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ADU's

What is an ADU?
ADU stands for Accessory Dwelling Unit which is essentially a secondary dwelling with individual living facilities such as a kitchen, bathroom, and other facilities in a relatively small, fully amenitized unit. ADUs are typically additional structures or transformed spaces within a single-family home or lot. They may be more commonly referred to as granny flats, in-law houses, backyard cottages, or guest houses.

INTERNAL
• Converted Basement
• Converted Attic

ATTACHED
• Addition
• Conversion of Attached Garage

DETACHED
• Freestanding Backyard Structure
• Detached Garage Conversion
• Detached Garage Addition
Process

Community Profile
Analyzes the demographic makeup of Peoria to better understand Peoria’s housing needs and establish a comprehensive community profile of the City.

Literature Review
Analyzes existing literature and research on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) for common themes and background information.

Stakeholder Engagement
Provides an overview of a qualitative analysis with stakeholders in the form of focus groups and individual interviews, as well as a comprehensive analysis of the data gathered with inductive content analysis to create themes and sub-themes that relate to the comments received.

Case Study Overview
Provides a brief summary of the case study selection process and provides general key takeaways from national and state level case studies.

Detailed Case Studies
Provides a detailed overview of each selected city’s ADU policy and highlights city specific takeaways and key observations.

Recommendations & Conclusion
Synthesizes the research outlined in the prior chapters in order to identify best practices and other important considerations from which the City of Peoria can draw as it introduces its policy for ADUs.
Chapter 1: Introduction

During the Spring 2021 semester, graduate students enrolled in the Planning Workshop in the Master of Urban and Environmental Planning Program (MUEP) at ASU’s School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning (SGSUP) worked in conjunction with the City of Peoria (AZ) to address a real-world planning problem. The partnership was facilitated by ASU’s Project Cities program, which matches ASU courses with community partners to address a range of local challenges. The course fulfills SGSUP’s requirement that second-year MUEP students complete a culminating project, which promotes an opportunity for students to have an integrative academic and professional planning experience with a client.

The Spring 2021 Planning Workshop collaborated with the City of Peoria’s Planning and Zoning Department to research the opportunities and constraints associated with Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) policies, and examined the role they could play in meeting Peoria’s housing needs. The students employed a range of planning skills to establish a sound planning document, including background research, creating a community profile, stakeholder engagement, and peer city case studies to deliver final recommendations to the City of Peoria.

This report represents the culmination of the Planning Workshop team’s efforts and proposes guidance for Peoria’s Planning and Zoning Department as they consider future ADU policies. The report highlights: stakeholder perspectives from City of Peoria leaders, staff, local developers, and affordable housing organizations; a series of case studies that examine ADU policies in similar cities, within Arizona and across the US; and best practices and considerations for Peoria as they explore an ADU policy.

Chapter 1 encompasses a brief introduction to the City of Peoria, as well as additional information about ASU’s Planning Workshop. This chapter also encapsulates the primary goals which advanced the progression of this project.

1.1 Introduction to Peoria

The City of Peoria was founded in 1886 and incorporated in 1954. Bordering the old desert road, which is now Grand Avenue, Peoria was developed along one of the main routes from Phoenix to the gold mines of Wickenburg (History of Peoria, Arizona). In the 1950s, an economic boom occurred through the Valley. The postwar construction boom set the stage for Peoria to become the suburban oasis it is today. Currently, Peoria is the sixth-largest city in Arizona with respect to land area, at 179 square miles (See Figure 1) (2019 Economic Profile). As of 2019, approximately 175,000 people are currently residing in the city (City of Peoria: General Plan 2040, p.2-4). In relation to Phoenix, Arizona’s state capital, Peoria is about a 30-minute drive northwest of Phoenix. With easy highway access along State Route 101 (Loop 101), Peoria is relatively accessible to several cities in the region, including Downtown Phoenix amenities, making it a popular suburban
area. Additionally, Peoria hosts its own amenities and attractions in three entertainment districts: P83, Park West, and the “Four Corners.”

The P83 Entertainment District in Peoria is centrally located and just east of Loop 101, or Agua Fria Highway, and south of Bell Road (See Figure 2). The district consists of many mixed-use developments including various bars, restaurants, retail, and lodging areas. The Peoria Sports Complex, a baseball complex that is home to both the San Diego Padres and Seattle Mariners, who play in the Spring Training Cactus League, is located in the P83 Entertainment District (Top Shopping Centers in Peoria). Additionally, the P83 district is also bordered by the Northvalley Power Center and the Arrowhead Crossing shopping centers.

Park West is designated as a lifestyle shopping center and consists of over 30 restaurants and shops (See Figure 3) (Top Shopping Centers in Peoria). It is situated within minutes of the Arizona Cardinals Stadium.

Figure 1. Map of top entertainment and shopping districts in Peoria

![Map of top entertainment and shopping districts in Peoria](https://www.j2design.us/portfolio/p83-district/)

Source: Created by T. Penton using ArcGIS

Figure 2. Image of P83 Entertainment District Signage

![Image of P83 Entertainment District Signage](https://www.j2design.us/portfolio/p83-district/)

Source: https://www.j2design.us/portfolio/p83-district/
the Westgate Entertainment District, and Tanger Outlets (a retail outlet center). Furthermore, it is just west of the newly constructed Desert Diamond Casino, Peoria Crossing shopping center, and Loop 101. As of 2021, Park West has become home to a new concept called Popup Peoria. A collaboration between the City of Peoria, CIRE Equity, and the J. Orin Edson Entrepreneurship and Innovation Institute at Arizona State University has led to the introduction of a combined community space with popup retail and boutiques (Top Shopping Centers in Peoria). This public-private collaboration is intended to bring a unique experience into Peoria and "curates stronger community partnerships while offering interesting programming in a unique and fun environment for the benefit of Peoria residents" (Top Shopping Centers in Peoria).

Lastly, the "Four Corners" is located in the northern part of Peoria. It has been dubbed the "Four Corners" due to its location that consists of the Pleasant Towne Center (northwest corner), Lake Pleasant Crossing (northeast corner), Lake Pleasant Pavilion (southwest corner), and Mountainside Fitness plaza (southeast corner) (See Figure 4). The "Four Corners" is a popular shopping center for residents within the Lake Pleasant and Happy Valley communities; due to its proximity to Lake Pleasant, it is often a stop for tourists as well.

Figure 3. Image of Park West Entrance Signage


Figure 4. Image of Lake Pleasant Towne Center Signage

Source: https://vestar.com/sprouts-lake-pleasant-towne-center/
Peoria’s economic sectors are diverse, including: healthcare, advanced manufacturing, retail trade, arts, and entertainment industries. With various retail trade, arts, and entertainment facilities, the City of Peoria’s thriving entertainment districts are some of the most affluent and vibrant areas within the West Valley. Additionally, Peoria is home to several major healthcare providers within the West Valley, including: Cigna Medical Group, Honor Health, and, recently, Valleywise Health. Peoria is also an incubator hub for unique industries. Examples include Maxwell Technologies, recently purchased by Tesla, which produces advanced battery technology, and TYR Tactical, which has opened a 76,000 square foot manufacturing facility that produces body armor for the police and military are located in Peoria.

Until recently, Peoria was best classified as a low-density suburban community. However, over the last few years, the population has grown exponentially, and with that, the city has started to see more medium-density and mixed-use development options. These developments have started to shift the feel of Peoria overall, adding new opportunities. Peoria has also incorporated a series of unique design features based on the “growing smarter” legislation, aimed at addressing rapid growth within the Valley, including fostering a sense of community and identity through placemaking on public and private lands. In addition, the City of Peoria has prioritized sustainable design practices and increased connectivity as means of managing new growth pressures. These features have led to an increase in mixed-use development, as well as improved pedestrian experiences and livability efforts.

Recently, Peoria has also adopted Livability Initiatives within its General Plan, which serve as a strategic guideline for planning and visioning to foster “a safe, connected, engaged, vibrant, and livable community that emphasizes fiscal responsibility and thoughtful growth to ensure a healthy city for all citizens” by 2040 (City of Peoria: General Plan 2040, p.3-2). The Livability Initiatives include: 1) Arts, Cultural and Recreational Enrichment, 2) Economic Prosperity, 3) Smart Growth, 4) Healthy Neighborhoods, 5) Superior Public Services, and 6) Integrated Transportation (See Figure 5) (City of Peoria: General Plan 2040).
1.2 Scope of Work

During Spring 2021, students enrolled in ASU’s Planning Workshop worked with the City of Peoria to research ADU policy best practices and mold recommendations based on their findings. The team’s analyses aim to help steer future development by creating a vision for new housing options in the context of Peoria. The team’s research is comprised of six major components:

1. **Organizing a community profile of Peoria;**
2. **Background research and literature review;**
3. **Engaging with stakeholders:**
4. **Researching peer city case studies in Arizona;**
5. **Researching peer city case studies nationally;**
6. **Drafting recommendations for the City of Peoria.**

As a growing suburban community, the City of Peoria strives to enact an ADU ordinance which will diversify the housing stock and improve affordability. The Planning Workshop’s recommendations structured by research offer guidance to Peoria while they shape their ADU policy to fulfill the community’s visions.
1.3 Introduction to Chapters

The Planning Workshop’s ADU research highlights an iterative process with multiple elements to guide policy recommendations that contribute to Peoria’s long-term housing goals. This report provides background information, before summarizing our original research and final recommendations. The remainder of this report unfolds as follows:

Chapter 2: Community Profile
- The Community Profile chapter analyzes the demographic makeup of Peoria to better understand Peoria’s housing needs and establish a comprehensive community profile of the City.

Chapter 3: Literature Review
- This chapter analyzes existing literature and research on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) for common themes and background information.

Chapter 4: Stakeholder Engagement
- This chapter provides an overview of a qualitative analysis with stakeholders in the form of focus groups and individual interviews, as well as a comprehensive analysis of the data gathered with inductive content analysis to create themes and sub-themes that relate to the comments received.

Chapter 5: Case Study Overview
- This chapter provides a brief summary of the case study selection process and provides general key takeaways from national and state level case studies.

Chapter 6: Detailed Case Studies
- This chapter contains the case study reports that provide a detailed overview of each selected city’s ADU policy and highlights city specific takeaways and key observations.

Chapter 7: Recommendations & Conclusion
- The Recommendations & Conclusion chapter will synthesize the research outlined in the prior chapters in order to identify best practices and other important considerations from which the City of Peoria can draw as it introduces its policy for ADUs. The chapter will close with a formal conclusion to the project report.
Chapter 2: Community Profile

2.1 Introduction

A prerequisite for effective city planning is having a thorough understanding of the attributes that make up the local population. This enables planners to draft plans with a higher degree of specificity to the demands of those individuals who are, or will be, occupying the area. Since the real estate market is immobile and durable, it is important to enable the construction of physical infrastructure that meets the populations present and future needs insofar as a practical analysis can foresee.

Housing affordability is a function of the real estate market, which encompasses all the mechanics of supply and demand as it pertains to the allocation of physical space and how that space is utilized via the implementation of physical infrastructure. The demand for housing specifically is dependent on the number of people who seek to occupy a given area. Fundamentally, this is driven by affordability, accessibility, and employment opportunities. In the case of Peoria, the population is growing, so the demand per habitable unit-of-space within the jurisdiction is also increasing.

ADUs are one style of dwelling unit that can be added to Peoria’s housing supply, helping to meet a segment of the growing demand for housing and relieve the upward pressure on home prices.

To better understand Peoria’s housing needs, the Planning Workshop team researched a comprehensive community profile of the city. This profile consists mainly of data derived from the US Census Bureau’s 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates across several variables, which the team analyzed and summarized with tables, charts and maps for clarity.

2.2 Land Use

According to the MAG Land Use Explorer, the municipal planning area (MPA) for the City of Peoria is 204 square miles, or over 130,000 acres. As of 2019, three quarters of the land area within the MPA is either vacant (33.4%) or designated open space (41.8%). The third highest land use is single-family residential (15.3%). No other land use exceeds even 5% of the existing area. These other land uses include: employment (5.7%), transportation (2.6%), multi-family residential (0.7%), and agriculture (0.6%).

However, buildout projections provided by the MAG Land Use Explorer for the Peoria MPA assume that all land currently designated as vacant or agriculture will be ultimately repurposed for other uses. As of 2019, MAG projects that open space will remain the largest land use in Peoria at buildout (46.4%). The second largest land use will be single-family residential (38.1%). No other land use is projected to exceed 10% of the MPA. In descending order, these land uses will be: employment (9.9%), transportation (2.7%), commercial (2.1%), multi-family residential (1.8%), and mixed-use (1.1%). Figures 1 and 2 offer a visual comparison of the existing and projected future land uses of Peoria as provided by MAG.
These projections assume that Peoria’s plan is to continue growing and developing in a way that emphasizes the preservation of open space and single-family residential neighborhoods. However, it is important to note that Peoria has updated its General Plan since MAG released its latest land-use projections. Voters overwhelmingly approved the plan update, “General Plan 2040,” in November 2020, including updates to the City’s land-use map and strategies. And while the General Plan does not provide numerical or percentage figures for its land-use categories, it is certainly possible that the future allocations of land uses are revised from the figures provided by MAG. For example, the General Plan makes repeated reference to “smart growth” and mixed-use development, and adopts several policies that seem to encourage increasing the allocation of land for mixed uses throughout the city (perhaps well above the 1.1% figure cited by MAG). Figure 3 below shows the future land use map (FLUM) provided in the General Plan (3-7). More detailed discussion of the General Plan will follow later in this chapter.

**Figure 1: Existing Land Uses within the Peoria MPA,**

**Figure 2: Future Land Uses within the Peoria MPA,**

*Note: Per 2019 MAG projections. The “employment” category was created by combining the “commercial,” “industrial,” “office,” and “other employment” categories. This was done for simplification.*

*Source: http://geo.azmag.gov/maps/landuse/

*Note: Per 2019 MAG projections.*

*Source: http://geo.azmag.gov/maps/landuse/*
2.3 Demographic Information

This section summarizes Peoria’s basic demographic characteristics, primarily drawing from US Census and ACS data.

2.3.1 Population

Per ACS 1-Year estimates, Peoria’s population is estimated to have increased from 148,702 in 2010 to 168,196 in 2019 (see Figure 4). This represents an increase of 13%, or an average 1.4% per year. A longer-term trend going back to 1990 can be seen in Figure 5, as provided by the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). These trends, combined with the overall county and regional growth trends (Figures 6 and 7), suggest that the city’s population growth will continue for
the foreseeable future. This assumption is further supported by the most recent population projections released by MAG in 2019, which currently predict that Peoria will reach a population of 287,400 by 2050 within the current city limits—an increase of 71% from 2019, or an average of 2.3% per year. Therefore, as Peoria continues to attract new residents, it is safe to assume there will also be increased demand for additional places to eat, sleep, live, work, and play.

Figure 5: Population from 1990 - 2018


Figure 6: Percent Population Change

Note: Maricopa County is among the counties with the fastest rate of population growth (Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2020). Percent Population Change by County and Municipio: 2010 to 2019).

Figure 7: Numeric Population Change

Note: Maricopa County is centrally located between the fastest-growing counties in the U.S. by sheer count. (Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2020). Numeric Population Change by County.)


2.3.2 Age

Peoria is relatively evenly distributed when it comes to age. The two population pyramids below were created by dividing the population into age cohorts of five-year intervals, see Figures 8 and 9. Each of the cohorts in the 0-64 age range is fairly even, with a noticeable drop-off occurring for those aged 65 and above. The data shows that Peoria has a diverse population across generational lines. However, when comparing the population pyramids from 2010 and 2019, it becomes evident that Peoria is an aging community, as the portion of the population aged 65 and above appears to be growing as a proportion of the total.

**Figure 8: 2010 Population by Age and Gender**

**Figure 9: 2019 Population by Age and Gender**

*Note: Notice that the older age brackets represent a greater share of the total population in 2019 than in 2010.*
2.3.3 Race
Peoria’s racial demographic is dominated by Non-Hispanic White and Latino populations, who make up 69% and 20% of the total population, respectively. Asians comprise about 4% of the population, whereas African Americans comprise less than 3%. An additional 3% of the population is of some other race (e.g., American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, two or more races, etc.), see Figure 10. For comparison, in Maricopa County, Non-Hispanic Whites and Latinos make up 55% and 31%, respectively (Figure 11). African Americans and Asians comprise about 5% and 4% of the population, respectively, with an additional 4% (difference due to rounding) being of some other race. Race statistics for the Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler MSA, which includes both Maricopa and Pinal Counties, are nearly identical to those for Maricopa County alone. Thus, relative to the region, the City of Peoria’s population is whiter and less diverse, on average.

Figure 10: Population by Race

![City of Peoria: Population by Race](image1)

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2019). ACS 5 Year Estimates

Figure 11: Population by race for Maricopa County.

![Maricopa County: Population by Race](image2)

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2019). ACS 5 Year Estimates
2.4 Socioeconomic Information

This section shows socioeconomic characteristics for the city of Peoria, drawing from US Census Bureau data 2012-2021.

2.4.1 Median Household Income

The median household income for the City of Peoria between 2014 and 2019 is $75,323, per 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Figure 12 illustrates the distribution of household incomes for the City of Peoria. Over half (52.6%) of households fall into the $50,000 to $149,999 range, and almost a fifth (19.4%) fall into the $100,000 to $149,999 bracket. However, nearly a third (31.9%) of Peoria households make less than $50,000 per year, which could demonstrate a need for more affordable housing options for these lower-income families and households.

When compared to the Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler MSA, Peoria has a greater percentage of its population earning over $100,000 per year (34.8%) compared to the MSA’s proportion of just 29.39%, and Peoria has a noticeably lower percentage of people who make less than $50,000 per year (31.9%) compared to MSA’s 38.72% (Figure 13). In short, more people are making more money, and fewer people are making less money, as a percentage of the population in Peoria than in the MSA. This is especially true when comparing the percentages of each respective population that makes less than $25,000 per year, whereby Peoria is at 12.9% and MSA is at 16.9%.
The spatial distribution of median household incomes can be seen below in Figure 14 where two patterns become apparent: first, that the lowest household incomes (in red) tend to be clustered in the southern portion of the city. This provides insight as to where ADU’s might be the most beneficial toward ameliorating the burdens of housing costs for those most affected by them. Second, the highest median household incomes (dark green and dark blue) are largely located in the central-to-northern portions of the city. This could show areas that are most in need of more diverse housing choices. Overall, this information is useful because it can help to guide decision-makers toward areas where members of the population might be more (or less) in favor of, or in need of, implementing ADUs, enabling a more targeted approach as it pertains to gaining enough political will to get the ball rolling.

