

**From:** Mark Knox [mailto:knox@mind.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 21, 2021 12:40 PM  
**To:** Maria Harris <maria.harris@ashland.or.us>  
**Cc:** 'Mark Knox' <knox@mind.net>  
**Subject:** RE: updates to ARU and duplex code

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Hey Maria,

I have the following comments about the proposed ARU/Duplex code revisions:

- 1) Based on my personal and professional experiences with accessory units and duplex units, one code factor definitely “conflicting” with other codes more and more over the last 10 to 15 years is lot coverage maximums. As lots are getting smaller and infill is become more encouraged, the maximum percentages relating to lot coverage are getting tighter. It’s down to inches in many cases as I suspect you have been hearing. As such, I would like to suggest that language be added that allows (which is also an affordable construction incentive) to allow for a 50% (??) reduction in the ARU or Duplex unit’s square footage. For example, if someone proposed a 500 sq. ft. ARU, only 250 sq. ft. would count towards the zone’s lot coverage.... Something like that... I understand there’s also the general philosophy that in cases where lot coverage is an issue, the alternative would be to go smaller or build above the existing house/garage, but that’s often more costly, intrusive, often complex, may conflict w/ solar codes, etc.
- 2) 18.2.5.060 B. 2 and 3 (Yard Exceptions): Should there be language that qualifies the reduced setback does not apply to garages/carports where the minimum back-up dimension is not met? If 16’ alley and the setback is 4’ that’s only 20’ and code is 22’ which is pretty tight as is, especially when the other side of the alley’s right-of-way has been encroached upon by the neighbor’s junk.
- 3) On page 39 (North Mountain Design Standards) where it talks about a minimum 9’ driveway width standards, you may want to talk to PW about this standard as I think they have a larger minimum of 12’ or 15’. It came up a few years ago and although I can’t recall the details, it was an issue.
- 4) Please make sure ARU’s are NOT considered multi-family and “automatically” charged the multi-family utility base rate which is roughly a \$63 per month extra charge that has nothing to do with usage. This is an impediment to the intent of the proposed code.
- 5) On page 50, Parking Management Standards, I’m not understanding why detached SFR and duplexes are not permitted to utilize the parking management strategies? I would strike the first half of the beginning sentence which would essentially allow all types.
- 6) On page 63, Site Review Exemptions, Section C.1. A recent issue came up where because two side-by-side garages off an alley were to be attached, it requires a Site Review Permit. In my opinion, this is a very good thing and leaves the “public realm – i.e. the public street” available for attractive architecture and comfortable pedestrian appeal. I would suggest adding language in that section that simply states “except for two attached garages located parallel to an alley”.
- 7) Lastly, this probably is not the right time to adjust this section of code, but it might be.... I would suggest increasing the size of cottage units from 800 sq. ft. to 850 sq. ft. We’ve tried very hard to figure out how to add an extra bathroom and we cant. We need 50 more square feet which would allow for 2 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms. Based on conversations with realtors and various tenants at the Garden Cottages off Laurel Street, the extra bathroom would make it more conducive for “family” living whereas the current code is attracting more singles with the second room an office. Just a thought.

Overall, I think you did a great job on this Maria! I know it’s tedious work with many unforeseen consequences, but as I read through it with the understanding what the issues are and the legislature’s intent, I think it looks great. – Mark

