ~~in the~~ FOR *single-family* residential USES ~~districts~~, subject to the following:

1. Use. *Accessory buildings* ~~shall not~~ MAY be used as a *dwelling*, ~~except~~ where permitted as *guest quarters*, PURSUANT TO SECTION 3-411, AND ACCESSORY DWELLINGS, PURSUANT TO SECTION 3-402.

SECTION 2. That Section 3-402 of the Zoning and Development Code, pertaining to accessory dwellings, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 3-402 Accessory Dwellings. ~~{reserved}~~

ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS ARE DESIGNED TO ALLOW A SECONDARY DWELLING, THAT MAY BE RENTED OR LEASED INDEPENDENTLY FROM THE MAIN RESIDENCE, WHICH PROVIDES A SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPTION WHILE ENSURING THAT THE PROPERTY REMAINS COMPATIBLE WITH THE SCALE OF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

A. APPLICABILITY. ACCESSORY DWELLINGS ARE PERMITTED IN MULTI-FAMILY DISTRICTS WHEN A PROPERTY CONTAINS AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, SUBJECT TO THE STANDARDS LISTED BELOW.

B. FLOOR AREA.

1. THE FLOOR AREA OF AN ACCESSORY DWELLING SHALL NOT EXCEED SIX HUNDRED (600) SQUARE FEET OF LIVABLE FLOOR AREA. SAFETY STANDARDS AND MINIMUM FLOOR AREAS OF AN ACCESSORY DWELLING SHALL COMPLY WITH THE CITY OF TEMPE'S ADOPTED RESIDENTIAL BUILDING CODE AND AMENDMENTS.
2. AN EXPANSION OF AN ACCESSORY DWELLING TO A SIZE EXCEEDING THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE LIVABLE FLOOR AREA, THEN SUCH UNIT SHALL NO LONGER BE CONSIDERED AN ACCESSORY DWELLING AND SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE STANDARDS OF A MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT.

C. DENSITY.

1. A MAXIMUM OF ONE (1) ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT IS ALLOWED ON A LOT IN A MULTI-FAMILY DISTRICT CONTAINING AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING. AN ACCESSORY DWELLING IS NOT DEEMED A SECOND DWELLING, OR MULTI-FAMILY UNIT, WHEN DETERMINING MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DENSITY.
2. AN ACCESSORY DWELLING WILL BE COUNTED TOWARD THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DENSITY OF THE ZONING DISTRICT WHEN THE FOLLOWING OCCURS:
 - A. ANOTHER DWELLING UNIT IS PROPOSED IN ADDITION TO THE ACCESSORY DWELLING AND MAIN RESIDENCE DWELLING ON THE LOT;
OR
 - B. THE ACCESSORY DWELLING EXPANDS BEYOND THE ALLOWABLE AREA OR STANDARDS DESCRIBED IN SECTION 3-402.

D. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

1. NO ADDITIONAL VEHICLE PARKING IS REQUIRED FOR AN ACCESSORY DWELLING.
2. NO MORE THAN TWO BEDROOMS ARE ALLOWED WITHIN AN ACCESSORY DWELLING.
3. WHEN ATTACHED TO THE MAIN RESIDENCE THE ACCESSORY DWELLING SHALL COMPLY WITH THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SETBACK, BUILDING HEIGHT, AND LOT COVERAGE STANDARDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 4-202.
4. WHEN DETACHED FROM THE MAIN RESIDENCE THE ACCESSORY DWELLING SHALL COMPLY WITH THE STANDARDS FOR ACCESSORY BUILDINGS, PURSUANT TO SECTION 3-401.

5. A PROPERTY CONTAINING AN ACCESSORY DWELLING SHALL RETAIN ITS SINGLE-FAMILY USE STATUS. AS A RESULT, ACCESSORY DWELLINGS ARE EXCLUDED FROM THE MULTI-FAMILY USE REGULATIONS FOUND IN PART 4, CHAPTER 4, BUILDING DESIGN; CHAPTER 6, PARKING; CHAPTER 7, LANDSCAPE AND WALLS; CHAPTER 8, LIGHTING; AND SECTION 6-306, DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW.

E. INFRASTRUCTURE.

1. CONNECTION TO SEWER, WATER AND UTILITY SERVICES SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE ACCESSORY DWELLING IN CONFORMANCE WITH CITY STANDARDS.
2. THE ACCESSORY DWELLING SHALL PROVIDE A COMPLETE BATHROOM INCLUDING SHOWER/TUB, TOILET AND SINK, AND COOKING FACILITIES WITHIN THE UNIT.
3. TINY HOUSES ON TRAILERS ARE ALLOWED AS AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT WHEN THE SUSPENSION/AXLE COMPONENTS HAVE BEEN REMOVED AND THE CHASSIS PERMANENTLY ATTACHED ON AN APPROVED FOUNDATION.

SECTION 3. That Section 3-411 of the Zoning and Development Code, pertaining to guest quarters, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 3-411 Guest Quarters.

A. Applicability. *Guest quarters* are permitted in single-family residential districts ON A LOT/PARCEL having a minimum NET SITE AREA ~~lot size of 15,000~~ 10,000 square feet, subject to the following standards:

1. Only one *guest quarters* is permitted on a single lot;
2. The *gross floor area* shall be no greater than fifty (50) percent of the *main building's gross floor area* at or above grade;
3. An *attached building* shall comply with the development standards set forth in Table 4-202A;
4. *Guest quarters* detached from the *main building* shall comply with the *accessory building* standards set forth in Section 3-401;
5. There shall be no separate metering for utility services and no separate mailing address; and
6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a real covenant shall be recorded with the land restricting the use of the guest quarters from being rented or leased. The City of Tempe shall be parties to such covenant and shall be binding to all subsequent owners.