Figure 14

Note: The lowest income households are located in the southern half of the city where topography is flat, which makes it easier to build affordable housing.
2.4.2 Educational Attainment

Educational attainment in Peoria is high and appears to be increasing. Based on recent 2015-2019 ACS estimates, the percentage of the population aged 25+ years with a high school degree or more is higher in Peoria (92.6%) than Maricopa County (87.7%) and the Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler MSA (87.4%), as well as state (87.1%) and national (88%) averages (see Figure 15). A further breakdown of Peoria’s educational attainment can be seen in Figure 16, which, among other things, shows that a third (32.8%) of Peoria residents have a bachelor’s degree or more.

Figure 15: Educational Attainment

![Regional Educational Attainment Rates (Age 25+)](image)

Note: A macro view: Peoria has the highest ‘bachelor’s degree or higher’ recipient rate when compared to the Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler (MSA), county, state, and entire US.


Figure 16: Education Brackets

![Peoria Education Brackets](image)

Note: The vast majority of Peoria’s population is high school educated or more, with just under one-third having a bachelor’s degree or higher.

2.4.3 Industries and Employment

Peoria has consistently held a lower unemployment rate relative to the Phoenix MSA for the last 30 years, from 1990 through the most recently available data in 2020 (Figure 17). The sudden spike in unemployment that followed the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in Spring 2020 highlights a possible—and likely relatively brief—exception. Even then, it appears that Peoria’s unemployment rate remains lower than the MSA average.

Figure 18 provides employment figures by sector within the city. Although at least one sector—‘educational services, health care, and social assistance’—stands out as employing the largest number of workers, what is evident is that the workforce of Peoria appears to be rather diverse in terms of which sectors workers belong to.

Note: Peoria’s unemployment rate is consistently lower than the MSA with the exception of a brief period in 2020 during the Covid 19 pandemic.


2.4.4 Commute

Eighty-nine percent (89%) of Peoria’s workforce, over the age of 16, reports using a vehicle to get to work. For comparison, less than 1% of the workforce reports using public transportation for their commute, and 75% report working from home (it is important to reiterate that these figures are from the most recent ACS 5-year estimates from 2015 through 2019, so they predate the COVID-19 pandemic). And as Figure 19 illustrates below, over 44% of Peoria residents who drive alone report that they spend at least half an hour on their commute to work, with 75% reporting that they spend at least an hour or more. Comparatively, although they represent less than 1% of the overall workforce, nearly 89% of residents who take public transportation report spending at least half an hour on their commute, with well over half spending over an hour.

2.5 Housing Information

Between 2015 and 2019, per ACS 5-Year Estimates, the City of Peoria had 65,790 housing units, of which 59,659 (or 91%) were occupied. Of these occupied units, 75% were owner-occupied, whereas the remaining 25% were renter-occupied. Figure 20 illustrates below, the vast majority (75%) of housing units in Peoria are detached single family homes, which suggests that there may be opportunity for other kinds of housing options. This appears especially relevant in the northern half of the city, where upwards of 81% of housing units are homeowner occupied (see Figure 21)—suggesting there is room for rental supply growth.
Figure 21

Note: This map displays an approximate distribution of the percentage of homeowner-occupied units in different parts of Peoria. Source: Included in Picture.

Source: Created by L. Carnie using ArcGIS
2.5.1 Percent of Monthly Income Allocated to Housing Costs

Figure 22 summarizes the percent of monthly income allocated toward housing costs for renters and owners in the City of Peoria. Renters allocate between 9 to 14 percent more of their income toward housing costs monthly relative to owners, and the trend increased by 2% from 2018 through 2019. This could suggest that the demand for rentals is starting to increase at a faster rate than the demand for homes that are for sale.

Figure 22:

Note: The monthly income allocated to housing is 9-14 percent greater for renter-occupied than owner-occupied units.

2.5.2 Home Ownership and Rentership By Income

While 75% of homes in Peoria are owner occupied, it is important to contextualize this information in relation to income. Figure 23 provides a comparison between rentership and ownership by income bracket. This illustrates that, for all income brackets under the $75,000 threshold, more households rent than own; meanwhile, households that are at or above the $75,000 annual income mark are more likely to own than rent. It is also critical to note that the average household income of those who own is $86,884 annually, while the average household income of those who rent in Peoria is $47,766.

Figure 23:

Note: Peoria citizens who make less than $75,000 per year tend to rent their homes, whereas those earning $75,000 per year or more tend to own their homes.
Figures 24 and 25 illustrate the cost of housing for both renters and homeowners, respectively, as a percentage of income in Peoria. In this case, cost burden is defined as spending more than 30% of the household income on one’s rent or mortgage. By this definition, 53% of renters in Peoria are cost-burdened, as are 24% of homeowners. While this is a massive disparity, they are nonetheless concerning statistics for owners and renters alike and call further attention to the need for more affordable housing options.

**Figure 24:**

**Monthly Gross Rent Cost as Percent of Income**

- 42% Less than 20.0 percent
- 24% 20.0 to 24.9 percent
- 12% 25.0 to 29.9 percent
- 11% 30.0 to 34.9 percent
- 11% 35.0 percent or more

*Note: Among renters, more than half (53%) spend at least 30% of their income on rent.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year (2019)*

**Figure 25**

**Monthly Homeownership Cost as Percent of Income**

- 50% Less than 20.0 percent
- 17% 20.0 to 24.9 percent
- 10% 25.0 to 29.9 percent
- 7% 30.0 to 34.9 percent
- 16% 35.0 percent or more

*Note: Among homeowners, half spend less than 20% of their income on homeownership.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year (2019)*
2.6 A Review of Peoria Plans and Policies

In addition to assessing current demographic, socioeconomic and housing data, we reviewed several of Peoria’s contemporary planning documents. These plans all included public participation processes, which enabled us to learn about community vision and goals. The purpose of this review process was to understand the context in which an ADU policy might exist. We summarize our findings below in the following section.

2.6.1 Peoria General Plan 2040

The General Plan for the City of Peoria establishes a vision for where the city hopes to be in the coming decades. The 2040 General Plan recognizes the intention to maintain responsible and sustainable implementations as the city continues to grow. The plan recommends improved methods of development with several goals related to creating healthy neighborhoods and pressing forward with smarter growth. These goals, however, must not undermine the key principles of responsible stewardship of taxpayer funds, preservation of the natural landscape and maintenance of the community’s character. All of these principles, alongside the quality of life, are the very reasons residents have chosen to make Peoria their home. The challenge for any growing community lies in how it can allow for growth while meeting the emerging needs of the region. Affordable housing options are in high demand across the Phoenix Metropolitan Area. While Peoria has already taken some steps to ensure the city has a diverse housing stock, ADUs can expand further on the housing options currently available in the community. Moreover, ADUs can further support housing affordability goals because additional supply of housing will reduce upward pressure on home prices, while also adding to the diversity of housing options for a growing city. The Plan also recognizes that increased density can enable more sustainable development. Section 5 of the Plan, Healthy Neighborhoods, recognizes that housing can have a significant and sustained impact on an individual’s health, as well as the health of the entire community. Affordability, quality, fair practices, and aging in place are all emphasized as part of attaining a healthy neighborhood. Echoing sentiments of Section 3, the City of Peoria “seeks to expand housing options throughout the community to offer lifestyle housing options for all residents” (General Plan 2040, p. 5-9). The Plan’s policy recommendations also specifically promote and encourage diverse workforce housing, multigenerational housing, and non-traditional housing types, including ADUs (General Plan 2040, p. 5-15). Overall, a robust ADU policy is one housing solution that is compatible with the City’s priorities for health and prosperity.

2.6.2 Specific Area Plans

The City of Peoria has adopted numerous specific area plans over the past few decades to guide development. These plans echo similar themes from the General Plan. Earlier plans, such as the Lake Pleasant and North Peoria Area Plan (1999), emphasize the preservation of the natural environment. More recent plans such as the Old Town Peoria (2011) and Camino a Lago (2014) call for more diversity in housing options. Although vague, the specific area plans reinforce the community’s overall priorities.
2.6.3 Peoria Zoning Ordinance

The City of Peoria’s current zoning ordinance includes limitations that constrain ADU development. Ordinances governing Suburban Ranch and Single Family Residential districts, for instance, have separate sections discussing guest houses (and servant’s quarters) and accessory buildings, but these building types are not considered together. Guest houses are defined as “an attached or detached accessory building used to house guests of the occupants of the principal building, and which is never rented or offered for rent.” Moreover, guest houses with cooking facilities are considered dwelling units, which are only permitted in Suburban Ranch (SR-43 and SR-35) districts and the largest categories of Single Family Residential (R1-43 and R1-35) districts. In a separate section titled General Provisions Section (21-803), the zoning code addresses permitted accessory buildings. Attached accessory buildings are subject to the same code requirements as the principal building, while detached accessory buildings have their own standards. The size of an accessory building is dictated by the residential district it is located within, wherein larger lots allow for larger and taller structures. Ultimately, however, none of the accessory buildings can be higher than 25 feet. Also, there are no specified square footage requirements stated, but the building size remains subject to the maximum lot coverage requirement, and the zoning ordinance prohibits the use of cellars, garages, tents, basements or accessory buildings as a dwelling unit with the exception of guest houses and “quarters for night watchmen.” Peoria’s zoning ordinance is not completely prohibitive of ADU-like structures, however, the limitation on rentals presents an obstacle. More explicit language that allows for ADUs may be necessary.

2.7 Conclusion: Context Surrounding Accessory Dwelling Units

This chapter offers insights pertaining to market fundamentals that help support a rationale for including ADUs as a housing option in Peoria. Specifically, Peoria offers: strong population growth, an aging (and expanding) population (aged 65-74), and has a segment of the population with incomes that do not align with existing housing market trends—roughly one-third of the city’s residents earned less than $50,000 per year. Furthermore, with only a small fraction of land being allocated toward multi-family residential (0.7%), and a General Plan that emphasizes open space and single-family residential neighborhoods, the undermining reality is clear: ADUs, or other types of small-scale infill developments that can be brought to market at more attainable prices, could be an effective and locationally-flexible solution to the increasingly expensive real estate market in Peoria. If implemented, these expanded housing choices could expand economic opportunity, diversify housing options for a wider range of household types, and strengthen connections to place for broad swaths of the community.
Chapter 3: ADU Literature Review

Chapter 3 provides an overview of existing literature and research regarding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). The intent of the chapter is to objectively present background information and common themes upon which practical recommendations may be formed. The chapter: 1) defines ADUs and outlines their many uses; 2) addresses historical precedents and the current state of housing; and 3) provides a foundational understanding of regulatory controls, barriers, opportunities, and strategies associated with ADU implementation.

3.1 What are ADUs? What forms do they take?

Accessory Dwelling Units, or ADUs, are a secondary housing option that originally gained popularity in the early 20th century as a response to increasing housing needs. An ADU is a secondary dwelling with individual living facilities such as a kitchen, bathroom, and other amenities in a small space relative to a primary dwelling. They are typically additional structures on a single-family lot or part of transformed spaces in a single-family home, by the free will of a homeowner. They may be more commonly referred to as granny flats, in-law houses, backyard cottages, or guest houses.

Today, ADUs are a housing type that is once again gaining traction in Western societies that have traditionally had stringent land use regulations, though they have been more popular in most European countries for some time. ADUs tend to be much more common where the population is growing the fastest, for instance, the southern and western United States. In a recent survey conducted

---

**FAST FACTS**

- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are additional living facilities independent from a main single-family residence.
- ADUs have existed throughout history but are becoming more extensively regulated as localities navigate how to implement and formalize these housing units.
- They can assume a variety of uses (multi-generational housing, aging-in-place opportunities, short/long-term rentals) and can contribute to affordable housing solutions by increasing diversity and supply. They can also provide additional income streams that make homeownership more affordable.
- Research suggests that ADUs are predominantly used for long-term rental housing.
- Development costs and permitting processes can create barriers to ADU construction for homeowners. Neighborhood opposition and negative perceptions present barriers as well.
- Strategic regulatory frameworks, community education, and technical assistance are at the center of approaches to promote ADU implementation.
- Research confirms that these units can play a role in mediating the housing crisis in the United States and provide expansive options to homeowners and ADU residents alike.
by Freddie Mac, half of the ADUs identified were in California, Florida, Georgia and Texas. In Denver, Colorado the average annual growth of ADUs between 2015 and 2018 was 2.7% (Andrus, 2020).

Historically, ADUs took on many different uses depending on existing infrastructure and available resources for homeowners. The modern day ADU dates back to the 1940s and 50s, as homeowners pursued them to expand household finances and accommodate multi-generational family configurations in the wake of World War II (Hulse, 2015). During the early 20th century, ADUs were relatively widespread and supportive of these household uses (Pfeiffer, 2015). Over time, the ADU fell out of favor as zoning codes were changed to accommodate preferences for low-density single-family residential neighborhoods which eventually led to more prohibitory land uses, and consequently, suburban sprawl. This outcome ultimately made the permitting processes and construction of any type of ADU more cumbersome for homeowners, resulting in many illegal units.

In more recent years, following the booming suburban sprawl that has shaped much of the development in the United States, ADUs have re-emerged at the city planning scale as part of approaches to address infrastructure and housing challenges that many countries, including the United States, face. Community leaders are seeking strategies to alleviate the outcomes of aforementioned restrictive zoning laws and planning practices, including traffic congestion, limited affordable housing, diminishing housing stock, and a lack of housing diversity. In the 1990s, urban design movements such as Smart Growth and New Urbanism emerged to reduce automobile dependency and improve quality of life by creating inclusive walkable communities that also provide a wide range of housing choices (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2008). ADUs have been the subject of debate because although they can provide lower cost of housing and modestly increased density and variety, there is a large resistance that stems from the preferred tradition of low-density single-family development patterns and the “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) sentiment that has shaped the United States. They are slowly starting to work their way back into city planning conversations as a serious contender to help alleviate these issues.

The legality of an ADU structure is usually determined by the zoning laws of the local jurisdiction, which specifies the location and form an ADU may take on a property. Presently, the most common form of ADUs are those constructed as a detached structure located typically in the backyard of a single-family lot or as an attached unit to

Figure 3.1: ADU-Types

Source: (Town of Barnstable, n.d.)
ADUs have garnered much attention and discussion because they can take on a variety of uses and purposes. For instance, they are recognized as a crucial piece to the housing market puzzle because they can provide diversification and an increased supply of affordable housing units in communities where supply is limited and/or land availability is constricted. This section begins with a discussion of the state of housing in the United States, broadly, and in Arizona, specifically, with a focus on housing affordability and need. Subsequently, the section offers an overview on the importance of ADUs, including the roles they can play for communities and details on the kinds of households that are frequently interested in building them. Housing affordability is a major concern in the United States, as well as in Arizona. Single-family homes, garden apartments, and condominiums are the three most common dwelling options in locations across the United States is wide ranging due to the broad array of opinions and perceptions. Cities that adopt and tailor their own perspective of ADUs and mold policies that benefit and fit the needs of their community will have a better understanding of where ADU implementation will stand decades from now. The purposes, uses, regulations and perceptions of ADU implementation are accompanied by a swath of historical and contemporary context which must be acknowledged in any efforts made to establish this type of housing option as a more permanent and feasible solution.

3.2 Why ADUs? What purposes can they serve?

ADUs have garnered much attention and discussion because they can take on a variety of uses and purposes. For instance, they are recognized as a crucial piece to the housing market puzzle because they can provide diversification and an increased supply of affordable housing units in communities where supply is limited and/or land availability is constricted. This section begins with a discussion of the state of housing in the United States, broadly, and in Arizona, specifically, with a focus on housing affordability and need. Subsequently, the section offers an overview on the importance of ADUs, including the roles they can play for communities and details on the kinds of households that are frequently interested in building them. Housing affordability is a major concern in the United States, as well as in Arizona. Single-family homes, garden apartments, and condominiums are the three most common dwelling options in locations across the United States is wide ranging due to the broad array of opinions and perceptions. Cities that adopt and tailor their own perspective of ADUs and mold policies that benefit and fit the needs of their community will have a better understanding of where ADU implementation will stand decades from now. The purposes, uses, regulations and perceptions of ADU implementation are accompanied by a swath of historical and contemporary context which must be acknowledged in any efforts made to establish this type of housing option as a more permanent and feasible solution.
the United States (Julian, 2019) due to zoning regulations that have traditionally favored single-family housing and government subsidies that dictate who can afford homeownership. This has created a division in affordability and accessibility (Badger & Bui, 2019). Planners and citizens alike are recognizing the inherent limitations in this structure and its dramatic contribution to housing market shortages. While single-family housing is the most abundant housing option, it is the least affordable with a number of accessibility hurdles (e.g., mortgage qualifications and financial stability, broad variation in the cost of housing based on local/regional real estate markets). There is also a significant shortfall of government funding and programs aimed towards supporting housing opportunities for low-income families. Affordable housing programs that do exist predominantly target rental housing options and rely on private market participation.

Arizona is ranked the third worst state in the nation for its capacity to provide sufficient affordable housing options relative to demand (Zucker, 2020). According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC), there are only 25 affordable rentals available in Arizona for every 100 extremely low-income renter households (Newman et al., 2020). The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines “affordable housing” as those units where a household shall spend 30% or less of their monthly income on rent (Schwartz, n.d.). While rents have continued to rise throughout the years, incomes — especially those for low-wage occupations — have stayed relatively stagnant, increasing the number of cost-burdened renters (Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University, 2020). It all comes down to the rising inequalities of wages, and the most severely cost-burdened households are renters with extremely low incomes (Newman et al., 2020).

