



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: MARCH 18, 2013

ITEM NUMBER:

SUBJECT: SECOND READING OF ORDINANCE 14-04 FOR CODE AMENDMENT CO-13-04

DATE: MARCH 11, 2014

FROM: DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

PRESENTATION BY: MINOO ASHABI, PRINCIPAL PLANNER

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: MINOO ASHABI (714) 754-5610
minoo.ashabi@costamesaca.gov**

RECOMMENDATION:

Give second reading to Ordinance 14-04 amending Title 13, Chapters I, IV, V and related definitions and amendment to land use matrix and a new Article 2.5 to Chapter V to allow small lot subdivisions in multiple family zoning districts and urban plan areas.

ANALYSIS:

The purpose and intent of the small lot ordinance is to promote affordable ownership housing by providing more flexible development standards and maintenance mechanisms for underutilized multi-family residential lots within the densities allowed by the General Plan. This proposed code amendment will add a new section to the zoning code applicable to detached residential and live/work development of up to 15 units without modifying the current "Common Interest Development" standards.

On March 4, 2014, City Council gave first reading to Ordinance 14-04 by a 3-2 vote (Councilmembers Genis and Leece voting No). The following revisions were made to the draft ordinance based on Council direction:

- Tandem parking – New language was added to not allow tandem garage or parking.
- Open Space – Table 13-42 was revised to include "Development Lot" referring to open space requirement.
- Side and Rear Setback – Table 13-42 was revised to include "one story" to side and rear setback requirement.
- Automatic Garage Door – "Required" was added referring to automatic garage door openers in Table 13-42.
- Trash Storage – This section was revised to require storage space for three trash containers instead of two to accommodate the new organic waste containers.

MINOO ASHABI, AIA
Principal Planner

GARY ARMSTRONG, AICP
Economic and Development Services
Director

Attachment: 1- [Ordinance 14-04](#)
 2- [Redlined Draft](#)

cc: Chief Executive Officer
 Assistant Chief Executive Officer
 Director of Economic & Development/Deputy CEO
 Public Services Director
 City Attorney
 Transportation Services Manager
 City Engineer
 City Clerk (20)
 Staff (7)
 File (2)

From: Colin McCarthy

Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 4:21 PM

To: RIGHEIMER, JIM; MENSINGER, STEPHEN; LEECE, WENDY; MONAHAN, GARY; GENIS, SANDRA

Cc: ARMSTRONG, GARY; GREEN, BRENDA; Jim Fitzpatrick; HATCH, THOMAS

Subject: Old Business Item No. 1

Mayor Righeimer and Councilmembers,

On March 10th the Costa Mesa Planning Commission unanimously approved a tentative tract map and design review to construct 6 detached for sale homes at 2183 and 2187 Miner Street, off of Victoria in our City's westside. This project was proposed within existing density (12 dwelling units per acre), although adjoining densities went up to 19 dwelling units per acre. As proposed all homes are properly parked.

The application consisted of 5 deviations- one variance, three administrative adjustments and one minor modification.

With the passage of the Small Lot Ordinance, this application would have required only one administrative adjustment and one minor modification, saving both the applicant and our staff valuable time.

I have attached the "before" and "after pictures from the property. According to the neighbors, the abandoned structure on this property is a haven for homeless, drugs, trash and noise. By all accounts, it is a blighted property. Parking on Miner Street is a nightmare according to those same residents.

The attached "before" photograph reflects where we were. The attached "after" photograph reflects where we are going. I hope you will agree this is an improvement. I encourage you to visit this property before Tuesday's meeting. This is not "HUD housing." It is not a "developer giveaway." It is a project built within existing densities (actually at lower density than neighboring properties), and fully parked. It exemplifies why we need an SLO in our City.

I, and many others in our community, look forward to the second reading of the proposed Small Lot Ordinance and more projects like this in our City.

Thank you for your time.

Colin McCarthy



AUTHORIZED
PARKING ONLY



From: Daniel Hoffmann
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2014 10:13 AM
To: LEECE, WENDY; WENDY LEECE- City Council; GENIS, SANDRA
Subject: Small Lot Development Ordinance

Dear Sandy and Wendy

I have been following from a bit afar the development with the small lot development ordinance ("Ordinance")

I understand during the last city council meeting the Ordinance was voted on and, not surprisingly, was vote 3:2 with the two of you voting against it.

I also understand that the Ordinance is up for a second vote.

Could you please advise me when the second vote will be and if it is adopted along the same voting record, either or both of you would submit an appeal.

I personally see the Ordinance highly flawed for two reasons:

1. Facts vs Fiction – Entry level homeownership

The fact is touted that the Ordinance will be beneficial for entry level homeowners. Case in point: 2525 Santa Ana Ave Project that would easily fall under the Ordinance. With a project's price of \$750K, which first homeowner can afford this? The targeted first homeowner are typically kids that have college background. Alas their salary might be good to qualify, yet, they are mired down with student loans (at a tune of \$1000 to \$1200/mo) plus car payments, making them ineligible for homeownership. Lastly where, with all the student debt, do they find \$150K (20% of asking price) for a downpayment.

Should the parents step in and part of the "historic wealth transfer", provide the downpayment or co-sign the loan, then the kids will want to move into a neighborhood with single family dwellings where they have a yard, as they are thinking having kids.

Case in point: A young couple under 30 with a kid and a second one on the way just moved into our neighborhood, paying cash \$1,050M for a 3 BR/2Ba home. It was a gift from both parents!

2. Traffic

Small lot development are ideally suited for downtown areas where things are within walking distance, thereby alleviating the need for cars. Many kids have delayed buying a car; in fact, many do not want to have a car, if they live in a downtown area where everything is within walking distance. Examples of such development are downtown LA, downtown Santa Monica. Therefore, any development under the Ordinance should be (1) limited to downtown areas and (2) coupled with public transportation improvements so that the purchaser of such property does not have to rely on having a 1:1 ratio of vehicles to inhabitants.

A straightforward development is just densification to the benefit of the developer (and of course the city's tax base) and to the detriment of the general population.

Thanks for allowing me to share this with you

Best
daniel

Daniel Hoffmann

Costa Mesa, CA 92627