SECTION 4. Pursuant to City Charter, Section 2.12, ordinances are effective thirty (30) days after adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMPE, ARIZONA, this _____ day of _____, 2018.

Mark W. Mitchell, Mayor

ATTEST:

Brigitta M. Kuiper, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Judith R. Baumann, City Attorney



PROJECT FILE

for


ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (PL170425)

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1-3. Parcel Size Maps for Guest Quarters Analysis
- 4-6. Example of Area Maps Potentially Eligible for ADUs
- 7-8. Online Public Input Summary & Survey Results
- 9-22. Online Public Comments from Survey (Sept. 5 - 12, 2017)

Residential Parcels Larger Than 10,000 Square Feet

Note: Parcels identified include AG
and R1 zoned properties



ATTACHMENT 1




north



Residential Parcels Larger Than 12,000 Square Feet

Note: Parcels identified include AG
and R1 zoned properties




ATTACHMENT 2

0 1 2 miles

Residential Parcels Larger Than 15,000 Square Feet

Note: Parcels identified include AG
and R1 zoned properties




ATTACHMENT 3




north




AREA IN TEMPE POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE UNDER THE DRAFT ADU ORDINANCE



AREA IN TEMPE POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE UNDER THE DRAFT ADU ORDINANCE



AREA IN TEMPE POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE UNDER THE DRAFT ADU ORDINANCE





PROPOSED ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT RE: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUS) PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

Overview

The following information was posted on Tempe Forum along with a 5 question survey. The opportunity to comment was also posted on the city's Facebook and Nextdoor pages.

A Tempe City Council working group is currently collecting feedback about a proposed amendment to the Zoning and Development Code that would allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) to be built on Multi-Family zoned properties with an existing single-family use.

This is one strategy being explored to help address and mitigate the concerns of development pressure on these types of properties, provide an alternate housing style and address affordable housing needs.

The intent of the proposed amendment is to provide the following:

- *An ADU would be allowed as a secondary dwelling for multi-family properties with one existing dwelling (single-family use)*
- *The property would still be deemed a "single-family residence", allowing a streamlined process with no design review and no multi-family regulations imposed (same as single-family). Submittals would apply for building permits and meet the ADU parameters.*
- *Offers an alternative way to reinvest in your property with an accessory dwelling of up to 600 square feet of livable space, while maintaining the existing dwelling on the property.*
- *An ADU building must still comply with zoning setbacks and height requirements.*
- *An ADU may be a supplemental rental, multigenerational house, a tiny house design, or a downsizing option (live in the smaller home, rent out the main residence).*
- *As a single-family residence property, ADU's are eligible for the [Residential Rebate Program](#)*

As a reference, attached are maps of significant areas in Tempe where the proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance may apply with an existing single-family use (properties zoned R-2, R-3R, R-3, R-4 and R-5). For all zoning areas refer to the [City's Zoning District map](#).

As of September 13, 2017, 9:57 AM, the forum had:

Attendees: 195

All Responses: 72

Hours of Public Comment: 3.6

This topic started on September 5, 2017, 10:56 AM.

This topic ended on September 12, 2017, 11:59 PM.

Attachments:

1. Survey Results
2. Facebook Comments
3. Nextdoor Comments

Attachment 1 - Survey Results

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)



Proposed Zoning and Development Code Amendment re: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Responses




Do you support the proposed draft ordinance?

| | | % | Count |
|----------|---|-------|-------|
| Yes |  | 47.2% | 34 |
| No |  | 38.9% | 28 |
| Not sure |  | 13.9% | 10 |



For future consideration, would you like to see ADUs in Multi-Family zoning only, or within Single-Family zoning as well?

| | | % | Count |
|-------------------|---|-------|-------|
| Multi-family Only |  | 33.8% | 23 |
| Both |  | 44.1% | 30 |
| Not sure |  | 22.1% | 15 |

With the increase in housing costs, are you interested in having other housing options in your city?

| | | % | Count |
|----------|---|-------|-------|
| Yes |  | 46.5% | 33 |
| No |  | 40.8% | 29 |
| Not sure |  | 12.7% | 9 |

Do you feel ADUs would provide an alternative to redeveloping an existing home?

| | | % | Count |
|----------|---|-------|-------|
| Yes |  | 53.5% | 38 |
| No |  | 38.0% | 27 |
| Not sure |  | 8.5% | 6 |

Additional Comments

Yes responses to “Do you support the proposed draft ordinance?”