Nationally, the labor market has become extremely polarized over the last 40 years, with state minimum wages beginning at $7.25 per hour at the lowest end of the spectrum (Newman et al., 2020). These wages have stark implications for local housing markets, especially for low-wage workers in pursuit of rental housing. Although extremely low-income renter households account for only 25% of all renters in the US, they account for 72% of all severely housing cost-burdened renter households (Newman et al., 2020). For perspective, in Arizona, it is estimated that renters make up 36% of the housing market. As the state's minimum wage currently sits at $12 an hour, the fair market rent for a minimum wage worker to comfortably afford a two-bedroom apartment calculates to $1,097 a month. That means a low wage worker would have to work an average of 70 hours a week to meet this budget (NLIHC, 2020). These are some of the many stressors that have created an inaccessible housing market within the United States and Arizona, with particularly significant repercussions for those seeking affordable housing. These conditions especially impact low-wage workers and vulnerable populations in a variety of situations. Young adults, people of color, and elderly populations tend to face the greatest obstacles when finding and affording housing.

Housing diversification can be a solution to mediate the affordable housing crisis (Julian, 2019). A report from the National Association of Home Builders identified ordinances and codes across the United States that have enabled the construction of a greater mix of smaller and more affordable housing types (Julian, 2019). This recent research has identified that increased housing diversity helps
address the “missing middle” of housing units—in other words, it adds unit types that go beyond the standard models of traditional one- to two-bedroom apartments or single-family residences to serve the circumstances of the broader population (Figure 3). The diversification of housing is a response to the interconnected challenges of affordability and housing supply shortages. Housing diversity can be accomplished through infill development if more cities amend their zoning laws to allow for smaller housing options on smaller lots or in single-family housing districts. Accessory dwelling units can offer increased density, affordability, diversification and thus a more attainable housing supply. (NAHB, 2019). Further, research suggests that the most influential factor for people who choose these smaller housing types is a preference for proximity to services and amenities over unit size (NAHB, 2019). These findings acknowledge the potential use of ADUs to further diversify housing options and help address complex issues of affordability and divides in housing supply.

### 3.2.2 ADU Uses

ADUs can assume a variety of uses. As income disparities and aging populations increase in the United States, ADUs offer multi-generational and aging-in-place opportunities. Many homeowners are looking to house parents, young adults, or extended family in need of independent residence. Evidence from an AARP survey in 2018 shows that many people 50 years or older want to remain in their homes or communities for their foreseeable future (Spevak &
Stanton, 2019). ADUs offer a viable solution to aging-in-place goals, and family-occupied ADUs have multiple benefits: strengthened emotional bonds and support systems, extra household income, childcare assistance, additional household maintenance, additional security, and more (Sisson, 2018) (Brinig and Garnette, 2013).

A survey of Portland, Seattle and Vancouver ADUs found that most ADUs were occupied by smaller households. Approximately 57% of ADUs housed single occupants, and 36% housed two occupants (Chapple et al., 2017). The small ADU household size suggests that ADUs are typically occupied by adults—either alone or in a couple/roommate context—and are unlikely to increase the school-aged population within a community. This study also found that property owners are overwhelmingly housing family members or friends within their ADUs (Chapple et al., 2017).

Current data on the primary types of occupation and uses of ADUs coinciding with either short-term or long-term rentals is limited. The previously mentioned study estimates that 60% of ADUs are used for permanent housing, while 12% of units are utilized for short-term rentals. The other 28% is reserved for other uses. (Chapple et al., 2017). These findings suggest that ADUs contribute to the long-term rental market, contrary to much public debate (Chapple et al., 2017). Short-term rentals can provide temporary accommodations for tourists or individuals who are transitioning between homes and/or cities. Some homeowners may elect to build an ADU to generate an income stream via short-term rentals (e.g., AirBnB or VRBO). This can be especially appealing in areas where a strong tourist market exists and housing is expensive. Homeowners are able to host a variety of guests without a long-term commitment, and with an additional income-stream, homeownership is more affordable over
the long-term. Unlike other rental scenarios, homeowners living on the property can directly oversee the short-term use of an ADU.

In addition to infill development and affordable housing, ADUs also offer homeowners the opportunity to leverage their property as both developers and landlords. Through increased appraisal values, tax incentives, and rental income, homeowners who choose to build ADUs can grow their generational wealth by investing in their property. Additionally, the landlord may be able to depend on the tenant for house sitting, added security, and domestic maintenance tasks (Brining and Garnette, 2013). Depending on regulations and standards, homeowners may have full authority to build the ADU to their needs and aesthetic preferences. For tenants, ADUs can offer affordable housing options in neighborhoods that previously provided limited to no rental opportunities. They may find housing choices closer to employment opportunities or are able to remain in their community.

While ADU uses can offer a number of opportunities, it is important to note there is limited data on the legal and/or non-conforming regulatory status of existing ADU structures across the United States. In part, this uncertainty stems from the flexibility of ADUs—homeowners have the ability to change the use of the structure at any point (e.g., from a storage space to an occupied unit). Some homeowners may choose to operate an ADU as a permanent space for tenants within their family, as they were initially founded; others might pursue a short-term vacation rental for tourists such as Airbnb—an increasingly popular option that has many communities wary. These varying purposes pose both opportunities and challenges. For instance, homeowners can increase their monthly income while also providing affordable housing for tenants or their extended family, but community opposition, financial complexities, and regulatory hurdles are inherent obstacles.

3.3 Regulatory Controls

While ADUs have been popular in European countries for some time, they represent a relatively new housing option for many communities in the United States, particularly those with established suburban and/or more restrictive land use regulations. As municipalities begin to contemplate how ADUs may fit into their housing plans and communities, they may face a number of challenges, including those associated with existing regulatory structures, as well as issues stemming from community preferences and resistance to increased residential density that may cast ADUs and other forms of rental housing as a threat. This section summarizes several of the main challenges for ADU policies and implementation.

3.3.1 Zoning Regulations: Historical Precedents

ADU-style building types have long historical precedents leading up to the 20th century. Wealthy settlers and farmers routinely built as many dwellings on their land as they wished to accommodate their many domestic helpers, traditionally known as “carriage houses” or “servants quarters” (Spevak & Stanton, 2019). Transitioning into the industrial age, populations grew in city centers which resulted in the birth of the Euclidean model, a traditional zoning practice, which separates uses in an effort to limit over-densification conflicts and noxious impacts. However, this approach further implicated housing tensions, as racial segregation occurred in the residential context, creating “white flight” and suburban sprawl. These styles of zoning laws have generally segregated predominantly white single-family homeowners and neighborhoods which “almost always prohibit collocation on a single-family parcel” (Brining and Garnette, 2013), from immigrants and people of color who were left with inefficient conglomerate apartments or tentatments.
Despite historical precedents, ADUs can be logistically challenging to construct and difficult to incorporate into the existing urban fabric. Single-family residential neighborhoods with homes built into subdivisions can offer limited opportunity for redevelopment and/or rezoning. Beyond creating obstacles for increased housing density and accessibility, single-family development configurations are also land and energy intensive uses, leading to environmental challenges.

ADUs are built under the homeowners discretion; however, many subdivisions may have their own set of regulations, such as Homeowners Associations (HOAs), that could limit the ability to build an ADU on a property. For instance, existing restrictions around setbacks, open space requirements, and/or height requirements can constrain ADU development. Controversy surrounding ADUs is often related to their utilization and stems from zoning and safety concerns, which is why it is important for cities who intend to allow ADUs to have clear and concise zoning ordinances (MRSC, 1995).

### 3.3.2 Contemporary Zoning Regulations & State Statute

Zoning regulations concerning ADUs typically include specificities on minimum size requirements, building height, orientation, additional parking requirements, owner occupancy requirements, location restrictions, setbacks and other contextual standards that require ADU design to be subsidiary to and compatible with the principal dwelling (Salvador 2020). As land use patterns evolve and the desirability and/or acceptability of ADU units increases, local regulations will need to be adaptable to allow these housing units to more easily enter the market.

#### 3.3.2.1 State Enabling Legislation

Presently, many state legislatures are easing ADU development constraints by reducing zoning and permitting restrictions (Chapple et al., 2017). A report requested by the American Planning Association (APA) to the Public Policy Institute of AARP, asked the organization to develop model legislation (a state statute and a local ordinance) that would assist stakeholders in evaluating potential changes to state laws and local zoning ordinances, in order to encourage the wider availability of ADUs (Cobb, 2000). Their research found that regulatory barriers can be
effectively removed by the adoption of ADU legislation at the state level and by encouraging localities to adopt ADU ordinances (Cobb, 2000).

For example, in Vermont, a state statute explicitly supports ADU opportunities, providing that “no bylaw shall have the effect of excluding” ADUs as a permitted use (Brinig and Garnette, 2013). Furthermore, Vermont State Statute explicitly “limit[s] the authority of municipalities to regulate accessory apartments” and expressly states that an ADU “within or appurtenant to an owner-occupied single-family dwelling,” is a permitted use, as long as a few conditions are met (24 VSA §4412). In Florida, State Statutes allow municipalities to count ADUs towards satisfying the affordable housing components of a comprehensive plan, provided the building permits include affidavits from applicants who proclaim they are renting at affordable rates and to extremely low- to moderate-income residents (Fla. Stat. § 193.703 (2018)). And Maryland’s Department of Housing and Community Development provides incentives for ADUs, offering loans to rehabilitate homes to include accessory dwelling units (Brinig and Garnette, 2013).

There are other examples from across the United States but, in summary, the existing literature highlights that it is imperative for local government to consider the potential supports and/or impediments for ADUs that may exist at the state level. Research suggests that political support for ADUs within the state legislature can generate positive impacts at the local level (Brinig and Garnette, 2013). Alternatively, there are notable circumstances where state politics can hinder local efforts to incorporate ADUs into municipal housing strategies. In any case, it is useful for local governments to consider the larger legislative opportunities and/or challenges when considering a more diverse housing policy.

### 3.3.2.2 Local Zoning: Overview

The literature addresses a variety of case studies across the United States, where jurisdictions have relaxed their restrictions related to ADUs. For example, one study reviewed the ADU market in Lawrence, Kansas (Hulse, 2015). The study identified population growth and surging housing demand as two factors that were driving changes in housing supply. To combat housing supply shortages, developers and homeowners were adapting existing single-family homes into duplexes. However, many residents were resistant to this housing change, expressing concern that structural changes would harm the historic character of the neighborhoods (Hulse, 2015). Instead, the city identified an opportunity to support ADU development, which enabled homeowners to build and provide an additional unit on their property without substantially changing the existing fabric of the neighborhoods (Hulse, 2015).

However, identifying the benefits and opportunities is only the first step to understanding the prospects of ADUs. To accommodate ADUs, cities must define the appropriate zoning requirements and processes to permit and plan for this alternate form of housing (Salvador 2020). In the United States, and especially Arizona, there are limited examples of cities with clear ADU zoning and development standards that allow homeowners to build and navigate the permitting process effectively. Many communities either neglect to acknowledge ADUs in their planning and/or zoning documents or have limited approaches for implementing them.

One major point of concern related to ADUs (and commonly addressed within zoning ordinances) is parking. Existing minimum parking requirements can limit opportunities for homeowners to add ADUs to their property, either due to space or cost constraints.
However, some state and local governments are adopting zoning amendments that modify or eliminate parking requirements for ADUs. For example, California passed a series of laws in 2016 to eliminate off-street parking requirements for homes within half a mile of public transit, homes in historic districts, or for ADUs attached to an existing unit (Thomaz, 2018). Enforcing additional parking requirements can also cause a nuisance and unsightly additions to the neighborhood. However, recent evidence suggests that parking is less of a concern for ADU properties than previously thought. For example, a Portland, Oregon study found that 20% of ADUs had zero cars associated with them and the mean number of cars per ADU was 0.93 cars (Palmeri, 2014).

Parking-related concerns are relevant to ADUs because of the potential difficulties they pose for homeowners or the irritation they may induce for nearby neighbors. However, on-site parking can also be a burden for ADU tenants. Local regulations often stipulate that developers must build parking spaces in proportion to the number of housing units provided, and as a consequence, they are typically bundled with the rent or sale of the units (Lehe, 2018). A rental unit with designated on-site parking can increase the monthly rental price relative to one without a private space. Thus, there is a growing concern that minimum parking requirements inadvertently make housing unaffordable.

Given these potential challenges, traditional parking regulations may represent a significant obstacle for increasing the supply of ADUs, either reducing housing affordability or making it untenable for the homeowner to add additional parking without reconfiguring the entire property. More research needs to be done on the effects that ADUs have on parking; however, one of the most common practices that has been undertaken by cities trying to encourage more ADU construction is the elimination of parking requirements. Opposition towards ADUs sometimes manifests in regulatory controls. For instance, some municipalities in the Phoenix metropolitan area have either outlawed ADUs altogether or have placed a number of restrictions on their use, including: outlawing ADUs from having full kitchens—a feature that de facto prohibits long-term rental occupancy per local regulations; requiring shared addresses and/or utilities with the main residence; adopting specific occupancy requirements that constrain the ADU to either family or temporary occupants; or requiring additional regulatory hurdles, including a public hearing (Pfieffer, 2015).

Other Arizona communities report that strict regulation of lot coverage and setback requirements for ADUs are critical to overcoming neighborhood opposition while also preserving local ecology and wildlife corridors (Pfieffer, 2015). Interviews with public sector planners from 22 jurisdictions in the Phoenix region identified that compliance with lot coverage and setback requirements represented one of the most significant barriers to ADU development for homeowners (Figure 6). As indicated in the table excerpt from the study, 100% of the localities in the Phoenix metropolitan region have some regulatory structure related to building size limitations and lot coverage/setback requirements.

### 3.4 Barriers to ADU

Development ADUs are built fully under the homeowner’s discretion; therefore, they carry the full responsibility of legalizing and financing their ADU. There are many barriers that may prevent homeowners from building their ADU of choice, including financial hurdles, difficulty of navigating city codes, permit processes, and design guidelines. In addition, individual perspectives and misconceptions...
of ADUs at the neighborhood level create another unique set of barriers. The literature identifies obstacles related to development costs and financing, neighborhood opposition, and community education and offers a number of strategies that can be implemented.

3.4.1 Development Costs and Financing

ADUs can cost up to 40% less to build than comparably sized housing, though building and permitting costs remain a barrier for increased ADU development (MRSC, 1995). Specifically, attached units are more feasible because they are expansions of an existing home. Construction costs widely vary because of many different variables including, the building and materials fees, permitting fees, size, type, and style of an ADU (Building an ADU, n.d.). There is currently no clear average because ADU construction is based on personal preference of the homeowner. The most current sample totals can be found from an ADU homeowner education site seen in (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Average ADU Construction Costs

Source: (Building an ADU, n.d.)

From a 2018 survey, 70% of homeowners experienced additional unanticipated issues during ADU construction, which can cause delays and increased costs (Geffner, 2018). This can be frustrating along with finding contractors who have experience with micro-units because few contractors will take on such small projects (Geffner, 2018). Residential lending can represent another challenge, as lenders may not be familiar with ADU products and/or they may not have sufficient loan services to support ADU construction (Salvador 2020). The development of ADU-specific financing products at local banks may help activate development—in addition to creating a niche market for lenders willing to lead in ADU financing (Salvador 2020). Lastly, local governments new to legalizing ADUs may have limited familiarity with processing, and local ordinances may not provide sufficient regulations for them. Thus, in some places, ADUs can be considered a non-conforming use with the potential to result in stiff penalties for the property owners (MRSC, 1995).

Financial challenges can be intimidating or confusing for many. The financial burden of ADUs can represent a major hurdle for homeowners and cities in their attempt to increase housing supply.

Table 3. Frequency of common second unit regulations in the Phoenix region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Percentage of 22 localities requiring (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size limit</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage/setbacks</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rental</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same address and utilities</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design guidelines</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home built first</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional construction</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No front-yard location</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No full kitchens</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra parking</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-acre or larger zones</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearing required</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family only</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-acre or larger zones</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary occupancy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached only</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Planner interviews and review of localities’ second unit regulations.

Note: Since some localities allowed for several types of second units or varied regulations among lot sizes, the table shows the requirements for the most liberal type of unit allowed for the smallest lot size where it could be built.

Source: Pfeiffer, 2015, pg. 293
Homeowners could spend substantial sums of money with a number of other unexpected financial hurdles on a space or structure, only to receive little or no return upfront, which may inhibit property owners from pursuing ADUs entirely. Looking beyond the financial challenges, there are other negative perceptions and barriers that can make ADUs impractical including neighborhood opposition, unjust property values, and notions of crime. The following sections describe solutions from the literature that can ease some of these apprehensions, particularly through education and community involvement.

### 3.4.2 NIMBYism and Neighborhood Opposition

Many aforementioned fears about ADUs lead to a “Not In My Backyard,” or NIMBY, stance. This is best defined as an overwhelming opposition to a development of any type within one’s area (Hayes, 1991). In relation to ADUs, many misconceptions have led to negative attention towards these projects, making it difficult for development or the passing of new zoning ordinances to make building them more feasible. Neighborhood opposition can impact housing options within a community because it can decrease much needed rental units, multi-family structures, and other housing options that may increase density within existing neighborhoods. Increasing density is often seen as unwarranted in single-family neighborhoods because it is perceived to disrupt neighborhood character, invade privacy, negatively impact property values, and create a sense of insecurity due to the presence of unfamiliar tenants.

#### 3.4.2.1 Short Term Rental Concerns

ADUs as short-term rentals are one of the primary points of neighborhood opposition, due to resident concerns related to a transitory population within the community and the potentially negative impact on the community landscape. Some cities across the United States have considered laws to limit short-term rentals in order to preserve neighborhood character and ensure that locals are able to afford housing in high valued tourist areas (Simmons, 2020). Larger municipalities such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and Seattle are supportive of ADUs, but have incorporated additional licensing, costs, and fines as precautions (Simmons, 2020). Meanwhile, in Arizona, Senate Bill 1350 prohibits cities from banning short-term rentals completely, although cities are allowed to reasonably regulate or limit their uses if it is within the health and safety of the community (Arizona Senate Fifty-Second Legislature, 2016).

