

*Supplemental Item –*

Correspondence for Land Use Element and Development Code  
Workshop

**Agenda Item No. 1**  
**Correspondence for Land Use Element and  
Development Code Workshop**

**(CC/PC Mtg 9/7/2021)**

**From:** [David Swift](#)  
**To:** [Wendi Sims](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Input for Development Code Workshop  
**Date:** Monday, September 6, 2021 8:42:30 PM

---

Please find my input to the workshop below.

#### 1) Development fees

a) To encourage smaller, affordable home improvements and development projects, I would recommend developing a tiered development fee that considers the total cost (%) to the finished project. Large projects pay higher fees based on number of rooms, square footage, expected occupancy, road and infrastructure impact. **BENEFIT:** Smaller properties can be developed at an affordable price because the fees aren't such a large % of the project. Large projects would cover a larger part of their community impact (roads, water, sewer, police, fire, etc.).

b) Waive development fees for projects that result in dwelling units smaller than 500 square feet, 2bd/2ba to encourage development or rehabilitation of small, affordable units and ADUs. **BENEFIT:** Makes the development and/or rehabilitation of small units cost effective and therefore affordable.

#### 2) City Mandated Improvements

a) City mandated improvements (Street, curb, sidewalk, ADA corner ramps, fire sprinklers, electrical undergrounding, storm water management) can add \$50k to \$100k to a project. This can be cost prohibitive to development or rehabilitation of older, smaller homes. Recommend changing this to be based on a tiered % of existing square footage instead of the current 40% in 5.20.010. Example is a remodel and addition to an existing 500 sqft house that results in a 750 sqft house would incur all improvements, the cost of which makes the small project/house unaffordable. If this were tiered to allow 50% or 60% improvement on houses that are less than 900 square feet when finished, these smaller projects would be more cost effective.

**BENEFIT:** For development, if the cost of improvements is independent of final project size, it is more cost effective to absorb that burden on a large, expensive home where the builder/developer can recoup the cost. Making smaller projects cheaper will encourage more smaller and affordable homes. It will also encourage people to improve existing small homes in the community instead of tearing them down to build big, luxury homes.

b) Setbacks and land use requirements should be updated to allow for smaller parcels and shorter front setbacks (<20 feet).

i) Many of the existing, older homes do not meet the current 20 foot setback requirements. Allowing improvements and rehabilitation of older homes, including the non-conforming portions will allow homeowners to keep their small homes while still modernizing them. **BENEFIT:** Keeps more smaller homes instead of tearing them down to bring the lot into compliance.

ii) 20 foot setbacks in R1 neighborhoods are a relic from the 1950s suburbia. A 20 foot by 75 foot front yard represents 1500 square feet of yard that will use water or have runoff that must be managed. Reducing this requirement to 10 feet and establishing a maximum lot coverage would promote smaller homes on smaller lots with more control over creating usable outdoor space behind or between homes.

#### Summary

All the above recommendations are focused on promoting smaller homes in slightly smaller R1 lots. The assumption being that smaller homes are more affordable, more in character with

our beach community, and more efficient from a land and resource use perspective. Development codes, fee structures, and mandated improvements can be used to make small homes more appealing to developers as well as more affordable to the owner to improve or rehabilitate.

David Swift, PE  
Independent Consulting Engineer