1. Only when multigenerational is considered and not a rental for purely rental income. Setbacks should vary between single and multi-family zones. Multigenerational should allow building connection such as breezeway or courtyard
2. We think this is a wonderful consideration. Thank you for putting this together.
3. Please approve
4. I live in South Tempe on a lot that is almost 2 acres. We have several neighborhoods in South Tempe that have acreage and this would be a nice option for us. With the economy and high home and rental prices, it would be great to be able to build a small ADU for an aging parent or grown child that is still saving for a home of their own.
5. To add an ADU to single-family zoning, you need to consider reasonable setbacks and a minimum square footage for the lot. Our side of the 700 block of W 11th, for example, has tiny back yards, as the property was developed with 3 tiers of housing between Howe and 11th. So small lots like ours would not be appropriate for an ADU. I can see social uses for this change: two generations of a family could live on the same lot, or someone could supplement retirement income by adding a student. This is from my viewpoint, as an elder.
6. I love tiny houses! I follow several blogs on the subject. They provide a great alternative. Tiny houses are good for the people that can adapt to them; they are good for the environment with the tiny foot print. Properly planned they are a wonderful addition to our city. Granted they are not for everyone. But most people can downsize and an in between less extreme reduction. Also when completed with thought they can be as positive force in the community. It is very disheartening to see soon many that have closed minds. But lately I have become more use to these reactionaries. But not pleased. I am tired of 30% if population making life miserable for the majority. I want Tempe to be a progressive city!!!
7. The suburban aspect that drew me to continue to reside in my native North Tempe neighborhood is becoming a congested cityscape of transient residents who seem disconnected from neighborly conduct. Additionally, contrary to the belief that residents near light rail do not have personal cars is false. Visiting friends and relatives in surrounding cities, local farms, and taking road trips as well as handling errands in triple digit heat necessitate a vehicle, thus, parking is an issue. Furthermore, affordable housing in Tempe is non-existent.
8. I think this is a great idea. This may provide for more opportunities for "eyes on the street" or "eyes on the alley" as well, which could help to improve safety in our neighborhoods. It makes a lot of sense, and it's great for the homeowner to have some flexibility with their property.
9. I think allowing more flexible use of existing space will help increase housing availability and housing density. It should increase property values and therefore, increase with property taxes and rental sales tax receipts. It is also in accordance with the idea that people should have more freedom to do what they want with their own private property in the current case where the net externalities should be positive for the people of Tempe.
10. Let's give our families the opportunity to stay together and help each other in times of need. Any issues that may follow, we can address them together.
11. I have a 9,000 sq. foot lot with a 1450 sq. foot home; would love to add an ADU for my parents as they are aging and need more care.
12. I feel it would be a great option if single family home owners could add a small unit for grandparents, adult children, or even small rental units legally and permitted. Not sure what the effect would be for multi-family units except to let the developers make more \$\$\$. But in that example, just how would it benefit a person who lived there?? I would really love to understand how the homeowner of a multi-family unit could add onto their home and reap a benefit.
13. Tiny Homes are a nice option to expand the livable space of your property for a reasonable cost. Excellent option!

14. There still should be some limits to the second unit such as size (don't allow it as a way to virtually split the property into two properties with full homes on each). It should be clear that the second unit is a smaller unit appropriate to an aging parent ("mother-in-law apartment"). And there should still be occupancy limits (# of unrelated persons residing in the space).
15. Referencing Table 4-202B there are maximum lot coverages. For an R-2 residential district, only 45% of the lot may be built upon for structures. More over this addendum only provisions for 1 Accessory Dwelling on a lot that only has a single family home on it. I am fine with this ruling. Residing in an R1-6 zone, I wish I lived in a multi-family district. A tiny home dreamer's dream come true. As for the rewording in Section 1. Outside of Multi-Family district, For Accessory Buildings, it still requires that the dwelling be on a lot at least 15,000 sq. ft. As per "guest quarters" guidelines.(Which is hard to come by in the ASU area.)
16. The draft does not mention minimum lot sizes and lot coverage. We just build an attached ADU for our son, sharing a bathroom in the main house. We already had 3 bathrooms and are not interested in renting the place out. Build the 640 square feet addition around an atrium/ light well for privacy and light. No mention of shared utilities in the draft or separate set-up. Welcome to come and see our attached ADU which won the first City of Tempe Sustainability Award. Wished I could have added a 240 Volt line for a stove top and oven. Can I do this after the ordinance passes or is our place than too big? The size of our addition was dependent on the function it needed to serve and what would fit comfortably on our property.
17. Not sure if I understand this fully. I live on a half-acre in S Tempe and would like to add an additional small home on my property so that my son and his family could live in my primary home. I don't need all the space nowadays.
18. The proposed changes look reasonable. Any future changes should be run through this same process to ensure they are not in areas that are not appropriate for this type of change.
19. I like the idea of discouraging large multi-family developments on lots within single-family home neighborhoods that were zoned for multi-family, and hope Tempe continues to discourage significant changes to single-family neighborhoods.

No responses to "Do you support the proposed draft ordinance?"

20. This doesn't sound like a solution to affordable housing. This sounds like someone has an idea to make money by increasing housing density in lower cost neighborhoods. What are the underlying reasons people can't afford housing in Tempe? Meaning, what causes them not to have the necessary disposable income to live in Tempe? How does this proposal address those reasons/causes? Who is proposing ADU as a solution and what is their financial interest in having ADU? What other solutions have been considered?
21. The parking situation (residents/renters on the street) is already impossible. Our neighborhood is not circled on your map, but how long will it be before it is? There are quite a few so-called "grandfathered-in" units around here already, although they were added illegally.
22. Tempe is crowded enough. If you continue to pursue these ideas it will only get worse and end up in gridlock. The case could be made that since Tempe is landlocked the "city fathers" would like this to occur as it would be an additional avenue for taxes and provide additional revenue. In recent years Tempe has allowed MASSIVE apartment projects in several locations. They are NOT attractive and detract from the appeal of the city. If this mindset continues we will end up like an ant colony, in ugly chaos. Tempe spends considerable resources on "Public Events", I STRONGLY SUGGEST that Tempe has NEGLECTED the proper maintenance of nearly all streets and roads in the city. Cracked asphalt, potholes, uneven pavement, etc. Where is the responsibility for that? And more people will make it worse. As always, increased revenue to be spent on feel good events is king. Much more of this and I am moving OUT! Tempe is no longer a desirable place to live. DO NOT turn it into an ant colony.
23. It appears that this is being proposed to help the "investor" not for affordable housing, or to make more housing affordable!
24. What will the tax rate be on these new dwellings?