ADUs used for long-term, multi-generational housing tend to garner the most support from homeowners and neighborhoods (Brinig and Garnette, 2013), but the long-term versus short-term rental status of ADUs drives much of the controversy surrounding their implementation. Broadly speaking, the market has been responding well to high quality, smaller-designed units that fit within single-family neighborhoods.

---

**Figure 7. Average ADU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Sq foot</th>
<th>Cost per Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached new construction</td>
<td>$180,833</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement ADU</td>
<td>$185,833</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached ADU</td>
<td>$154,400</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage conversion</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached new construction above a garage</td>
<td>$217,714</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: (Building an ADU, n.d.)*
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(NAHB, 2019). This opens the door for ADUs to be part of a solution that increases housing density, improves affordability, and maintains neighborhood character. The literature has identified ADUs as adding diversity and market competition to local housing markets. In Arizona, ADUs are frequently detached from the main residence and are built as an independent structure in the back or side yard. ADUs enable homeowners to construct independent dwelling units on their properties, while providing lower cost housing (and, potentially, an income stream).

3.4.2.2 Neighborhood Character and Design Standards

One of the most common complaints neighboring homeowners have with the addition of secondary units, including ADUs, is that the additional unit will invade privacy and disrupt the existing character of the neighborhood. Existing literature suggests there are specific ADU policies that can help overcome local opposition, including: ensuring ADUs are designed to complement the existing property and neighborhood context; and targeting ADU development within neighborhoods with close proximity to public transit options, limiting traffic concerns (Pfieffer, 2015). There are many case study examples in the United States but specifically from California because of their progressive approach to addressing the housing crisis in their state. Many of their ADU policies attempt to address and minimize these neighborhood concerns through several means. For instance, most ADU policies require preservation of the original single-family residence through an application of design guidelines. This can include enforcing a similar facade, color, and style of home. It is also typically required in many jurisdictions for an ADU to be built in the rear or side yards of a property for privacy (Brining and Garnette, 2013). In addition, it is important to incorporate community engagement and outreach which can assist with validating the regulatory approaches because it is tailored to the preference of the community, including modified on/off street parking requirements, and building standards such as materials, colors, and height. (Abu-Kahlaf, 2020). These policy strategies can help ensure predictability and consistency for property owners and builders, as well as mitigate negative community perceptions.

A case study in San Jose, California offers an example of the ways ADU development and sustainable design can support affordable housing goals (Stagi, 2019). The city used aerial imagery to identify two typical lot types in the San Jose region: Lot A—a long, thin lot that is common for smaller homes found in older San Jose neighborhoods, and Lot B—a more standard, rectangular lot that is suitable for larger homes that are sited near the center of the property. Using this information and survey responses from City staff and the general public, San Jose created a series of design standards for ADUs—referred to as the “Design Toolkit”—to help guide future development opportunities. The toolkit identified a range of design elements to consider, including skylights, solar panels, rain gardens, permeable pavers, and native vegetation, among others (Stagi, 2019). Afterward, the City drafted sit-scale designs to demonstrate the potential layouts for ADUs located within Lot A- or Lot B-type properties and to illustrate the design elements in the toolkit.

Since ADUs are typically homeowner-driven projects, as opposed to larger-scale, commercial residential projects built by professional developers, cities may benefit from the creation of toolkits, accessible handouts, and how-to-guides that raise awareness and educate homeowners on the value, processes, and regulations surrounding ADUs (Salvador 2020). In order to streamline the city review and permitting processes, some jurisdictions have offered pre-approved,
standard ADU building plans. San Diego County, for example, offers a variety of standard ADU plan types that are categorized by square footage and layout, including one-, two-, and three-bedroom plans that range from 600 to 1,200 square feet in size (San Diego County, n.d.). The plans offered by San Diego County were designed and reviewed by the Planning and Development Services Department to ensure compliance with the California Building Code and are provided at no cost for the end-user. Since the characteristics of each property vary throughout the County, the pre-approved plans are intended to be approximately 85% complete, enabling the individual property owner to alter the final plans to address context-specific requirements (Howe, 2019).

3.4.2.3 Neighborhood Property Values

Another common concern from neighboring property owners is that rental units, including ADUs, may decrease their property values. There is a small body of literature that refutes this concern, and research specifically examining the relationship between ADUs and property values is limited. One study suggests that ADUs can often lead to property value increases for the individual parcel and do not negatively impact nearby property values (Thomaz, Brown and Watkins, 2018). Another study used a regression analysis of property values to conclude that people were willing to pay more for homes located in denser areas with New Urbanist designs that accommodated ADUs, while there was less market demand for increased density in suburban areas (Song and Knaap, 2003).

A more recent study for the City of Pasadena, California compared two adjacent neighborhoods with similar lot sizes and neighborhood characteristics but with one important difference: ADUs accounted for 17% of the total housing units in one neighborhood (High-ADU Neighborhood), while ADUs represented only 2% of total housing units in the other (Low-ADU Neighborhood) (Burns, 2017). When the study compared sales prices for homes without ADUs in the two neighborhoods, it found that homes in the High-ADU neighborhood sold at a slightly higher overall sales price and a slightly lower price per square foot (Burns, 2017). The report also concluded that higher ADU concentrations did not appear to negatively affect neighboring property values in Pasadena, (Figure 8) (Burns, 2017). Although the High-ADU Neighborhood was larger than the Low-ADU neighborhood, the study did not discuss why there appears to be a higher turnover rate in the neighborhood with more ADUs.

3.4.2.4 Crime & Disregard for the Neighborhood

Homeowners often express concern over ADUs, citing a fear of increased crime and neighborhood decline stemming from the transitory nature of renters and potential tenant disregard for the neighborhood. Research has not extensively explored the validity of these concerns in neighborhoods with respect to ADUs. However, existing literature does offer some insights regarding the association between crime rates, declining neighborhood conditions, and rental units (including apartments and single-family rentals), with differing results. One study found no relationship between single-family rental units and crime rates (Ihlanfeldt and Yost, 2019), while another found crime rates were positively associated with the owner’s distance from the rental unit (Rephann, 2008). Another article reasoned that, counter to the general concern over ADUs and quality of life, ADUs actually contributed to neighborhood upkeep, as the homeowner could either barter for maintenance work in lieu of rent or use...
newfound rental income for maintenance expenses (MSRC, 1995). Notably, existing research suggests homeowners or landlords are often required to maintain primary residence on the same parcel as the ADU, potentially resulting in better screening and supervision of tenants than other forms of rental housing (Brining and Garnette, 2013). Additionally, the increased tax revenue generated by ADU rentals (e.g., through increased property valuation) have the potential to enable higher levels of public services to the community, such as emergency services, parks, or LED streetlights.

3.4.3 Overcoming Opposition & Encouraging YIMBY-ism

Despite the challenges and opportunities discussed above, overcoming neighborhood opposition to ADUs remains a significant barrier for implementing successful policies. For instance, “lower-income bedroom communities facing fiscal pressure may aspire to become affluent job centers and embrace housing strategies such as ADUs that lead to the population density needed to support thriving commercial districts. Higher-income bedroom communities (particularly those oriented to retirees) may be wary of second units because they want to protect their quality of life and have the resources to do so” (Pfeiffer, 2015). While bedroom communities are not at immediate risk of decline, such communities can view ADUs as a way to avoid decline by supporting the market for those who desire living in dense, diverse, and more walkable communities (Pfeiffer, 2015). Despite these challenges, there is minimal evidence to support or refute NIMBY perceptions associated with ADUs (Pfeiffer 2015). Conversely, there is a growing advocacy for increased density that supports affordable housing supply. This position, known as YIMBY-ism (Yes In My Backyard), acknowledges and supports ADUs as a minimally invasive and viable option for additional housing. The literature identifies several strategies for overcoming opposition and increasing YIMBY support for ADUs.

Homeowner education is a central strategy for overcoming ADU opposition and encouraging YIMBY-ism. Case studies and other research identifies lack of experience with construction projects, intimidating permitting processes, and fear of violating building codes as major barriers to building ADUs for homeowners and builders alike (Chapple et al. 2017). Recent research points to the success of educational community programs to help homeowners overcome these challenges and familiarize themselves with the ADU process. For instance, Portland, Oregon developed educational programs in 2008 and, by 2010,
the city began to see dramatic increases in its ADU permits (Chapple et al. 2017). Key educational strategies may include:

- Community involvement meetings/charrettes
- Manuals/handouts
- Websites
- Technical assistance
- Tours or other events of existing ADUs

Community involvement is known to be the most beneficial solution to getting the community onboard with any type of city planning project or zoning changes. Engaging the community can actively promote trust and assurance and adequately address the needs of the community. Community involvement can be in the form of community meetings that allow residents and stakeholders to express their concerns, be a part of the decision-making process. A charrette is an example of a specific hands-on participation method to resolve conflicts and map solutions. These educational strategies relate to ADUs because the community will be more apt to approve of them if they are a part of the process to design the codes to suit the community’s needs (Abu-Kahlaf, 2020).

Manuals can offer a step-by-step guide that reduces confusion over ADU permitting and construction processes. The literature highly recommends manuals as one strategy to educate homeowners and noted this was one element of the City of Santa Cruz’s multifaceted ADU program (Chapple et al. 2017). ADU manuals can serve multiple purposes, including describing the permitting requirements and/or providing step-by-step instructions on how to apply for permits, grants or waivers, and financing options.

ADU websites have also been used to educate homeowners and builders on local programs, resources, and incentives, such as expedited permitting, financing programs, and pre-approved (permit-ready) ADU plans. San Diego County’s ADU website provides links to pre-approved plans, ADU-specific requirements, and instructions to obtain building permits (San Diego County n.d.). The site also provides basic information needed to understand fee waivers and lists allowable sizes (Figure 9).

Technical assistance strategies can also make it easier for homeowners to navigate the ADU permitting process. One example includes assigning a homeowner or building a dedicated point of contact (e.g., a current zoning planner) to guide them through the ADU process. The City of Vancouver provided technical assistance as part of its highly successful ADU program (Chapple et al. 2017), and San Diego County has an email account dedicated to ADU questions on its website to provide information on ADU-specific requirements (San Diego County). Lastly, tours and other educational events are low-cost programs that can offer information on city requirements, while also providing potential ADU homeowners the opportunity to experience properties with ADUs and ADU configurations. Some of Portland’s ADU success has been attributed to bike tours conducted by ADU and green building advocates, promoting the housing type (Chapple et al. 2017). Combining these various educational programs and strategies, which may be sponsored by public or private entities and feature ADU-appropriate regulations and/or incentives, can help increase support for ADUs (Chapple et al. 2017).
3.5 Discussion

The body of research and literature surrounding ADUs will inevitably grow as cities and localities propose new ordinances for legality or adapt to the needs and changes in their specific community. Even so, the current conversations around ADUs confirm that these units have a valuable purpose in assisting to mediate the housing crisis in the United States and provide options to homeowners and ADU residents alike—whether they are family members or young professionals seeking affordable rental opportunities within their community. However regulatory controls and barriers, such as financial costs and neighborhood opposition, stunt the progress of normalizing the construction of ADUs in many jurisdictions. Since single-family zoning has existed for about a century, perceptions of ADUs have fluctuated over time (Baldassari & Solomon, 2020). In the modern day, there is the realization that the zoning choices of the past have directly contributed to many of the housing challenges that communities are either currently facing or anticipating in the future. Reestablishing the opportunities for—and necessity of—ADUs may be one of the important missing pieces of the housing puzzle. ADUs notably offer a range of possibilities, albeit not without a handful of obstacles. However, if applied properly, ADUs could benefit many lives and communities.

Figure 9. San Diego County

Examples for allowable ADU sizes are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square Footage of Existing single-family residence (SFD)</th>
<th>Maximum Allowed Square Footage for Detached ADU</th>
<th>Maximum Allowed Square Footage for Attached ADU (up to 50% of SFD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,450 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>725 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,800 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>900 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,500 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After reviewing the information provided on ADUs, if you still have any questions please contact us:
Phone Number: (858) 495-5362
E-mail: PDS.ADUquestions@sdcounty.ca.gov

To find out how your property is zoned (please enter your APN # on the upcoming screen)
Complete List of ADU Zoning Requirements
Instructions for Obtaining a Building Permit

Source: San Diego County
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Chapter 4: Stakeholder Engagement

In an effort to capture the sentiments of key stakeholders relating to housing affordability and knowledge about ADUs, the Planning Workshop team included a qualitative research component in the scope of work with the City of Peoria. The team collaborated with the City to select appropriate research questions and to identify key stakeholders whose knowledge related to these questions would be important to consider. What followed was a series of focus groups and interviews with City staff, affordable housing advocates, and private developers in order to get a broad range of ideas on the feasibility of ADUs by gathering experiences, common issues faced, and best practices. The team subsequently organized the qualitative information into a comprehensive database, analyzing it to identify common trends and ideas that aided our investigating team in providing recommendations to the City of Peoria. While more public engagement is expected, the findings in this chapter represent a broad overview of the perceptions and attitudes held by key stakeholders as they relate to housing affordability in Peoria and ADUs as a policy measure, and can provide important insight in shaping an effective ADU policy in Peoria.

4.1 Research Methodology

The project team worked closely with the City of Peoria to create a standard interview instrument that sought in-depth stakeholder feedback related to affordability and availability of housing in Peoria, as well as perceptions and recommendations related to a potential ADU policy. This interview instrument included the following questions:

General Housing Questions

1. Regarding housing types, do you think there is a variety of housing available in the City? Is there affordable housing available? What about housing to accommodate seniors, young people or multi-generational housing?
2. Do you think there is a need for additional types of housing in Peoria? What types and where (if applicable)?
3. What challenges exist to increase affordable housing supply in Peoria?
4. What do you think is the most effective way to improve housing affordability?

ADU-specific Questions

5. Based on what you know about ADUs, what are your perceptions?
6. Do you think ADUs would be feasible within the City? Why or why not?
7. In which parts/neighborhoods of the City do you think ADUs would receive the most positive (or negative) reception? Why (or why not)?
8. What would you say are the advantages/disadvantages of ADUs?
9. If the City of Peoria were to adopt an ADU policy, where would you anticipate challenges? Opportunities?
10. What would an effective ADU policy look like in the City?
Subsequently, the Planning Workshop team worked with Peoria’s Planning & Zoning Department to identify an appropriate list of internal and external stakeholders to interview about the agreed research topics. The analysis group selected stakeholders based on their expertise related to housing development, policy, or Peoria-specific knowledge. Members of the Planning Workshop team facilitated each interview or focus group, including one or two interviewers and additional members as note-takers. We conducted all of the individual interviews and most of the focus groups discussions virtually, via Zoom. In addition, the team was able to conduct an in-person focus group for the Planning and Zoning Commission at the invitation of City officials. In total, we interviewed 27 stakeholders, either individually or as part of a moderated focus group discussion. The discussions included:

- Four focus groups comprised of the following stakeholders:
  - Peoria City Manager’s Office, including the City Manager and members of his executive leadership team;
  - Peoria City Staff with participation from representatives from various departments including: Planning and Zoning, Economic Development, Neighborhood and Human Services, and Public Works;
  - City of Peoria Planning and Zoning Commission, which was attended by seven commissioners as part of the official commission meeting on March 18, 2021;
  - Affordable housing advocacy groups including a representative from the Arizona Housing Coalition, Urban Land Institute Arizona, Vitalyst Health Foundation, ASU Stardust Center for Affordable Homes and the Family; and
- Five individual interviews with representatives from the private sector including home developers and land entitlement planners.

Once the interviews were completed, the Planning Workshop team performed an initial coding exercise. One representative from each interview conducted this inductive content analysis and took notes on overall topics that arose from the discussion. After this preliminary inductive coding work was completed, a member of the analysis team created a more formalized codebook based on the preliminary analysis. This analysis yielded five major themes, each with multiple subthemes, descriptions of which are outlined below. A team of two then conducted a deductive line by line analysis of the interview results based on the themes and subthemes in the codebook.

### 4.1.1 Potential Validity and Reliability Issues

The primary goal in stakeholder selection and construction of the interview instrument was to ensure that broad points of view were taken into consideration in the analysis. Initially, a representative group of residents and leaders of local homeowners associations (HOAs) were expected to be included. However, due to time and resource constraints, engagement with these stakeholders was not able to be performed. This presents a potential external validity issue as the feedback received from the interviewed stakeholders may not be reflective of the perceptions of residents or HOA leaders more generally. The remaining focus groups and interviewees commented on opinions and ideas likely to be brought up during sessions with residents and HOA representatives; however, these groups focused on their specific areas of expertise. For instance, the affordable housing group comments tended to focus on affordable housing stock. Similarly, the developer group had a large number of comments geared towards development costs and ordinance restrictions. The
Planning and Zoning Commission was anticipated to be sensitive to and include Peoria residents’ opinions, however, it is suggested that once the pandemic and resources allow, residents and HOA representatives be queried to ensure this viewpoint is accounted for.

From a process perspective, COVID-19 restrictions required the majority of focus groups and interviews to be conducted online via Zoom. This may have led to minor difficulties including a learning curve for facilitators and participants, unstable internet connections and an inability to read body language. These limitations were addressed by employing multiple note-takers and facilitators for focus groups as well as recording the sessions for further review.

Finally, due to the amount of participants, a high quantity of data was generated, necessitating review by multiple coders. To ensure reliability of the line by line analysis, all stages of coding and identification of themes and subthemes were reviewed and approved by the entire qualitative group before proceeding to the next stage. This ensured adherence to the codebook and promoted high intercoder reliability.

4.2 Themes Derived from Assessment

Throughout the qualitative analysis there were several themes that became apparent through conversations and interviews with these key stakeholders. These themes were separated and categorized based on definition and prevalence to the subject matter. The five main themes that emerged were: ADU implementation, unaffordable housing, ADU development challenges, housing type diversity, and ADU benefits.

Through an extensive coding process, themes were broken down further into subthemes, which offered more detailed examples of pros and cons associated with ADUs. The following section is a detailed description of all themes and subthemes derived from our data analysis.

1. ADU Implementation

Description: Examples or specific recommendations for implementation of a successful ADU policy.