25. This is a poorly designed survey which leads to faulty conclusions. Q#2 assumes only three choices, none of which allow for a response which eliminates ADUs and if the response is "yes" to ADUs in multifamily only the response gives the false impression that future consideration is warranted even if the respondent has voted against it. Q#3 is rhetorical. Housing costs are generally going up everywhere, costs are not really the issue, development opportunity is the issue. Q#4 is similarly rhetorical, of course ADUs provide an alternative, the question is whether they are a reasonable alternative. This is why Q#2 and 4 weren't answered. What is the genesis of this scheme? Multiple property owners (developers) in Maple/Ash who want to multiply their rental inventory? Property owners who took advantage of the last round of ordinances allowing detached housing for family members who no longer have family members who qualify to occupy the property and want to re-purpose the vacant building? Owners who want to rent to Airbnb, effectively creating a business use in a residential neighborhood? How does any of the ordinance ensure compatibility with the character of the neighborhood? It does just the opposite. It encourages rentals to students nearby the university and the city doesn't control student rentals in residential neighborhoods as it is. It provides no new parking which encourages jamming already small streets. It promotes a mishmash: here a tiny home, there a mobile home (forget about permanent immobilization). It increases noise and refuse. Renters could care less about the safety of their neighbors because they are not truly neighbors, they are just longer term transients. Landlords and owners will move on or die and the remnant will not be a "neighborhood" it will be a hive. This idea is a foil for a few not an answer to "housing costs." The city supports the neighborhoods less and less (notwithstanding the associations) while supporting urbanization more and more. The sidewalks in older neighborhoods are a hazard to older people. The lighting is virtually non-existent. The infrastructure is decaying. The street improvements don't match the increase in traffic from new developments all around ASU. The lanes for cars turning left onto rural southbound/northbound at Apache back up into the east/west Apache lanes for 25 yds. which removes an entire lane of east/west traffic. The same can be seen at Broadway and College which lost an entire automobile lane to a handful of bikers between Mill and Rural and won an award for doing so. These are the consequences of relaxing zoning standards to appease development. The council has adopted so many goals and concepts and standards that it can't possibly manage them or adequately study the consequences. City staff hasn't been resized to accommodate this flood. The most recent example of an under studied much demanded concept is the McClintock fiasco. Did you see the abject bewilderment on their faces at the last work study session? If we don't want multi-family housing in our single family residential neighborhoods the answer is not to add a different version of multifamily. There is multifamily development going on all over the city outside of the neighborhoods. It is not the job of the City, nor its mandate, to make single family residential neighborhoods affordable. Don't experiment with Tempe's neighborhoods and don't claim that this ordinance will "ensure" compatibility with the neighborhood character. Do publish what council members proposed this and who met with legal staff to draft the ordinance.
26. There is enough density in Tempe now much more and quality of life is beginning to deteriorate as a result. The distinctive neighborhoods are one of the reasons I moved to Tempe. I believe the ordinance, if passed, will contribute to further deterioration of neighborhoods thereby hastening the disintegration of quality of life in the City. I'm also concerned about the potential effect this would have on some neighborhoods, and the elimination of some of the "charm" that they provide as a differentiator from much of the cookie-cutter housing in the valley. Rather than being a boon for home owners, this seems more like a boon for rental owners. I'm not sure that Tempe benefits in that case as most taxes are left unpaid. I bought into Tempe because it was a great atmosphere for my family, I have watched it eroded away by investors and rental properties which has created blight. This proposal turns Tempe into an overcrowded unpleasing place to live. With all the apartment complexes and rentals with five or six occupants the area is slowly turning Tempe into a rundown city. Single family zoning was meant to stop this from happening in the first place. I hope Tempe continues to discourage significant changes to single-family neighborhoods.

27. This is the most ridiculous proposal I have ever heard of coming out of The City of Tempe. You can't even control the housing communities you have now & you want to add more density. A few weeks ago we drove through some of the neighborhoods mentioned in your proposal & some outside the proposal & what a mess or down right blight. Parking of vehicles is another mess. When you The City of Tempe get your act together I might consider this proposal.
28. Developers in Tempe have a clear history of making our city LESS livable, not more. They are drawn to our livable neighborhoods, yet ignore the low-income neighbors (which is most of us). What's more is that residents are often priced-out of these developments. We the neighbors have fought to prevent massive structures with no parking, and will continue to do so. This is a PLOY to circumvent hearing from the public on building in the future.
29. Horrible idea! Is this idea for adding housing for the homeless? Students? Have you considered the parking issues, garbage issues, noise and security issues?? And why only areas north of Broadway Rd.? Our single family homes are already rental homes housing multiple students leaving our area blighted by vehicles both in yards and on streets, not following traffic regulations, failure to maintain yards and alleys, and most troubling we have no idea who belongs in our neighborhood and who does not. We have multiple apartment complexes in Tempe and I feel these would be a much better housing solution than creating "shanty towns" in our backyards.
30. This is a bull proposition. It will ghetto up existing neighborhoods, like LA, to overpopulate a good neighborhood with god-knows-who living in a converted garage. Pure trash. If you like trash, move to Mesa, Glendale, Apache Junction, Maryvale, Phoenix, Coolidge...
31. ADU's would increase the number of poorly-maintained rental properties that already overwhelm Tempe. They would give Tempe's biggest slum-lord, who owns several poorly-maintained properties in the Maple-Ash area, an opportunity to make more money by adding cheap rental units to his properties. This would give him additional incentive to purchase old houses and rent them without investing in their upkeep.
32. Housing is already abused in Tempe. My neighborhood is zoned single family, but has many houses with more than 3 unrelated (students) people living in them. The cars are parked up and down the street as well as strewn about the yard. Two houses on the block next to mine were remodeled this summer to accommodate many unrelated people. One put a parking lot in the front yard...literally. Pavers over what had been grass so more cars could park off street. It looks like a used car lot. The other house is listed as 4 bed 4 bath and put an ASU pitch fork on the door before anyone took occupancy. I'd really like to see the zoning enforced before we start talking about changes.
33. I THINK THAT THE CITY OF TEMPE STAFF AHAS ALREADY MADE UP ITS MIND BUT HERE IS MY INPUT. I THING THAT THE NEIGHBORHOODS ARE ALREADY TOO CONCENTRATED SO WHY ADD TO THE PROBLEMS OF TRANSPORTATION AND JUST TOO MANY PEOPLE IN A CONCENTRATED AREA. DO NOT DO THIS BECAUSE THE HOUSING PRICING WILL STABALIZE. WE ALREADY HAVE TOO MANY PEOPLE PER AREA AS IT IS.....
34. There is enough density in Tempe now and quality of life is beginning to deteriorate as a result. The distinctive neighborhoods are one of the reasons I moved to Tempe. I believe the Ordinance, if passed, will contribute to further deterioration of neighborhoods thereby hastening the disintegration of quality of life in the City.
35. I'm concerned about the potential effect this would have on some neighborhoods, and the elimination of some of the "charm" that they provide as a differentiator from much of the cookie-cutter housing in the valley. Rather than being a boon for home owners, this seems more like a boon for rentals. I'm not sure that Tempe benefits in that case. The proposal isn't clear, is there a limit to the number of ADUs that can be placed on a property?
36. We already have issues with density in this city, the traffic is terrible, crime has increased. This would serve only to make those issues worse and bring down the quality of life in our residential neighborhoods, which are already suffering. When will there be a serious discussion about capping enrollment at ASU main campus?
37. You're proposing putting more people on the same property. More cars, more density. Millennials might want high density but not all of them are buying houses.