Subthemes:

- **Policy Scope and Intention** Responses that mention scope, intention or incentives relating to an effective ADU policy. Participants noted driving factors and objectives behind policies as being important.
- **Short Term Rentals** Any mention of ADUs being used as a short-term rental, whether for good or bad, including statements that mention AirBnb, vacation rental, etc.
- **Neighborhood Attitudes** Phrases related to criticism or support of ADUs by neighbors or homeowners associations or any mention of NIMBYism.
- **Community Outreach** Recommendations for community outreach or education campaigns to build support for ADUs from the neighborhood level.
- **Development Timeline** and Infrastructure Coordination developing or after developing the primary unit or discuss issues relating to utility and other public service coordination.
1. **Unaffordable Housing**  
*Description: Comments that center on the lack of affordable/attainable housing.*

**Subthemes:**
- **Supply/Demand Imbalance:** General comments that convey that there is a shortage of attainable and/or affordable housing attributed to market forces.
- **High Development Costs:** Phrases relating to the cost of land, construction, materials, etc. that make building homes at attainable prices difficult in the current market.
- **Regulatory Burdens:** Mentions of zoning codes or other development regulations in Peoria or other administrative level as a barrier to more affordable housing development.
- **Lack of Public Resources:** Phrases that mention missing public funds, or program supports that could incentivize development of more affordable housing.

2. **ADU Development Challenges**  
*Description: Comments related to challenges associated with physical development or regulation of ADUs.*

**Subthemes:**
- **Physical lot characteristics:** Responses that include mention of physical lot characteristics that impede ADU development such as lot size and/or setbacks.
- **Parking and traffic:** Any mention of ADUs and parking requirements or additional traffic imposed. Perception of ADU development impacts, or lack of impact on traffic.
- **Cost to build:** Comments related to the cost of ADU development via cost of permits, building materials, contractor hiring price, etc.
- **Neighborhood character:** Responses that discuss ADUs in the context of the character of the neighborhoods in which they are built and whether ADUs are beneficial or harmful to that perceived character.
- **Design review processes:** Phrases mentioning design aesthetic standards or reviews of ADUs. Typically strenuous design standards requiring matching aesthetics can make the building process more complicated.

3. **Housing Type Diversity**  
*Description: Responses that relate to the diversity of housing types in Peoria.*

**Subthemes:**
- **Missing middle housing:** Phrases that mention “Missing middle” housing or the desire to provide neighborhood-scale housing types beyond single-family homes.
- **Changing preferences:** Statements about the changing preferences for housing. Including starter homes, downsizing, or desire for housing types aside from the typical single family home.
- **Infill:** Responses that include mention of infill development typically in the form of developing on vacant lots within city limits, in largely developed and aging areas.
4. ADU Benefits

Description: Phrases promoting the beneficial aspects of ADUs.

Subthemes:

- Multi-generational living: Phrases that identify ADUs as a means to provide housing support for aging parents or young adult children
- Increase supply of attainable/affordable housing: Phrases that characterize ADUs as a strategy to deliver more affordable and/or attainable housing.
- Other benefits: Statements that mention general benefits of ADUs beyond as a means to increase affordable housing or provide multi-generational living options.

4.3 Results and Findings

After coding was completed, the team conducted an analysis of themes and subthemes. Figure 1 depicts the number of comments from the qualitative assessment that fell into each of the five major theme categories. “ADU implementation” received the highest number of comments with 102 (30% of the total), “Unaffordable housing” had 78 comments (23% of the total), and 71 comments were made with respect to “ADU development challenges” (21% of the total). This demonstrates that, generally, respondents were most focused on how ADUs would be implemented in Peoria, the lack of affordable housing available within the city, and many of the known challenges associated with developing ADUs.

4.3.1 ADU Implementation

The most consistently mentioned subtheme within the ADU implementation category was “policy scope and intention,” as demonstrated in Figure 2 below. Comments of this type expressed a feeling that any ADU policy enacted by the city must be specifically and carefully tailored to whatever its intentions are; if not, ADUs could be used for other purposes. As an example, one interviewee stated that it is imperative that general guidelines for the policy are established as clearly as possible.
The topic of “short-term rentals” also relates closely to policy intention. Several participants noted that there could be an issue of ADUs being used as AirBnB’s or other vacation rentals, for example, instead of their intended purpose for permanent residents. However, as detailed in the literature review in Chapter 3, existing research suggests a small share of ADUs (approximately 12% in the cited study) are actually used for short-term rentals. This might suggest that the scale of the short-term rental issue is smaller than communities perceive it to be.

“Neighborhood attitudes” was another popular subtheme, which represented phrases related to criticism or support of ADUs by neighbors or homeowners associations, as well as any mention of NIMBYism. Many comments coded under this subtheme, particularly those made by public sector respondents, often related to homeowners associations (HOAs) and the perceived opposition those groups might put up. Implementing ADUs within a specific community might be difficult due to NIMBYism and the political weight that these local associations hold. This, as a result, illustrates another challenge that Peoria might need to overcome in order to provide a successful and impactful ADU policy.

### 4.3.2 Unaffordable Housing

Due to the rapid growth of Peoria—and much of the Phoenix metropolitan area overall, there is an increasing supply-and-demand imbalance within the housing market, which is placing upward pressure on the costs of land, labor, and materials. This, in return, has made building homes at affordable or attainable prices exceptionally difficult in the current market. Figure 3 demonstrates how 42% of the responses in the unaffordable housing category fell into the “supply/demand imbalance” subtheme, showing the large concern for the lack of affordable housing in Peoria. This conveys the unsatisfied demand...
from the large population influx to Peoria, where the dwelling units needed to house these new residents have simply not been built. As a result, housing prices are driven up. For example, one middle-aged interviewee had stated that “today, it’s almost insurmountable for somebody younger than me [to afford a home in Peoria],” which further perpetuates a need for cheaper housing throughout the city. This appeared to be a frequent attitude among all who were interviewed.

Second, “high development costs” (27%) were another large concern in relation to ADU and housing affordability, as material and labor costs continue to rise for home building and construction in general. The developer stakeholder group expressed the most concern with this particular issue. In addition to this, the varying topography in areas like northern Peoria might make ADU construction more difficult, while building ADUs in already constructed homes in the southern portions of Peoria has its own set of additional costs associated with it. These variables, as a result, pose further challenges for developers and city planners, as they attempt to create affordable housing that is much needed throughout Peoria.

### 4.3.3 ADU Development Challenges

The primary concern among respondents when referencing ADU development challenges related to “physical lot characteristics,” which encompassed 35% of all answers that fell under this theme (Figure 4). One overarching issue with ADUs is the surface area that they require; unfortunately, as a result, this can make building ADUs on parcels with smaller lot sizes a challenge. For example, the southern portion of Peoria is generally made up of less expensive housing, but these homes are often older and smaller lots, many of which would not accommodate ADU development. Conversely, the northern portions of Peoria are generally more sprawled out and homes are often on lots that are potentially large enough to accommodate an ADU. In addition, setbacks and other zoning regulations further complicate where ADUs can be built within a specific parcel.

The “parking and traffic” (27%) subtheme dealt with issues surrounding parking, such as whether or not additional spaces should be required along with the construction of an ADU, and traffic, which primarily focused on concerns that an influx of ADUs might increase traffic in a certain neighborhood, community, or locality. Many interviewees expressed concern over potential traffic impacts, but mainly alluded to the challenge...
of parking for ADUs, as Peoria is predominantly an auto dependent city.

Finally, the costs associated with building ADUs ("cost to build," 15%) was mostly a concern that was voiced by developers, but one that should be noted with caution; as one respondent noted, if ADUs are expensive to build, they will also likely be expensive to rent. This is particularly true in higher income areas, such as the northern areas of Peoria, where lots are often larger. These challenges provide context for why ADU development within Peoria could prove difficult in a variety of different facets.

4.3.4 Housing-Type Diversity

"Missing-middle housing" constituted the vast majority of statements under this theme (Figure 5). This term relates to the smaller scale of housing options that exist on the spectrum of housing types between detached single-family homes (at the lower end) and mid-rise multifamily (at the upper end). Data from the Community Profile shows that two to four unit housing types make up only 2% of Peoria’s housing stock.

"Changing preferences" refers to the idea of individuals wanting different types of housing than they previously occupied. For instance, some households are considering the possibility of downsizing, which would correlate to a possible desire for an ADU. One interviewee alluded to this directly, summarizing that there are shifts in the homebuilding industry and smaller-sized households becoming more common.

Finally, the topic of "infill development" was also mentioned sporadically, primarily as a method of increasing housing density and filling gaps that have been created by earlier leapfrog development.

"We need workforce development housing along fixed-route transit. Density, walkability."
4.3.5 ADU Benefits

The major benefit of ADUs, according to respondents, is “multi-generational” living (Figure 6). Multi-generational housing options can serve either aging parents, who no longer want or can maintain a full size home, or younger adults, who might not yet be fully able to financially support themselves. This is commonly seen as one of the overarching benefits of ADUs. One interviewee described this multi-generational living status as “proximity to loved ones without excessive dependence.”

ADUs can also be used for “increasing the supply of attainable or affordable housing.” As smaller-scale units, ADUs offer lower rents than a standard single-family home or other types of larger dwelling units (either owned or rented). This, coupled with the fact that Peoria already has a small supply of rental units, could increase supply for a high demand housing option. Considering that a primary challenge within housing development in Peoria is currently the lack of affordable housing, this demonstrates the importance of ADUs’ role in helping mitigate that problem.

Lastly, some of the “other benefits” that interviewees associated with ADUs include that they can be trendy, fun, or a cool way for younger adults to live—particularly those who are recent graduates. Collectively, Peoria stakeholders recognized many different benefits associated with ADUs. Developing an appropriate ADU policy for the community could provide an opportunity for Peoria to capitalize on these interests and opportunities, bringing value to the local housing market.

4.4 Stakeholder Observation Take-aways

Peoria lacks housing affordability and diversity. ADUs are part of the solution to both problems, but are not a silver bullet. The first take-away relates to the overall makeup of Peoria’s housing stock. Housing diversity is a critical component of a successful, vibrant Peoria. Housing industry experts and City of Peoria representatives were concerned with the missing middle housing stock. They identified single family homes as the dominant housing type, with little supply in between single family residences and more dense development (also known as the “missing middle”). This can make it more difficult for younger and older populations to find attainable housing, particularly recent graduates or seniors who may wish to remain within the

Figure 6: Breakdown of ADU Benefits subthemes

"Increasing housing choice is certainly welcome as part of ULI's mission, and ADUs can be a part of that solution."
community, but downsize to smaller and/or more affordable housing options. Peoria’s increased desirability and current reliance on single family neighborhoods has also fueled a supply/demand imbalance, exacerbating the affordability crisis that is prevalent in Peoria and the Phoenix region at large. From this perspective, participants noted that ADUs could be an effective tool in the affordability toolbox. However, they also stressed that ADUs alone would not fully address these issues.

Purposeful policy details hold the key to successful development and acceptance of ADUs in Peoria neighborhoods. Policy is crucial to successful integration of ADUs in Peoria. Purposeful policy written with clear intent is necessary to support desired uses and deter unintended uses and consequences. The primary purpose for the ADU policy must be identified and the policy drafted with this use in mind. Multiple participants suggested multi-generational housing was a desirable use, while short-term rental uses were singled out as a concerning potential for ADUs in the city. Other prevalent policy concerns included parking and physical lot characteristics such as lot size and setbacks. Physical lot requirements should be modified to the extent they support the established ADU purpose. For instance, additional parking requirements may influence what type of occupant resides in the ADU, and therefore the most prevalent use of ADUs. In this case, parking requirements in similar cities with ADUs should be analyzed to determine the extent to which parking—for instance—has posed a measurable problem for other communities and to understand any negative impacts.

These high-level take-aways from the stakeholder engagement point to necessary strategies for successful adoption of any ADU policy that Peoria proposes. Utilizing this stakeholder knowledge can lead to a
Chapter 5: Case Study Overview

Chapter 4 offered Peoria stakeholder perspectives, yielding insights into how receptive the community may be to ADUs and the associated barriers and opportunities for potential ADU policy. Chapters 5 and 6 offer external insights into ADU policies, examining existing ADU policies in Arizona and beyond. Since the City of Peoria does not currently have an existing ADU code, these case studies provide an important opportunity to examine existing policies throughout Arizona and across the United States, evaluating a diverse set of approaches and strategies. The ultimate goal of the case study analysis is to provide Peoria decision makers with a range of possible policy options. This chapter functions as an overview of the ADU case studies that the Planning Workshop team conducted for the City of Peoria. In total, we completed nine case studies, including four Arizona cities and five cities at the national level. We selected these cities to represent the wide variety of ADU policy possibilities, offering maximum insights and choice to the City of Peoria.

This chapter contains an outlined methodology of case study selection, analysis, and synthesis of observations. As part of the research process, the team developed an ADU spectrum, which is described below. Finally, this chapter presents final takeaways from the case studies. We provide detailed case study reports for each of the nine selected cases in Chapter 6.

5.1 Research Methodology

In this section, we outline the six-step research methodology that we used to complete the case study analysis. First, the Planning Workshop team identified cities of interest on both the Arizona and national level. These cities of interest were selected based on demographic data, geographic similarities, shared development patterns, and other factors. The team then evaluated ADU specific data and created an ADU spectrum that measured a city’s ADU policy development. From this evaluation, we made our case study selections: four cities in Arizona and five cities across the country. We then completed an in-depth analysis of publicly available resources, zoning codes and ordinances, and supplementary documents. Additionally, we conducted virtual interviews with a member of each city’s planning department in order to gain a more robust understanding of each ADU policy. After synthesizing our findings from the previous stages of research, the team drafted city-specific reports that provide a complete evaluation and analysis of ADU policies. We provide a more detailed summary of this process below.

5.1.1 Arizona Case Selection Process

1. Identification of 18 cities of interest

The Planning Workshop team explored and evaluated each city’s publicly available online resources. These included general and comprehensive plans, zoning codes and ordinances, and complementary planning documents. For an extensive compilation of gathered data for this stage of research, see Appendix 1.
2. Evaluation of ADU specific data

We then analyzed specific ADU code requirements and removed cities from consideration that did not have established ADU codes and policies. The team then evaluated the remaining cities with ADU policies. See Appendix 1 for a comprehensive matrix of ADU code requirements.

Figure 1. Snapshot of Arizona Zoning Code research.

3. Development of ADU spectrum

We used the findings from previous steps of analysis to guide the development of an ADU spectrum, which broadly illustrates the state of ADU-related policies among the defined group of Arizona cities (illustrated in Figure 2.).
4. Finalization of case study selection

The Planning Workshop team selected four Arizona cities as case studies based on aforementioned criteria, compelling qualities (such as code language, public guidance materials and easily-navigable requirements), demographic characteristics, and development patterns. The four cities include:

- Flagstaff
- Surprise
- Tempe
- Queen Creek

5. Case study evaluation and analysis

We then conducted in-depth analysis of each of the four selected Arizona cities by revisiting ADU specific codes and ordinances as well as publicly available information related to ADU policies. Additionally, team members conducted virtual interviews with individuals of each city’s planning department. With previously established interview questions, our goal was to gain a clear snapshot of how ADU programs and policies are being evaluated and practiced. Interviews were recorded and transcribed for ease of analysis.

6. Case study takeaways

Once research and analysis were completed, the Planning Workshop team synthesized key takeaways for each case, drawing upon interviews and previous analysis.

5.1.2 National Case Selection Process

1. Identification of 27 cities of interest

For the national cases, the Planning Workshop team identified 27 cities of interest based on demographic similarities to the City of Peoria (e.g., population, household income, urban development patterns). We also utilized a private website that lists cities that permit ADUs to guide our city identification process. Data tracking for this process was compiled into an extensive data matrix (see Appendix 1).
2. Evaluation of ADU specific data

The team recorded and evaluated specific ADU code requirements for the cities of interest (see Appendix 1). Additionally, we documented whether or not cities provided additional ADU resources and materials such as user guides, checklists and other publicly available resources.

3. Development of ADU spectrum

We used the findings from previous steps of analysis to guide the development of an ADU spectrum, which broadly illustrates the state of ADU-related policies among the defined group of cities from across the country (illustrated in Figure 3.).
4. Finalization of case study selection

After initial analysis, the team selected five cities from across the United States based on demographic similarities, presence of mature, established ADU policy, and compelling qualities and additional resources. The five cities selected were:

v. Salem, Oregon  
vi. Santa Cruz, California  
vii. Oceanside, California  
viii. Lakewood, Colorado  
ix. Vancouver, Washington

*Note: The team also considered Salt Lake City, Utah for inclusion in the study. However, we were unsuccessful in connecting with the local planning department and determined the best course of action would be to focus on the cities where we were able to interview city staff.

5. Case study evaluation and analysis

The Planning Workshop team then conducted in-depth analysis of each of the five selected cases by revisiting ADU codes and ordinances, as well as additional publicly available ADU support materials. Additionally, team members conducted virtual interviews with individuals from each city’s planning department. When interviewees were unable to participate in a virtual conversation, we offered them to provide written responses to our questions. Through these interviews, our goal was to gain clarification about the ways each city’s ADU programs and policies functioned. The team recorded and transcribed the interviews for ease of analysis.

6. Case study takeaways

Once research and analysis were completed, the team then synthesized key takeaways for each case, drawing upon interviews and previous analysis.

5.2 ADU Spectrum

Throughout the case study analysis process, it became clear that there was no singular city that set the gold standard for an ADU code, policy, or strategy. This is not to say that the selected cities do not have effective or successful ADU approaches. Instead, it was apparent that a spectrum of approaches to ADU policy existed and that each city had its own unique mix of practices and strategies. As the Planning Workshop team completed their research on each selected city, we developed a visual representation of this spectrum to facilitate ongoing research and conversations. The spectrum arrayed...
### Table 1 ADU Spectrum Definitions and Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>ADU Code Accessibility</th>
<th>ADU Code Comprehensiveness</th>
<th>Affordability Focus</th>
<th>Flexibility of Implementation</th>
<th>Supplementary Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Ease of navigation and interpretation for members of the public</td>
<td>Degree of detail in standards</td>
<td>Prioritization of affordability in ADU policy approach</td>
<td>Degree to which zoning allows ADUs to be located throughout the municipality</td>
<td>Presence of additional ADU resources available to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>Complex, difficult to find and/or navigate, numerous cross-references to other sections; familiarity with zoning codes necessary</td>
<td>Lacking typical elements; simplistic</td>
<td>Affordability is not the primary goal</td>
<td>Standards largely restrict the zoning districts in which ADUs may be implemented</td>
<td>Non-existent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>Familiarity with zoning codes helpful; complex but not unwieldy</td>
<td>Includes many typical elements: use, design, building standards, parking</td>
<td>Affordability is a peripheral goal</td>
<td>Standards limit the zoning districts in which ADUs may be implemented</td>
<td>Limited resources for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★</td>
<td>Easy to locate, navigate and understand, avoids unnecessary jargon</td>
<td>Includes all typical elements plus additional information; (often reflects how long code has been established)</td>
<td>Affordability is the top priority</td>
<td>Flexible standards allow broad implementation of ADUs in the majority of zoning districts</td>
<td>More than one type of resource residents are able to access to advance their ADU project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the cases on a continuum from standard ADU policy to exemplary, highly-developed ADU policy. Subsequently, we created a matrix to help evaluate individual features of each case’s ADU policy. Table 1 describes the case study matrix, including definitions of key features and classifications. Table 2 evaluates each of the cases individually, in addition to providing a comparative view of ADU policy approaches.
5.3 Valuable Case Study Takeaways

As previously mentioned, the primary goal of case study analysis was to identify a range of ADU policy options that stakeholders at the City of Peoria could use to make informed decisions when creating their own ADU policy. After identifying four cities in Arizona and five cities from across the country, we conducted in depth research and analysis to examine the realities of ADU policy in various contexts. From these nine cases, we have gained valuable insight regarding best practices and areas of consideration that will be helpful for future ADU policy development in Peoria.

It should be said that there is a noticeable difference in ADU policy development between Arizona and non-Arizona cities. Since ADUs are not common in many Arizonan cities, the number of insightful cases was limited. However, we believe the four Arizona cases offered an informative snapshot of how ADUs are currently being used in Arizona. The additional five cases of cities outside of Arizona offered an expanded view of the potential impact ADUs could have in Peoria over time. By identifying more developed and mature ADU policies, we acquired practical knowledge that reinforced trends identified in the Arizona cases. Final observations and takeaways are listed below:

1. **Intention and objectives for ADUs should be clear and established.**

Primary goals and objectives for ADU policy should be established before enacting or amending any new code. Peer cities highlighted the importance of focusing on the intention of ADU policy, whether that be to provide an increase of affordable housing stock or offer another option for multigenerational households or any additional purposes. The establishment of a clear intention gives ADU policy purpose and scope, which will ultimately lead to a more informed and targeted approach to ADU proliferation.

2. **ADU policy should be flexible and iterative.**

There is no “one-size-fits-all” approach when it comes to ADU policy. Each city and community has its unique opportunities and challenges and, therefore, should approach ADU policy with the local context in mind. ADU policy should be flexible to the needs of the local community and should be regularly evaluated to measure effectiveness and whether policy updates are necessary. Most of the peer cities have undergone various ADU policy changes and, through this iterative process, have built ADU policies that fit the specific needs of their residents. Overall, an ADU policy should be clear and purposeful, but also flexible enough to leave room for future updates.

3. **Additional resources and supplemental materials can encourage ADU implementation.**

Once an ADU policy is established and adopted by a city, additional resources and supplemental materials, such as a guidebook, pre-approved ADU models, or access to city staff, can be effective strategies to encourage ADU construction and usage. These strategies, however, require additional investments of time and money to develop and could be implemented once initial ADU codes are adopted and when the demand for ADUs supports the resources needed to prepare such materials.
Public engagement and education is essential for ADU awareness.

Public perception of ADUs and their impacts can vary widely. Peer cities expressed the need to engage and educate the public on ADUs to ensure NIMBYism and privacy concerns are adequately—and proactively—addressed. This can be accomplished through educational resources, public outreach meetings and testimonials from ADU residents. Also, it is useful to engage in ongoing conversations with housing developers and other stakeholders to evaluate additional strategies to encourage ADU construction.

Overall, these nine case studies provide useful information on ADU policies and the many strategies employed to promote ADU construction. Chapter 6 provides an in-depth summary of each case study city, individually, with additional insights and supporting data. Due to the spectrum of ADU policy possibilities, it is apparent that ADU policy should reflect the opportunities and challenges of the community in which the policy is being established. For the City of Peoria, the takeaways identified in case study analysis should be integrated with insight from local stakeholders so as to create an ADU policy that works for city staff and residents. Chapter 7 discusses this process in further detail and provides ADU policy recommendations combining all previous research, stakeholder engagement, and case study analysis.
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The City of Flagstaff’s approach to ADUs has evolved through multiple iterations, but it was founded on an understanding that the City should offer housing options for all income levels. According to City staff, increasing the affordable housing stock was and is the driving force behind including ADUs in the zoning code. Multi-generational housing, aging-in-place, and homeowner income opportunities are secondary benefits. ADUs are currently permitted in nearly all existing and new single-family residential zones. Flagstaff’s code is highly comprehensive and contains specific guidelines for standard elements of ADUs. In terms of accessibility, the code may be considered moderately complex. A familiarity with zoning codes would be helpful, but navigating the standards is not unwieldy. A public user would likely find the requirements easy to understand. The code avoids unnecessary jargon and communicates information through tables and graphics. City staff are available for code questions and clarifications.
Policy Background

2005: Community Housing Policy Task Force Report includes recommendations for ADUs among policies and regulations to increase housing options for all income levels. 2007: Code adopted to incentivize ADUs. Allowed in all existing and new single family residential zones. Exempt from lot coverage calculations. Removed minimum separation distance between main and accessory dwelling. Allowed encroachment into setbacks. Required same utility service as main dwelling. 2018: City of Flagstaff begins tracking permits issued for ADUs. 2019: Code updated. Clarified locations permitted, maximum size, architectural compatibility. Required restrictive covenant

Summary of ADU Policy

Housing in the Flagstaff region has a higher cost and value than comparable housing in other Arizona communities due to tourism and recreation attractions, the presence of Northern Arizona University (NAU), and desirable seasonal weather. There is a limited supply of land for development, and the city has experienced a consistent rate of population increase, including a growing student population at NAU which is expected to continue. The City seeks to address the region’s need for affordable housing and the housing needs of students in a situation where the external market demand for housing is driving prices higher than local wages can support. The City is also challenged to create community buy-in for higher density housing development and redevelopment as a means to provide more affordable housing choices. According to the Flagstaff Regional Plan (2015), future housing needs will focus on revitalization, infill, and preservation opportunities, yet new neighborhood development is possible.

The City of Flagstaff’s approach to ADUs has evolved through multiple iterations, but it was founded on an understanding that the City should offer housing options for all income levels. According to City staff, increasing the affordable housing stock was and is the driving force behind the implementation of ADUs. Multi-generational housing, aging-in-place, and homeowner income opportunities are secondary benefits.

While Flagstaff and Peoria are different in many respects, Peoria is experiencing a similar need for more affordable and diversified housing options. Both cities recognize that housing plays an important role in major employer and workforce location decisions. And both cities are navigating how to balance new development and redevelopment in neighborhoods while maintaining the desirable character of those neighborhoods.

In Flagstaff, embracing ADUs as one modest tool for addressing housing affordability has helped guide the decision-making process through each iteration. The City navigates the conversation by framing ADUs as “gentle density.” ADUs are an option to incrementally and subtly introduce higher density scenarios without compromising neighborhood character.
The most recent iteration of Flagstaff’s ADU code was implemented in 2019. In an effort to clarify previous versions, the code, as it currently stands, is highly detailed relative to other Arizona municipalities. With increased thoroughness comes increased complexity, but, overall, Flagstaff aims to make the processes straightforward and the standards widely applicable. Listed below are a selection of elements common to ADU codes along with Flagstaff’s specific requirements:

- Parking Requirements: One off-street parking space
- Rental Limitations: Long-term rentals permitted
- Short-Term Rentals: Permitted with conditions
- Separate Utilities: Not permitted
- Cooking Facilities: Required
- Maximum Size: 300 - 600 sq. ft.; 1,000 sq. ft. on lots larger than one acre
- Setbacks: Comply with the setback requirements of the property’s zone
- Maximum Height: 24 ft meeting setback requirements of the property’s zone
- Design: Compatible with primary structure

*Note: For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.*

Three types of ADUs are specifically identified (interior, attached, detached) and pictured in the Definitions section of the Zoning Code. In an effort to incentivize construction, ADUs follow the City’s standard permitting process. ADUs are currently permitted in all existing and new single-family residential zones on lots with a detached single-family home. They are exempt from lot coverage calculations. ADUs must have the same utility service as the primary dwelling which ultimately reduces additional metering costs for homeowners. At this time, a restrictive covenant requires property owners to occupy the primary dwelling or
the ADU, and if the property owner leases the property to a third party, the house and ADU must be on the same lease. This requirement has proven to be difficult to enforce and may be removed in the future.

In terms of accessibility, the code is considered moderately complex. A familiarity with zoning codes would be helpful, but navigating the standards is not unwieldy. A public user would likely find the requirements easy to understand. The code avoids unnecessary jargon and communicates information through tables and graphics. City staff are available for code questions and clarifications.

**Measures of Success**

The City began tracking permits issued for ADUs recently, largely in response to an increasing interest in the ADUs across the state and nation. City staff believe that permit-tracking is a measure of code effectiveness, stating that it is harder to receive feedback on code standards without it. Though limited, the data reflects an upward trend with 13 permits issued in 2018, 34 in 2019, and 30 as of April 2020. Issued permits include all three types of ADUs. If permit-tracking is indeed an accurate reflection of code effectiveness, then Flagstaff’s approach is proving to be successful. It should also be noted that, while the number of ADUs in Flagstaff is trending upwards, these are modest numbers that reflect the non-invasive realities of ADUs throughout the city. Again, City staff believe ADUs contribute to “gentle density” and function as an additional tool for residents and developers to diversify the housing stock.

**Next Steps**

The City of Flagstaff acknowledges existing barriers and opportunities for ADUs. As City staff recognize the iterative nature of ADU code, ongoing evaluation of existing code and practice is extremely beneficial. The City has consistently identified the barriers identified in the table below since the creation of the ADU code. City staff believe that continued conversations among City departments and public education could reduce the severity of some barriers. The following opportunities for ADU code updates and additional incentivizing elements have been discussed but not yet implemented.

**Figure 3. Example graphics from zoning code**

Source: City of Flagstaff, 2019
Although the City is generally receptive to increasing density and diversifying housing types, there is some hesitancy towards growth. Privacy and neighborhood character concerns have been raised by members of the public. The City is also navigating a development dynamic much different than Peoria with many projects aimed at dormitory-style student housing rather than long-term affordable housing for families.

Concerns of ADUs being used as short-term rentals remains a relevant issue. City staff recognizes that short-term rentals compete with hotels and long-term affordable housing. Language that regulates short-term rentals is included in the code, but current State law greatly limits the City’s ability to enforce such regulations.

**Key Takeaways**

After concluding research and analysis of Flagstaff’s ADU approach, numerous valuable takeaways were identified:

1. **ADU approaches should be iterative and adaptable to ongoing challenges.** Flagstaff’s ADU code is dynamic and is updated when opportunities to overcome existing barriers arise. Even with these changes, the City maintains its overarching goal to increase affordable housing options.

2. **A simple, straightforward, and widely applicable code can incentivize ADU construction while minimizing additional stresses on planning department staff and resources.** Reducing costs and complexity facilitates ADU construction without requiring major investments of time and resources by City staff.

3. **ADU permit tracking can determine effectiveness of code and process and should be implemented alongside initial code amendments.** This evaluation measure can be a clear (and relatively low-cost) way to determine successful ADU policy.

**Sources:**


The development of Surprise’s ADU policy, the most recently adopted of all the peer communities in Arizona, was motivated by the overall goal of adding diversity in housing choice and creating flexibility in the market. There are several secondary goals also satisfied with the policy, such as the notion of aging-in-place and increasing affordable housing. With this in mind, the City structured the policy to provide as little regulation as possible with regards to specific design related criteria and zoning restrictions. With basic zoning ordinance standards in place, there is very little that could be perceived as ADU-restrictive. This was done to make the process seamless and accessible to many, which is also exemplified by their lack of restrictive land uses for ADUs. Unlike some other municipalities observed, ADUs have an easier path forward in terms of zoning permissions and allowances in the community. Overall, the policy is still in its earliest stages of development but is shaped well and has several facets designed to allow room for future improvement as the City continues to work at the program.

**Surprise, Arizona**

- **Population:** 135,450
- **Median Age:** 41
- **Median Household Income:** $69,076
- **Median Monthly Rent:** $1,349
- **Median Home Value:** $239,500
- **Percent of Single-Family Units (1-unit, detached):** 84.8%
- **Housing Tenure (Owner/Renter):** 76% : 24%

*Source: ACS 2019 (5-year Estimates)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADU Code Accessibility</th>
<th>ADU Code Comprehensiveness</th>
<th>Affordability Focus</th>
<th>Flexibility of Implementation</th>
<th>Supplementary Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADU Spectrum Comparison**

*Figure 4: Aerial photo of residential development in Surprise*
Policy Background

2013: General Plan 2035 is adopted. The plan supports the implementation of ADUs as a viable policy to improve housing stock.

2020: The City Council adopted the new Land Development Ordinance which permits ADUs in most residential zoning districts.

Summary of ADU Policy

Housing in Surprise has traditionally been shaped by standard market factors, such as consumer preference, household size, and land availability. However, like many communities, they have come to recognize the need for greater flexibility in housing stock and a pivot towards more sustainable and low-impact standards of development. Surprise also offers one of the best comparative examples for Peoria as they are particularly similar in terms of urban composition and city structure. They are both large exurb communities of Phoenix, located in the West Valley, with fast-growing populations that face challenges related to the job-housing balance and many residents choosing to commute out of the city for work. They also have similar demographics with respect to single-family residential homes being the dominant housing type in the area and a clear desire for more flexible design and urban structure. The goal for both communities with their ADU policy is mitigating these challenges and providing more diverse housing in the area to sustain a livable community for all ages and backgrounds.

There are also several differences between the two cities. It is important to note that Surprise has developed much more recently than Peoria. Only 10% of its entire housing stock was constructed before 1990 (Peoria General Plan). This demonstrates the tremendous growth that has contributed to recognizing Surprise as an emerging community in the West Valley. The development of Surprise reflects a typical master planned community model, which may offer some insight into zoning regulations and practices for ADUs, as opposed to the typical restrictions so often seen in municipal zoning codes.

According to their recent General Plan, Surprise intends to pursue a “smart growth” model moving forward to ensure efficient use of their space. ADUs are specifically highlighted as a strategy to further the goal of smart growth.

In late 2020, the Surprise City Council adopted a new Land Development Ordinance with the goal of making their code easier to “read, administer and enforce” while aligning it with the new General Plan. The updated Land Development Ordinance permits ADUs, making Surprise one of the most recent adopters of an ADU policy in the region. Most importantly, ADUs are permitted in almost all residential districts—with the exception of R-3 high density residential districts. This essentially allows for ADUs in most parts of the city, which has the potential to increase ADU production.
Code Specifics

The code contains many of the same constraints imposed by other municipalities in the region. It allows for both attached and detached units, but they cannot be metered separately. Additionally, they do not regulate the ability to rent out ADUs. They do, however, impose a requirement for an additional parking space with ADUs. In line with all ADU ordinances reviewed, the unit is not permitted in the front yard. Surprise also makes it explicit that access to the unit cannot be visible from the street nor can it give the appearance of a two-family dwelling.

- Parking Requirements: One additional parking space required
- Rental Limitations: Not specified
- Short-Term Rentals: Not specified
- Separate Utilities: Not permitted
- Cooking Facilities: Not specified
- Setbacks: If attached, must conform to main structure standards; if detached, rear/side setbacks are five feet
- Design: Compatible with primary structure

Note: For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.

In terms of ease of use of the code, Surprise clearly identifies the requirements for an ADU in a direct and all-encompassing manner. Its location in the code is in line with other cities in that it is located in the Use Specific Standards section of the code.

Measures of Success

Given that the Surprise ADU policy is fairly new, they do not have an established process to measure success. However, they do want to look into what other aspects of the city will be affected by the new ADU ordinance, whether it relates to crime or resident happiness. The City hopes to gain insight to the specific elements of the ADU framework and its net benefits or challenges. Since the amendment in January of 2021, they have had one individual inquire about developing an ADU on their property.

Next Steps

The City has no current plans for what they are going to do with their ADU policy. Since they are in the early stages of the ordinance being amended, they want to wait and see how it currently develops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High costs of permitting and construction</td>
<td>Pre-approved ADU plans/models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space requirements</td>
<td>Option to waive requirements in appropriate circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of homeowner knowledge</td>
<td>Education and outreach to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA restrictions</td>
<td>HOA stakeholder engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

After concluding research and analysis of the City of Surprise’s ADU approach, numerous valuable takeaways were identified:

1. **ADU code and regulations should be as minimal as possible, so as to not create additional barriers to entry and help with accessibility.** Surprise’s code is minimal by design which allows for some of the greatest flexibility and applicability in the actual implementation of ADUs.

2. **ADU approaches cannot be built out in a day. It may take months and years of iterative adaptations as the program rises to meet the demands of the residents.** Surprise has just begun their journey with ADUs. The key is creating measures of success that will ultimately better inform the program for the years to come.