38. Feels like a path to continued high density, overcrowding and more of the same. Without extreme controls/laws, I see neighborhoods getting more rundown and crowded.
39. I feel most lots in my area at least (central Tempe) are too small to allow a second dwelling unit of any sort. Adding a second story to an existing dwelling would not bother me, but have many concerns about construction quality, noise, parking and disruption to neighbors.
40. Increase in housing cost claim is relative and political. I have a BS in Real Estate from ASU and am a lifelong Tempe resident. You need to adjust for inflation and look at the data over a historical term. Of course housing has increase over the last few years but is that a problem? No it's simply coming back to historic averages, also not all areas of Tempe have done the same. When government gets involved in housing it ends up creating artificial supply and demand that ends up harming the overall market place. The city of Tempe has done enough real estate damage to the area and makes me want to move. If you simply enforced the laws around Guadalupe and cleaned up the Arizona mill area that would increase housing values of the area around Tempe and increase the tax revenue. Why isn't the city interested in increasing housing value? It bothers me and makes me not want to live here.
41. I bought into Tempe because it was a great atmosphere for my kids, but in the 16 years I have been here I have watched it erode away by investors and rental properties which makes this small community outside of downtown a visual blight. I bought in Tempe because I knew that the property I had would go up in value. This proposal turns Tempe into an overcrowded visually unpleasing place to live. With all the apartment complexes and rental with 8 or nine occupants the area is slowly turning into the ghetto. You're stealing my investment because you want more people to live here? I'm sorry, they need to buy a house if they want to live in Tempe. The single family zoning was meant to stop this from happening in the first place. No I don't like what's happening and I think it stinks of developer pay offs to the city officials to even bring this up. We need to change the council and the mayor the next election cycle.
42. This City is already unconscionable about putting multifamily dwellings in single family residence streets, i.e., 3721 S. Dennis which has ruined!!!! S. Dennis and S. Wilson because you were not mindful enough to take into account the needs for city services on a particular street, i.e., 8 single family houses in a cul-de-sac now have 3 multifamily dwellings, a minimum of 40 cars where the street cannot hold 15, city services cannot enter. Public works cannot contain the garbage of these homes where in 3 houses, as many as 26-28 people live! Nope, I don't want to see any more of this nonsense without a City plan backing what can and cannot be done on any given block. To do this blindly is to sell our future for many of these streets. There has to be some guidelines, some square footage vis a vis land and availability for cars to park on the property and not to park on the streets or in the alleys. I am so disgusted with Zoning and their backbone or lack thereof to remedy their mistakes from the past. Nope, show me a plan before I ever give you leeway to do anything as horrific as this.

Not Sure responses to "Do you support the proposed draft ordinance?"

43. While I do support this ordinance under the right conditions (don't have enough detail yet), I don't want anyone thinking this is a real widespread solution to the overall housing crisis in our city. We need more housing that's affordable for the middle class. \$1200 for a studio or 1-bedroom in the Apache neighborhood is a joke. I understand if it's next to the lake, but not everyone in Tempe has that kind of money to throw around. I'm all for high-density and multifamily housing, but this is a niche solution. Sounds like a great idea for certain situations. I am for creative solutions to problems, but let's not pass this and then say "now we've made a major breakthrough on our housing problem." 600 square feet is not sufficient for most family situations. Also, from what I can tell, many lots in these neighborhoods are not large enough to support this anyway, unless I am looking at this wrong. Many of them seem quite small for all the surrounding requirements.
44. Noise, parking, building, and other code compliance issues must be considered and adhered to. Governments need to shrink our tax burden and lower crime, as well as other means to bring better job opportunities to the area to make housing for affordable. ADU's could just bring more blight.