3. **Demonstrates adapting market needs to create housing diversity but also encapsulates the benefits of forward facing or anticipatory planning.** Single-family housing raises concerns about affordability moving forward and ADUs provide a flexible, neighborhood-scale solution.
As a land-locked municipality in the Phoenix region, Tempe must balance the goals of optimizing the use of space while preserving neighborhood character. The initial discussion about ADUs began as far back as 2005, but it was quickly met with opposition due to concerns that ADUs would be used for student housing and affect the character of the existing neighborhoods. In late 2019, the City passed an ordinance establishing the right to build an ADU only in multi-family residential districts where a single-family structure already exists. This “ADU-lite” policy poses significant limits on ADU production in the city for now, and it is unlikely to have an impact on housing affordability. The ordinance itself is moderately complex in nature. The code is comprehensive. It explicitly states what is required but leaves room for flexibility. With renewed interest from the City Council, potential expansion of the program is in the works; however, any future moves on part of the City...
Policy Background

2005: The City revamped their Zoning Code. During that process, a section was reserved for an ADU ordinance in the event such a policy would be implemented. 2019: The City Council adopted Ordinance 2019.08 which codified Accessory Dwelling Units in the zoning ordinance. 2019: Tempe adopted its Affordable Housing Strategy. The document specifically identifies ADUs as a housing type that should be encouraged. 2019: The City Council adopted an ordinance regulating the use of all dwelling units as short-term/vacation rentals.

Summary of ADU Policy

While Tempe sits within a different context in the Phoenix metro area as a “college town,” they serve as a beneficial case study. As a land-locked municipality, they must balance the goals of optimizing the use of space while maintaining stable and thriving communities. This perspective can be relevant to other cities interested in providing for an expanding population while also preserving the existing character which attracted residents in the first place.

The initial discussion about ADUs began as far back as 2005, but it quickly met opposition due to concerns that ADUs would be used for student housing and affect the character of the existing neighborhoods. Over time, the rising student population and growth in employment near downtown Tempe has put a strain on housing demands. Around 2016, the demand for additional housing in downtown Tempe, led to some historic structures becoming targets for potential demolition and redevelopment. In response, ADUs re-emerged as a possible way to salvage older homes and maintain the character of the community, while increasing the number of dwelling units.

In late 2019, the City passed an ordinance establishing the right to build an ADU in Tempe. The updated ordinance, however, only allows for ADU development in multi-family residential districts where a single-family structure already exists. Since single-family residential districts make up a large majority of the city, the change is limited in applicability. According to the City, the change only made about 250 homes eligible for ADU construction. This “ADU-lite” policy still poses significant limits on ADU production in Tempe at this time.

When developing an ADU, residents are encouraged to seek out other resources to aid in the design of ADUs, but the City does not currently have templates or guidebooks of their own available to the public. The community development department does, however, have designated staff to assist with the permitting process. The Project Assistance Team, while not specifically focused on ADU projects, helps small businesses and residents navigate the process which some residents may see as a complicated and intimidating obstacle. This dedication of staff can be incredibly helpful to residents unsure of the process.

More broadly, ADUs are seen as a part of a range of strategies employed to tackle the affordable housing issue in Tempe. The City’s Affordable Housing Strategy outlines the benefits of ADUs for communities and goes on to elaborate on some considerations for Tempe. Unfortunately, because of the limited eligibility of the housing stock, it is unlikely that ADUs will have an impact on housing affordability.
Code Specifics

The Code itself is moderately complex in nature. Many of the parts read easily, but there are a number of references that direct the reader to other portions of the Code making it less user-friendly. The Code does not make use of graphics to convey the standards. With respect to its comprehensiveness, the Code details some baseline requirements, such as floor area, density (how it factors into the district’s allowable density), development standards, and relationship to existing infrastructure. Other than what is required, ADUs are mostly subject to the standards of other residential and accessory structures. The Code essentially expands the right to build ADUs and explicitly states what is required but leaves room for flexibility.

- Parking Requirements: No additional parking required
- Rental Limitations: Long-term rentals permitted
- Short-Term Rentals: Permitted with conditions
- Separate Utilities: Not permitted
- Cooking Facilities: Required
- Setbacks: If attached, must conform to main structure standards; if detached, must conform to accessory structure standards
- Design: Compatible with primary structure
- Note: For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.

Measures of Success

The City of Tempe does not have an established practice to measure the success of their ADU program, although, according to City records, only 13 building permits for ADUs have been issued since the ordinance was passed. City Council is interested in ongoing permit tracking and intends to evaluate the 2019 zoning ordinance update on ADU production. Findings will guide potential expansions of the provisions in the future.

Next Steps

Further research needs to be conducted on the program, and it is likely that the City will enter Phase II of their ADU program due to renewed interest from the City Council. Additionally, they are interested in providing some sort of template for residents interested in building an ADU, but they want to identify a concept that works well for Tempe. In terms of potential barriers, future concerns associated with expanded provisions will likely deal with density intensification and increases in traffic.

Overall, Tempe has cautiously introduced ADUs into their community. They are wary of creating a policy that attracts entities not invested in the long-term welfare of their neighborhoods. Any future moves on part of the City will continue to balance affordability with neighborhood preservation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposition from neighborhood groups</td>
<td>Use extensive public engagement strategies to ensure maximum community input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about density intensification</td>
<td>Emphasize &quot;gentle density&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about increased traffic</td>
<td>Target neighborhoods closer to existing public transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

After concluding research and analysis of the City of Tempe’s ADU approach, numerous valuable takeaways were identified:

1. **ADUs can be used as a tool to preserve older historic neighborhoods while enabling modest density increases.** While Tempe is a very different city from Peoria, their common goal for ADUs is to provide a more diverse housing stock while maintaining the existing character of the neighborhoods.

2. **Having dedicated City staff to help residents with small projects can help remove some hesitancy for homeowners interested in ADU construction.** An effective ADU program not only allows residents to build units but provides tools to make it happen. Tempe’s Project Assistance Team is a valuable resource their residents can tap into.

3. **A true ADU program must permit them in most parts of the city to be effective.** The limited application of Tempe’s ADU ordinance to strictly multi-family residential districts may be severely constraining new construction.

Sources:

Queen Creek, Arizona

- Population: 43,129
- Median Age: 35.1
- Median Household Income: $105,729
- Median Monthly Rent: $1,590
- Median Home Value (Owner-occupied): $348,600
- Percent Single-Family Units (1-unit, detached): 95.3%
- Housing Tenure (Owner/ Renter): 87%: 13%

Source: ACS 2019 (5-year Estimates)

Queen Creek was an early adopter of an ADU policy in Arizona. The town features an abundance of low density single-family homes. While ADUs are currently not permitted to function as rentals in Queen Creek, they do introduce the potential to diversify the housing stock. The Town’s policy has advantages, such as allowing ADU development in all single-family home residential zoning. The Town works closely with developers as the housing stock is predominantly market driven. A valuable resource that Queen Creek provides for the community is an educational guidebook with directions on how to design and develop an ADU or other accessory structures (see Figure 6). The zoning ordinance pertaining to ADUs is relatively complex, but the guidebook is an excellent resource to complement the code language. Queen Creek accommodates their residents with comprehensive resources which could be a valuable asset in shaping Peoria’s ADU policy.

ADU Spectrum Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADU Code Accessibility</th>
<th>ADU Code Comprehensiveness</th>
<th>Affordability Focus</th>
<th>Flexibility of Implementation</th>
<th>Supplementary Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figur 6: Snapshot from ADU guidebook demonstrating

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

1. A plot plan is a drawing of the lot showing the following:
   - Location of property lines on all sides.
   - All existing buildings on the lot, including their dimensions and distances to property lines.
   - All proposed additions or structures with their dimensions and distances to property lines.
   - Total square footage of the lot, existing buildings and proposed additions.
   - All required setbacks.

Source: Town of Queen Creek

Policy Background

- 2003: Detached ADUs were introduced and approved by the Town Council.
- 2003: Accessory Building Electrical Meter requirements added to ordinance.
- 2017: ADU ordinance was amended. The amendment defines ADUs and guest houses separately, but it states that ADUs include guest houses.
The Town of Queen Creek was one of the earliest adopters of an ADU policy in the Valley, introducing zoning ordinance amendments as early as 2003. These amendments were originally designed to add flexibility to housing types through detached structures. Over time, the ADU program has become more flexible, so that it can rise to meet certain challenges facing Queen Creek. This also makes the Town’s approach a relevant comparison for Peoria. In Queen Creek, low-density single-family homes are estimated to encompass nearly 91% of all homes in the town, compared to the Greater Phoenix metro area with 65%. The predominance of single-family homes has been identified as a component that could hinder the growth and expansion of the community. Consequences of the limited housing opportunities outlined in the Queen Creek General Plan include:

1. Employers not moving to Queen Creek due to a lack of housing diversity for its workers
2. Densities being too low to support retail development in some parts of town
3. Potential that many families and young people will be forced to relocate from Queen Creek based on the lack of housing supply and rising costs of housing.

These challenges are similar to those faced in Peoria and offer an opportunity to examine how ADU development can help address these challenges.

The Town’s original ordinance specifically states that the building must be detached from the primary residence. The current zoning ordinance restricts ADUs from serving as rentals and/or other income-generating uses. ADUs are permitted in all residential zoning districts, as indicated by the code. While kitchen facilities are permitted, the “guesthouse” designation prohibits the ADU from having separate utility metering from the primary residence. Queen Creek developed a guidebook entitled “Guidelines for Building Detached Accessory Structures,” which is beneficial in helping the public navigate the ADU process, particularly the design standards. This user-friendly guide assists homeowners and developers by providing definitions, points of contact for the Town, and design guidelines to facilitate ADU construction.

![Figure 7: Low density development in Queen Creek](Source: Arizona Homes 411, 2020)
Code Specifics

ADUs are currently allowed in all existing and new single family residential zones. ADUs must use the same meter as the main house if it is used as an additional living area. The dwelling unit can not be used for any other income-generating purpose.

The accessibility of the code is impacted by its complexity. Without an existing familiarity with zoning language, the ordinance may be difficult to understand. The guidebook is an excellent resource that interprets the ordinance in a more accessible manner. The Town’s planning staff are also willing to work with homeowners and developers for future production.

Listed below are a selection of elements common to ADU code along with Queen Creek specific requirements:

- Parking Requirements: One off-street parking space
- Rental Limitations: Long-term rentals not permitted
- Short-Term Rentals: Not permitted
- Separate Utilities: Not permitted
- Cooking Facilities: Permitted
- Setbacks: Comply with property’s zone
- Maximum Size: Square footage shall not exceed 50% of primary residence
- Design: Strict design components that match compatible with primary structure

Note: For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.

Measures of Success

The Town does not currently have a method for tracking the success or effectiveness of their ADU ordinance. ADUs fall under the same category as all accessory structures in the ordinance, and the Town estimates that 95% of the accessory structures are non-livable. There are many restrictions on residents developing their own ADU; however, major developers have started to incorporate ADUs in their home-building packages.

Next Steps

At this time, any significant amount of ADU construction will rely upon market trends and profitability for developers. While homeowners are able to build their own ADUs, developers will have a large influence in how many ADUs are built in the town in the future. HOAs could also restrict ADU development in the interest of maintaining low-density development. The Town does not identify affordability as a primary goal for their ADU policy at this time. Due to the fact that Queen Creek is not fully developed and still has space to expand in geographic size and population, the Town also does not prioritize infill development or increased density in their community.
The Town does not have specific plans for furthering its ADU program, but is willing to collaborate with developers if they express interest. Because they have worked with developers on how they can include ADUs in their developments, there is a great opportunity to increase their ADU housing stock if the desire grows. The guidebook showcases how residents can lay out pre-approved models, while educating them on the building process and guidelines.

**Key Takeaways**

After concluding research and analysis of the Town of Queen Creek’s ADU approach, numerous valuable takeaways were identified:

1. **A guidebook is a helpful resource for the development of ADUs.** Queen Creek’s guidebook is an effective strategy for supplying information to stakeholders who want to build an ADU. The guidebook is a way of interpreting the zoning ordinance in a language more accessible to the public.

2. **Working with developers could be an effective strategy to impact the housing stock.** Housing supply and demand in Queen Creek aligns closely with market trends and private developer strategies. Proactive communication with developers about including ADUs in new projects could help increase the overall housing stock.

**Sources:**


The primary goal of Salem’s ADU policy is to expand housing options throughout the community. The City states that their ADU policy will: provide a way for multi-generational families to live together on the same lot; help meet Salem’s growing need for more multi-family housing; allow more efficient use of existing infrastructure and land; and provide an opportunity for residents to earn additional income in order to remain in their homes.

**Regional Context**

Salem is a diverse and growing city, as well as Oregon’s capital. It is also the state’s second largest city in terms of population. The city is composed of many small businesses, as well as manufacturing companies. Agriculture also continues to represent a significant part of their economy. Given its capital status, many people relocate to Salem from other cities, making it a big driver of employment for the state.
Summary of ADU Policy

Salem is a forward-thinking city and, as such, has been actively engaged in addressing projected trends and concerns related to its housing stock. In February 2014, the City published its Housing Needs Analysis, which analyzed demographic and economic data to project what the city would look like in 20 years. Additionally, Salem analyzed the housing needs based on the population and economic data. During its last Housing Needs Analysis, the City found that there was a need to provide more affordable, mixed, and multi-generational housing choice. In this document, one recommendation to address housing affordability was to allow ADUs in single-family residential areas. In response, the City established a goal to “[d]evelop an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance that allows ADUs in appropriate zoning designations” (Housing Need Implementation Strategy, 2014). By February 2017, City staff began developing a plan that would allow ADUs. However, it wasn’t until 2018, when House Bill 4031 was signed into law, that cities within the state of Oregon had to accept ADU application for ADUs inside urban growth boundaries (UGBs).

According to City staff, the inclusion of a parking minimum was identified as the primary concern related to its ADU ordinance. In response to the public’s concern, the parking requirement for ADUs was excluded, which has proven to be helpful in ADU development. Additionally, with various revisions to the ADU policy, the City of Salem has found it beneficial to eliminate design standards. Salem does not have design guidelines for single-family homes and other buildings; therefore, it would be inconsistent with other requirements of the City’s ordinance to require specific design standards for ADUs. Furthermore, in the interest of preserving ADUs as a strategy for increasing affordable housing in Salem, the City is aware of the threats short-term rentals pose and is engaged in conversations about how to address this issue.

One of the best practices used by Salem is the allowance for flexibility in their ADU policy. Presently, nearly 70% of the city’s homes qualify for ADUs. Given the potential for ADUs to become cost prohibitive to build, the City has also enabled homeowners to construct modestly larger units to maximize cost efficiency. ADUs can be up to 900 square feet or 50% of the main house, whichever is less. Additionally, the City also established a mechanism that enables ADU construction to bring additional benefit to the community. Those interested in building an ADU must pay a System Development Charge (SDC), which is used to fund “additional public infrastructure to be constructed to meet demands of the new development” (Site Development Charges, n.d.). However, as of 2020, the City issued a five year waiver for SDCs in order to “update the methodologies used to determine SDCs for parks, transportation, water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure” (Accessory Dwelling Units, n.d.).

Policy Background

- 2014: Housing Needs Analysis, and draft Implementation Strategy published
- 2016: Housing Needs Analysis Work Plan approved; contained Implementing Measure 4.2: Develop an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance that allows ADUs in appropriate zoning designations
• 2017: ADU zoning ordinance established to allow ADUs in all residential zones, most commercial and industrial zones, and the neighborhood center mixed-use zone

**Code Specifics**

The City of Salem’s zoning ordinance for ADUs is “short and sweet.” The ordinance is intended to be quite flexible with less restrictive design standards relative to other cities’ ADU policies. Based on internal research and feedback from the public, the City found that less restrictive design standards coupled with a prohibition on short term rental uses furthered the City’s goal to increase affordable housing within the community.

ADUs are permitted in a variety of zones including residential, commercial, industrial, and mixed-use zones. Additionally, ADUs are exempt from density requirements, design guidelines, requirements to build garages, and parking. However, only one ADU is permitted per lot. ADUs are prohibited from being used as short-term rentals or accessory short-term rentals, and there are some ownership limitations in which ADUs shall not be separated in ownership from the underlying property. Additionally, there are some developmental limitations in which ADUs should not be more than 60% of lot coverage. Detached accessory dwelling units shall be located in the side yard or rear yard and ADUs shall only be allowed in lawfully-built dwelling units that meet building code requirements.

Listed below are a selection of elements common to ADU codes along with Salem’s specific requirements:

- **Parking Requirements:** No off-street parking spaces are required for ADUs
- **Rental Limitations:** None
- **Short-Term Rentals:** ADUs prohibited from being used as short-term rentals or accessory short-term rentals
- **Separate Utilities and Cooking facilities:** Requires both a bathroom and kitchen
- **Maximum Size:** ADUs shall not exceed 900 square feet, or 50 percent of the main building gross area, whichever is less
- **Minimum Building Setbacks**
  - **Abutting Street Setbacks:**
    - Detached accessory dwelling unit on local street minimum: 12 feet
    - Detached accessory dwelling unit on collector or arterial streets: minimum 20 feet
  - **Interior Side Setbacks:**
    - For detached accessory dwelling unit: minimum of three feet
  - **Interior Rear Setbacks:**
    - For detached accessory dwelling unit, minimum five feet unless adjacent to an alley, minimum 1 foot setback
- **Maximum Height:** Detached accessory dwelling units shall be no more than 25 feet in height
- **Design:** ADUs exempt from design requirements.

*Note: For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.*
Measures of Success

The City of Salem does not have any specific resource to measure the success of their ADU policy; however, City staff has expressed interest in developing an evaluation practice in the future. The City does have an internal resource to track the number and type of ADUs, but data is not complete. They also expect that ADU development may be addressed in future Housing Needs Analysis reports. Furthermore, the SDCs, applied to developments to fund additional public infrastructure to meet additional density demands, is an innovative opportunity—albeit one that needs careful monitoring and adjustment, as the City has recognized.

Next Steps

Salem has no established plans to expand their ADU policy. The primary focus of the City’s planner is tackling the “missing-middle” of housing. The City’s current concerns include figuring out what they can do with different types of middle housing, such as duplexes, triplexes, and cottage clusters. A 2019 State law made middle housing more permissible throughout Oregon, facilitating the development of smaller and denser housing overall—beyond just ADUs.

Planning staff have identified a few barriers and opportunities regarding the City’s ADU ordinance, which are highlighted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High costs of permitting and construction</td>
<td>Reduced permit fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupancy requirement</td>
<td>Removal of owner-occupancy requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited tracking and evaluation process</td>
<td>The potential for future ADU permit tracking and public outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

After concluding research and analysis of the City of Salem’s ADU approach, numerous valuable takeaways were identified:

1. **Zoning ordinance flexibility permits more ADU construction.** Even though Salem’s ADU zoning ordinance is relatively new, it remains flexible by offering design standard exemptions, removing additional parking requirements, and permitting ADU construction across a variety of zones. This flexibility has proven to be helpful and efficient in promoting ADU construction.