45. From what I've read in neighborhood forums (Facebook, Nextdoor, etc.) there appears to be a lot of confusion regarding the proposed draft ordinance. Many appear confused as to what areas of the city this ordinance would most likely impact, despite the fact that the introduction to the proposed ordinance states that it would pertain to existing Multi-Family zoned properties ONLY. Now this survey suggests the ordinance could impact Single-Family zoned areas. This really needs to be clarified before moving forward. I've read through some previous responses, many in Single-Family zoned areas are now excited about the prospect of being permitted to add ADU's as "supplemental rental" as the proposed ordinance states. This is the thin ice, IMHO. What's the point of having zoning if the city then proposes an ordinance that basically circumvents said zoning, turning Single-Family into Multi-Family? Bottom line, keep Single Family...single family. ADUs for grandma/grandpa, kids not-quite-ready-to-launch...are already permitted in Single-Family areas with currently standing ordinances (albeit; not permitted to have cooktop/ovens, but pretty much everything else to have "separate living" for extended family). Now, if the proposed ordinance does IN FACT just pertain to Multi-Family areas, then I am all for a strategy that may keep the developers/investors from coming in and bulldozing to build uber-density smack in the middle of a neighborhood simply because the lot they bought is R-2 or R-3. Am I correct in thinking that this proposal is an attempt to give homeowners in the Multi-Family areas an attractive option of building small ADUs on their lots in a possible attempt to keep them from selling out to developers? I'm not sure that is enough incentive anymore. What needs to happen is that city doesn't buckle and allow developers PADS and variances that allow the high density builds in first place.
46. My area is zoned R1-6. Looks like it would not apply to my house, which I am glad for. Many people are putting up sheds or extensions and it is changing views and generally is not an aesthetic improvement. I don't want this in my sfr neighborhood.
47. If vehicle and traffic accommodations are not considered in the INFRASTRUCTURE, then we are enhancing existing problems in the interest of revenue. The locations are favorable to both ASU and downtown Tempe, adding to already unsolved density. The landowner's total participation is a critical ingredient for a totally successful conclusion.
48. I think that there is interest in 'other housing options' to try to mitigate housing costs rising, but the question is very vague, in terms of what the options might be. Waiving rezoning costs for an owner to down zone would really stop the development. ADUs may be an alternative, but I'd like to have the group really think about unintended consequences of ADUs. (I don't have an example, but neighborhood crime, neighborhood discordance, concern that allowing more density, via ADUs, may impact a neighbor's quality of life negatively, etc.) But I feel like if someone asked/posted in a public forum like FB what the negative effects of ADUs on the hood would be people might come up with a few things that could be nipped thru the ordinance. If this has been done, then forget my comments!
49. I don't even understand the issue. Does this concern adding single homes to apartment developments? I don't think we have enough information to understand the issue. What is at the bottom of it and who is pressuring for this?

Attachment 2 - Facebook Comments

 **Brian Tomasi** I want to build a bunch of condos on my property just like Risi did and I want the city to give me special exemptions so that I can then flip it and put 400k profit in my pocket just like him. Will this let me do that?



Lori Murray Your on spot!



Gloria Brewster Lowe And where will they park? Let's look just like San Francisco and Seattle, all condos and streets full of cars. You couldn't ever have a visitor because there is no parking. A single family lot now houses 4 families and I bet there's not parking for even 4 cars on the street. The city is doing it's best to drive out families.



Sarah Maria Rainier lol and Tempe doesn't have anywhere near the transit options of Seattle or the bay.



Lori Murray Our home is already zoned for dual dwelling.



James Hanson Who and why did they do that, City if Tempe. Tempe you seem to do what the you want to do. Get out if my life.



Cindy Martin Jennifer Adams



Ashton Riley Nothing "affordable" in Tempe and I doubt this will be any different.



Sarah Maria Rainier Really stoked for more Air BnBs here instead of affordable housing. Can we come up with an affordable housing solution that doesn't force more austerity on middle to low income people?



Sarah Maria Rainier If the city would stop approving and encouraging luxury developments, the rents for everyone would calm down. Why is this so hard?



Brian Tomasi Build an affordable tower on the corner of Farmer and University. The city owns the land. Totally do-able. Or is the city afraid of poor and working class people living in their precious fake "arts" district? The city has already said that we can't expect to live by the lake that they subsidized. Where are we supposed to go?



Sarah Maria Rainier Everytime I see the city talk about affordable development it's always outside of the downtown area. Why is that? Is downtown only for a certain aesthetic of people? Is that why they criminalized homelessness on Mill?





Sarah Maria Rainier It's as if all of the issues MAFW has been shouting about for five years are connected.





**Holly Lynn Schineller** This is interesting.


**Holanda Salinas** What would be the best gift the [City of Tempe Government](#) could give us, is affordable housing. I've lived in this community for 22 years and I'm being priced out in a few months b/c I'm having twins and need to find affordable 3 bedroom places instead of the 2 bedroom I'm in!!


**Matthew Olin** That's a pretty rough part of town.


**Kimberly Fuqua** Hmm... build a tiny home and rent it at an exorbitant rate to a college student? I like it!


**James Hanson** City of Tempe think of the RESIDENTS who you are affecting. The residents that pay property taxes not a corp.


**Mark Mannheimer** Tempe gov can't run out of retarded ideas.


**Cara Bedenkop Czarnecki** Aside from those wanting to use the property for a rental, I have seen an increase for multigenerational home searching. I work with a lot of single parents and multigenerational housing is a great solution for them. In Tempe, most of the time they need...[See More](#)


**Marsha Nelson** My neighbors built a little home on their property for the parents and it is great. I think the tiny homes for college students would be great too.

**Kim Moore** There are enough rentals in tempe in which no one makes the owners take care of the property we don't need more.

**Michael Gonnell** Curious question, who that has commented negatively on this post actually lives north of Tempe Town Lake? Who specifically lives in the area shown above?

**Lori Murray** I live on the same street as the ridiculous New Port Townhomes. If I had known this was being built I would not have bought our home. Sick of the dust and so much more.

**Lisa Wakefield** apartments and rentals in Tempe are SUPER expensive so I see the appeal of a secondary or attached dwelling for those who are aged or starting out family members who can't afford high rental rates and need to be near family.

**Bill Wrobel** Do a satellite view of this neighborhood. Damn! It's a giant junk yard. I feel for anyone who owns property here. There's nothing you could do that would lower property values here. I can't imagine anyone wanting to rent a "small second dwelling." I don't think I would want to walk through this neighborhood. I'm sorry if my comments offend anyone. I just find it sad that this kind of thing can happen. Keep it in mind when making decisions about other neighborhoods.

Attachment 3 - Nextdoor Comments

Deb, Brian, Cara, and [18 others](#) thanked you

[Matt B.](#) from [Cole Park](#) · 5 Sep

Please click on the link and let the Tempe City Council know what a bad idea this is.

Sky thanked Matt

[Amy D.](#) from [Hollis Park](#) · 5 Sep

So in layman's terms, what does this mean for single-family home neighborhoods?

[Paul I.](#) from [Warner Ranch](#) · 5 Sep

This sounds like a great idea. If I want to build a small guest house in my backyard, this would allow me to do that.

<http://www.peakdemocracy.com/portals/99/...>

Erika, Gretchen, Peter, and [3 others](#) thanked Paul

[Marian R.](#) from [Warner Ranch](#) · 5 Sep

Unless you had a homeowners association.....can't imagine Warner Ranch allowing it.....

[Dave P.](#) from [Rural-Geneva](#) · 5 Sep

It also means, out of state landlords will be able to add square footage and rent to even more people,

Sky thanked Dave

[Anne T.](#) from [Shalimar](#) · 5 Sep

From what I can tell, It only applies to areas that are multi family zoned ... so it doesn't affect a lot of us. Mostly north of University and closer to the ASU ... see map ... but I'm sure there are a few areas here and there outside if the map area. There are probably a lot of rentals in that area so it would allow someone with a single family home rental property to maximize their profit for the amount of land. I think it could get ugly (especially with the words affordable associated with it). Will it become a big slum over in that section? Wonder who owns property over there.

I may be totally misunderstanding this though.

Joan thanked Anne

[Timothy C.](#) from [Scudder Park](#) · 5 Sep

Not only NO.....HELL NO

Sky thanked Timothy

[Kathy H.](#) from [Shalimar](#) · 5 Sep

Done. Thank you for the heads up on this important issue.

Sky thanked Kathy

[Robert W.](#) from [Mill Ave Baseline Rural](#) · 5 Sep

Tiny houses are becoming popular all over the country. We used to call them "guest houses." I think it is a good idea. Back east many homes have detached garages with apartments overhead as well. My own sister started her family in one such affordable residence. It wasn't like everyone had one. They were scattered here and there and served a good purpose.

<https://smallhousesociety.net/resources/...>

Brian, Gretchen, Kiersten, and [2 others](#) thanked Robert

[Michelle S.](#) from [Sunburst Farms](#) · 6 Sep

These properties are ALREADY zoned for higher density than is currently being utilized on the land. This option would provide LESS development than a full build out of apartments and allow current land owners options versus selling out to a developer. Make sure you understand the facts.

Deb, Brian, Gretchen, and [3 others](#) thanked Michelle

[Amy D.](#) from [Hollis Park](#) · 6 Sep

I think you make a good point, Michelle. I really do. What bothers me is question two. Sounds to me like they are wanting to eventually bring this kind of housing into single-family home neighborhoods. My concern is, when your home sits within a few miles of the largest university in the country that refuses to cap enrollment, what is the possibility of that happening? I think it would result in bringing in more investors/developers for student rentals into our single family home neighborhoods. And what would be the priority of our city government if it came to that? Can I trust that they would give weight to my concerns as a homeowner?

Sky and Anne thanked Amy

[Anne T.](#) from [Shalimar](#) · 6 Sep

Amy, it sounds like they are removing the Design Review Committee from the process. Then it will be open to whatever the property owner wants to do on the property as long as the code compliance rules are met including the size of the new structure. It makes me a little nervous. That being said, I was trying to look at a map to see exactly what properties could potentially be impacted.

ryan_levesque@tempe.gov is a good contact for questions. I wanted to read and study this a little more before I contacted him (so I haven't yet)

Lisa thanked Anne

[Nancy S.](#) from [Sunburst Farms](#) · 6 Sep

Attached is a map of the south portion of Tempe. The brown areas are what are Multi-family zoned. The yellow (including dark yellow) areas are Single Family zoned. The legend with colors is on the right. The proposal only affects the multi-family zoning area (brown). If you want to look more closely, here's the link to the interactive map:

<https://data.tempe.gov/showcase/zoning-m...>



Edited on 6 Sep

Julie, Joan, and Mushtaq thanked Nancy

[Sky W.](#) from [Shalimar](#) · 6 Sep

I've seen this back east. Everyone thinks it's a great idea for all the right reasons and then it passes. And the whole world changes. What people thought would be great little guest houses turns into lots with many many renters and cars everywhere. The original home owners move out and there homes become rentals and the overpopulation of the neighborhood explodes. It ruined the neighborhood in less than three years. I hope it does not pass but I know it probably will as people always think no one will take advantage of the system. Once it does pass it will be used as a model of how to "improve" R1-6 zones. Then the fight really gets tough because of presidence.

Geraldine thanked Sky

[Julie D.](#) from [Sunburst Farms](#) · 6 Sep

Personally, I would like to see this happen in my neighborhood which has large lots. I live on approx 2 acres and a guest house for my aging mother would be nice. With the economy as it is many families are having to have multiple generations living together and for those areas that have acreage this is a good option to consider.

Robert, Eve, Kiersten, and [1 other](#) thanked Julie

[Anne T.](#) from [Shalimar](#) · 6 Sep

Julie, if you are not zoned for multi family then I don't think this doesn't impact you. But I do believe that you maybe able to get an exception to build the extra apt for your mom if you check into it.

Mushtaq thanked Anne

[Meiny V.](#) from [Hollis Park](#) · 6 Sep

Large lots over 15000 square feet have always had this opportunity of adding guest quarters.

[Joan B.](#) from [Mach 8](#) · 7 Sep

Anne Till's first comment in this thread is spot on. The proposed amendment pertains to those areas ALREADY zoned Multi-family (which Michelle S. and Nancy S. also note). The proposal is in response to those neighborhoods west/northwest of ASU campus and downtown Tempe, already zoned Multi-family, feeling the squeeze out from developers coming in and building high density since a lot of properties are zoned R-3 which allows for higher density than just a "guest house." Just take a drive down Ash Avenue between 13th St. and University to see some of the developments squeezed onto some of those once lovely lots. So the idea of the proposal is to allow owners to build a guest/rental house rather than cave to developers wanting to raze the older homes and build high density. I own a number of properties in the area and the neighborhood groups have been asking/begging the city/council to help in preserving these neighborhoods, many of which are historical. There is also a movement afoot to get current owners to agree to "down-zoning" their properties, from the problematic R-3 down to R-2. I don't think anyone in R-1 neighborhoods needs to worry about this proposed ordinance change. What I would keep my eye on going forward, is how zoning might change in your area. Once the zoning is changed, it's a battle to get it unchanged.

Brian, Gretchen, Nancy, and [4 others](#) thanked Joan

[Nancy S.](#) from [Sunburst Farms](#) · 7 Sep

Julie, guest quarters are absolutely allowed. You have to get a permit (as with most other construction), but current ordinances allow exactly what you want to build. The guest quarters cannot be turned into a rental property.

Section 3-411 - Guest Quarters.

A. Applicability. Guest quarters are permitted in single-family residential districts having a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet, subject to the following standards:

1. Only one (1) guest quarters is permitted on a single lot;
2. The gross floor area shall be no greater than fifty (50) percent of the main building's gross floor area at or above grade ;
3. An attached building shall comply with the development standards set forth in Table 4-202A;
4. Guest quarters detached from the main building shall comply with the accessory building standards set forth in Section 3-401;
5. There shall be no separate metering for utility services and no separate mailing address; and
6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a real covenant shall be recorded with the land restricting the use of the guest quarters from being rented or leased. The City of Tempe shall be parties to such covenant and shall be binding to all subsequent owners.

(Ord. No. 2009.15, 10-22-2009)

Linda and Mushtaq thanked Nancy

[Debbie B.](#) from [Downtown Tempe](#) · 4d ago

I cannot believe that anyone would be for this. I live close to Mill Avenue and we already have an unbelievable problem with the drunkenness, homelessness, drug-seeking flow of people through here. Tempe is pretty well land bound and adding more tiny dwellings is not the answer. When there is an event happening anywhere in the area the people where I live have no place to park if they're out past a certain time because when we come back everyone that wants to go to the events or just go down to Mill to party always take our parking spaces. When I have said anything in a respectful way the filth that come out of these people's mouths towards me is unbelievable. Especially if you're at my age and retired you do not want to park 3 blocks away and try and walk home at midnight. And since I have a handicap I need to park in my handicap parking space. But totally able-bodied young men will borrow Grandma's placard put it on their car and park in any of our spaces that say handicapped. Our Vehicles already are being broken into or stolen or just plain vandalize because it's fun for the drunks to do. These people who come here to rent for a few months are not invested in the area so they don't care if they destroy other people's property. My neighbor went out to her porch at around 2 in the morning because the men who decided to park in front of her home thought it was funny to start destroying her Landscaping. I for one do not want to see any more people moving into this unbelievably packed area. This is a sore spot with me so I'm going to stop my rambling.



City of Tempe Government

Published by Kristina Baxter [?] · September 9 at 9:15am · 🌐

We'd like your feedback: There are a few neighborhoods in Tempe that are zoned for multi-family dwellings that are predominantly single family homes. Today, these properties are allowed to build or redevelop adding two, three or even more units on the property. There is a proposed draft ordinance for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) to allow the owners of these homes to build a small second dwelling on their property, up to 600 sq. ft. of living space, while maintaining the status as single family use. See which neighborhoods would be eligible, read the ordinance and comment at www.tempe.gov/forum.

This is one strategy being explored to address the concerns of development pressure on these types of properties, provide an alternate housing style and address affordable housing needs.



City of Tempe Government

Government Organization

[Learn More](#)

7,070 people reached

[View Results](#)

Dan Rue, Mark Mannheimer and 24 others · 21 Comments · 4 Shares

7,070 People Reached

72 Reactions, Comments & Shares

27 Like · 23 On Post

3 Angry · 3 On Post

33 Comments · 25 On Post

9 Shares · 4 On Post

1,560 Post Clicks

790 Photo Views · 95 Link Clicks

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

2 Hide Post

0 Report as Spam

Insights activity is reported in the time zone of your location.

Kris Baxter-Ging

Public Information Officer

480.858.2059 (Office)

480 250-5198 (Cell)

@tempegov Instagram and Twitter

@CityofTempe Facebook