2. **Additional ADU resources are available for public usage.** The City has an ADU webpage, handout, and educational video, which collectively inform the public about the process of building and owning an ADU. Having these resources available to the public facilitates access to crucial information related to ADUs.

3. **Open communication between City officials and the public.** Salem has a single City official who is designated to handle community input on development issues and has been an integral part of improving the ADU ordinance.
The City of Santa Cruz’s approach to ADUs has evolved through multiple iterations, dating back to as early as the 1980s. The City’s ADU code was originally established as a result of the difficulties of traditional land use patterns with a predominance of single-family homes, which exacerbated existing challenges for college students at UCSC trying to find housing. Santa Cruz was one of the first cities in the California region to begin experiencing a housing crisis, which has now impacted much of the state (and beyond). In addition to the pressing demands for student housing, the City was experiencing the limitations of single-family housing for its diverse population. In response, they wanted to explore opportunities to increase affordable housing and residential density. While the City was already on a path towards establishing its ADU policy, the State of California also established a new requirement to include ADUs in its state housing program.
Regional Context

Santa Cruz is a mid-size city, on the central coast of California, and the largest city in Santa Cruz County. It is located 75 miles south of San Francisco, adjacent to Silicon Valley. The city is home to the University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC), which represents a significant portion of the city’s population and economy. The City’s economy is primarily supported by industries such as government, education, and tourism.

Summary of ADU policy

According to City staff, many challenges remain in their efforts to make ADU construction more flexible and applicable throughout the city. In the early stages of the code, the City had requirements for owner occupancy and affordable contingencies prior to submitting for an ADU building permit. To the City, “affordable” meant renters had to qualify under a specific income bracket and owners had to qualify their ADU through HUD and other State-run programs. This process made it challenging for homeowners to build and legalize their ADUs. In addition, the ADU policy had a number of additional procedural requirements in order to permit these structures. The City also originally required homeowners to have at least one covered parking space on their property dedicated to the ADU, which was also identified as a challenge for homeowners.

Regionally, the California rental market is expensive, which also has implications for ADU construction. As a result, it is understood that homeowners are typically building ADUs as a method to earn additional income (and potentially a mechanism to make homeownership a more viable choice). Early ADUs were, in part, expensive due to the higher building standards that state requirements imposed. California has a green building program requirement for all their structures; within this program, ADUs were required to have a number of other specific features in order to be approved. While that requirement has since been lifted, City staff still expressed concerns about ADU affordability, stating “in order to get the ADUs up to standards, they’re going to have to get more rent out of it to make it worth their while.” Currently, garage conversions and detached ADUs tend to be more common because they are cheaper and easier to obtain approval through the City processes.

Figure 11: City of Santa Cruz ADU Manual

Source: (City of Santa Cruz, 2017)
The City of Santa Cruz regularly evaluates its ADU policy in order to make ADUs more viable. They have invested heavily in providing a variety of resources and guides including manuals, handouts, summarization of the zoning code in table format. They also created a program to provide booklets with pre-approved ADU plan sets—it is worth noting, City staff did not believe this program contributed to a significant increase in the number of ADUs that were built. During the three years that these resources were available, the City only saw about 12 units built. Other limiting factors included lot size variation, modern plan sets that were not necessarily aligned with more historic neighborhoods, and homeowner desires to modify the plans in ways that invalidated the pre-approved status.

As of January 2020, ADUs can be built on most residential properties throughout the city. Santa Cruz permits two versions of ADUs, which are currently allowed in nearly all existing new single-family and multi-family residential zones. The permitted ADU types include: a Junior ADU (JADU), which is part of an existing or proposed single-family home; and a more traditional ADU format (e.g., detached). An owner-occupied property with a single-family home can have both one ADU and one JADU.

Santa Cruz’s code is thorough and contains specific guidelines for standard elements of ADUs. In terms of accessibility, the code is considered moderately complex. A familiarity with zoning codes would be helpful, but navigating the standards is not unwieldy. While there are many resources available online, the City sees the opportunity to streamline those materials and the permitting process. Overall, a public user would likely find the requirements easy to understand; the code avoids unnecessary jargon and communicates information through tables and graphics. City staff are available for code questions and clarifications, if needed.

### Policy Background

- **1984:** ADU Ordinance adopted
- **1985-1994:** Amendments were made to provide clarification and flexibility
- **2003:** Updated zoning code and provided additional program/resources
- **2014:** Zoning amendment to expand path for legalization of ADUs, including:
  - Reduced Minimum lot size.
  - Eliminated setbacks for existing legal structures.
  - Reduced distance between ADU & house.
  - Eliminated maximum rear yard lot coverage.
  - Standardized 1 parking space for any size ADU.
  - Linked ADU to lot size (10% up to 940 sf.).
  - Allowed up to 2 yr. rental with CC approvals.
- **2020:** Changes driven larger by California state law. Making a zoning update to expand legalization of ADUs in all residential zones, reduce the limitation of owner-occupancy and parking requirements.
The current iteration of Santa Cruz’s ADU code was implemented in 2020. Interestingly, ADUs remain under the City’s affordable housing provisions, even though ADUs are no longer required to have affordable rents. In an effort to clarify previous versions, the current code is highly detailed, which is consistent with other California municipalities. This has introduced complexity, although Santa Cruz continues to prioritize a straightforward process with widely applicable standards.

The City’s code permits several configurations of ADUs, including: conversions, attached, or detached structures. In an effort to incentivize construction, ADUs follow the City’s standard permitting process. There are also several zoning incentives in place, designed to encourage ADU development. This includes a development fee waiver for ADUs that will be rented at affordable rates, as well as several parking-related considerations. Listed below are a selection of elements common to ADU codes along with Santa Cruz’s specific requirements:

- **Parking Requirements:** None
- **Rental Limitations:** Long-term rentals required.
- **Short-Term Rentals:** The only exception for short term rental is if a legal accessory dwelling unit property held legal status prior to November 10, 2015, and it was in use as a short-term/vacation rental prior to that date, and for which the owner remits transient occupancy tax is in compliance.
- **Separate Utilities and Cooking Facilities:** required
- **Maximum Size:**
  - Attached new construction: 50% size of primary home or 850 sf
  - Setsbacks: Use site standards that apply to primary home
- **Minimum Building Setbacks:**
  - Detached new construction:
    - Single or Two Story: 10% net lot area or 850 sf, not to exceed 1,200 sf
    - Single story: 16 feet max height.
    - Two story: 22 feet max height
    - Setbacks: Three feet side & rear setbacks. 6 ft distance between all existing buildings.
    - Any portion of the structure that exceeds 16 feet in height must be setback a minimum of five feet from the side yard and 10 feet from the rear yard
  - Conversion: created from part of an existing primary home, garage, or other legal structure, may expand up to 150 square feet, not to exceed a total floor area of 1,200 square feet. May expand up to two feet in height, not to exceed height standards that apply to New Construction ADUs. Use site standards that apply to primary homes.
- **Design:** Compatible with primary structure.

*Note: For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.*
Next Steps

The City of Santa Cruz acknowledges existing barriers and opportunities for ADUs. Although the City is generally open to increasing density and adding housing types, there is some hesitancy towards ADU development because of construction costs and fluctuating regulations. In the future, Santa Cruz wants to continue to increase flexibility for its ADU policies. In this spirit, they have already begun taking steps to allow ADUs to be built on multi-family properties without an owner-occupancy requirement. City staff believe that continued conversations among City departments and via public education channels could reduce the severity of the struggles to build ADUs. City staff recognize the iterative nature of ADU code and, thus, continue to evaluate the process. Based on conversations with City staff, the table below summarizes existing barriers and potential opportunities for Santa Cruz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High costs of permitting and construction</td>
<td>Pre-approved ADU plans/models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting short-term rental housing</td>
<td>No parking space requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated resources</td>
<td>Education and outreach to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legalizing older structures</td>
<td>No owner-occupancy requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures of Success

Every year the City provides a housing survey report to the state of California Housing Authority. According to the report, prior to 2020, there were approximately 80 legalized ADUs. State and City laws have since expanded ADU regulations, which has dramatically increased the number of ADUs over prior years—Santa Cruz now claims over 200 permitted and built ADUs. They also have a dedicated planner to assist ADU projects, with the goal of legalizing over 450 ADUs in the next decade. Their position is to assist residents to bring their units up to code or abate cases. To further measure this success, the City of Santa Cruz will continually adjust their ADU program to make it easier to build and permit ADUs.
Key Takeaways

After concluding research, interview and analysis of Santa Cruz’s ADU approach, numerous valuable takeaways were identified:

1. **Owner occupancy requirements may need to be adapted as ADU policy matures.** Santa Cruz initially required property owners to live in either the primary structure or in the ADU, if the owner wanted to rent the other structure. The City has since removed this requirement. Property owners can now rent out both the primary structure and the ADU without living on the property. Owner occupancy requirements provide different benefits at different stages of an ADU policy lifespan. Santa Cruz planning staff expressed the importance of determining the best solution for owner occupancy and owner renting rights and explained that these requirements may change over time to best fit the city’s needs.

2. **Pre-approved ADU plans can be an effective tool to encourage ADU construction.** Santa Cruz adopted a series of pre-approved ADU plans to facilitate the permit process for residents who were interested in building an ADU. While the City wasn’t able to discern whether or not this strategy has impacted ADU construction, it is another tool residents can refer to when deciding whether or not to build an ADU. Additionally, having pre-approved plans demonstrates the City’s investment in ADUs as a viable housing option.

Sources


Vancouver initially adopted its ADU ordinance in 2004. At that time, five to ten ADUs were constructed each year within the city. Between 2016 and 2017, the City established an affordable housing task force to identify specific housing needs of the community. As part of these efforts to address housing affordability, the City began a process to amend its zoning code to allow for easier development of ADUs and to make them a more prevalent housing option for residents within the community. Specifically, these amendments sought to eliminate requirements for owner occupancy types and additional parking spaces, as well as clarifying design ambiguities.

Regional Context

Vancouver, Washington is one of the oldest inhabited areas of the Pacific Northwest. Fort Vancouver, which was established in 1825, was the first permanent European settlement in the Northwest region (Vancouver, 2011). Over time, Vancouver continued to develop around the fort and expand outward throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. During the First and Second World Wars, there was rapid, temporary population increases resulting from the arrival of industrial laborers.
workers. In later years, the construction of Interstate 5 (I-5) in 1965 and I-205 in 1983 accommodated steadier population growth within the City. In the mid 1990s, Cascade Park was annexed into Vancouver, tripling the population of the city (Vancouver, 2011). Today, Vancouver, located across the Columbia River from Portland, Oregon, is approximately 52 square miles in size and home to a population of approximately 180,556 residents. Similar to many other western cities in the United States, Vancouver faces challenges associated with housing affordability, which is described by City staff as a “full-blown affordability crisis.”

Summary of ADU Policy

When the City proposed the zoning code amendment that would make ADUs easier to build, they received minimal feedback from community stakeholders. According to City staff, interested parties were generally pleased to see the changes. General concerns regarding the proposed changes largely pertained to financing, maintaining neighborhood character, and the impacts of increased residential density. City staff noted that the code amendment provided protective measures to address these concerns, such as building height limitations and design preservations.

Since the most recent zoning code amendment, the City has experienced an increase in ADU permits: from the previous five to ten a year to 33 permits in 2020. The City has created a frequently asked question (FAQ) handout, available to the public on their website, for residents interested in constructing an ADU. While the number of ADUs within Vancouver is increasing, the demand for such units does not compare to that in Portland. Similarly, challenges associated with increasing construction costs and compliance with specific State building code requirements remain a prominent barrier to constructing ADUs within the City.

Policy Background

- **2004:** The City amended its Zoning Code to include a chapter pertaining to ADUs
- **2017:** The City amended its Zoning Code pertaining to ADUs to include updates proposed in partial response to local housing affordability concerns, as well as efforts to increase the variety of housing choices within the community. Key amendments included:
  - 1. Defined Accessory Dwelling Unit to provide information on the range of ADU options
  - 2. Eliminated minimum lot size requirement
  - 3. Increased permitted size of ADUs to be up to 50% of main house, but not more than 800 square feet to provide for more flexibility and easier calculation (note: exception to square footage limit in existing basement conversion ADU)
  - 4. Eliminated minimum size of ADUs (300 square feet) to reflect changes in Washington State Building Code and consumer preferences.
  - 5. Reduced maximum building height for ADUs from 25 feet to 25 feet to ensure ADUs be less prominent than the main house
  - 6. Eliminated additional on-site parking requirements
  - 7. Revised design requirements so that ADU is “architecturally compatible” with the principal dwelling rather than “consistent in design and appearance”
  - 8. Eliminated owner occupancy residence requirements
Code Specifics

As noted above, the City developed an affordable housing task force to inform subsequent amendments of its ADU code and, therefore, the code has a strong focus on housing affordability. The stated purpose of the City’s zoning code with respect to ADUs is to:

- Provide homeowners with flexibility in establishing separate living quarters within or adjacent to their homes for the purpose of caring for seniors, providing housing for their children or obtaining rental income
- Increase the range of housing choices and the supply of accessible and affordable housing units within the community
- Ensure that the development of accessory dwelling units does not cause unanticipated impacts on the character or stability of single-family neighborhoods” (Code Section 20.810.010)

Vancouver’s zoning code is considered highly accessible. Navigating the standards of the zoning code does not require significant familiarity with zoning or building code requirements. Further, the Code avoids unnecessary jargon and communicates information through concise sections. The code is aided by the City’s FAQ page, which summarizes pertinent information and provides interactive references and links to applicable sections of the City’s zoning code for additional information.

ADUs are permitted as “limited uses” in all residential zoning districts, provided they are in compliance with applicable development standards for that district (see summary below). However, ADUs are not permitted within non-residential zoning districts or in circumstances where: a property does not contain a detached single family dwelling; and/or a property contains activities requiring a home occupation permit (Code Section 20.810.030).

Listed below are a selection of elements common to ADU codes along with Vancouver’s specific requirements:

- Parking Requirements: None
- Rental Limitations: Not specified
- Short-Term Rentals: Not specified
- Separate Utilities: Not specified
- Cooking Facilities: Not specified
- Setbacks: Additions to existing structures, or the construction of new detached structures, associated with the establishment of an ADU shall not exceed the allowable lot coverage of encroach into required setbacks as prescribed in the underlying zone. The applicable setbacks shall be the same as

Source: (Vancouver, 2017)
those prescribed for the primary structure, not those prescribed for detached accessory structures.

- **Minimum Unit Size:** The gross floor area of an ADU shall not be less than the requirements of the Washington State Building Code.

- **Maximum Unit Size:** The gross floor area, calculated from finished wall to finished wall, ADU shall not exceed 800 square feet or 50% of the primary single-family structure, not including garage and/or detached accessory buildings (whichever is less). ADUs created entirely within existing basements may exceed 800 square feet provided they are not larger than the size of the remainder of the overall home.

- **Design: Compatible with primary structure.** New detached ADUs, or ADUs extending from existing structures shall not comprise more than 50% of total visible facade area of the primary structure and other outbuildings not including the ADU, as seen from the front of the lot. ADUs shall be subject to a maximum height of 25 feet.

**Note:** For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.

The City reviews ADU development requests as a “Type I” procedure, which requires a pre-application conference with City staff and a formal application reviewed by the City’s Planning Official (Code Section 20.210.040). The Type I review process is an administrative review and approval process that does not require any public hearings or discretionary approvals. As part of the development review application, the applicant must submit standard building and site details (e.g., the locations of the primary residence and other accessory structures, parking, setbacks, and specific details about the ADU) (Code Section 20.810.050).

**Measures of Success**

The growing number of ADU permits demonstrate the success of the City’s current ADU code. According to City staff, implementation of the City’s ADU code is a “long-term play,” and the City will continue to monitor the number of ADUs that are constructed each year. Despite the loosening of restrictions related to ADUs, homeowners are still faced with the cost burdens associated with ADU construction (including meeting State building standards).

**Next Steps**

The City of Vancouver’s ADU amendments are still relatively new—they were adopted in 2018. Given these recent changes, the City is not currently planning for any immediate or significant changes. One potential opportunity for the future includes developing pre-approved plans or construction drawings for ADUs. However, according to City staff, the demand for ADUs within the City of Vancouver is currently too low to support the resources that would be required to develop such plans. Below is a table summary of the barriers and opportunities for the City of Vancouver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High costs of permitting and construction</td>
<td>Flexible design and development standard requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of State building standard requirements</td>
<td>No additional parking requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently limited demand for ADUs</td>
<td>No owner-occupancy requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAQ website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

After conclusion research and analysis of the City of Vancouver’s approach to ADUs, the following takeaways were identified:

1. **Establishing an ADU code is a “long-term play.”** An ADU code requires an initial investment of time and effort to enact. With time, revisions and additions will need to be made as public input is gathered and ADUs are built throughout the city. The benefits of an ADU ordinance, however, are worthy of the investment when supported by sufficient demand, described below, as they can have positive impacts in many ways.

2. **Consider homeowner rights in regards to ADUs.** Individuals and single-family property owners should be provided control and flexibility to generate additional income or address multi-generational housing needs.

3. **Understand the demand for ADUs before investing in additional resources.** Before a city begins investing in supplemental materials that aid ADU construction, the demand for ADUs should be observable to balance the amount of time and resources required to publish quality educational and informational resources.

Sources


The City of Lakewood’s approach to ADUs has evolved over time. The current policy has been shaped by public concern expressed during a zoning ordinance amendment process, which revealed ADUs as one pathway to providing more affordable housing options. ADUs were formally adopted into the zoning code during a major revision in April 2012. In addition to public input, the Comprehensive Plan and its goals were a major contributing factor to the inclusion of ADUs in the revised zoning code.
Regional Context

Lakewood, Colorado is a suburban community located in the Denver Metropolitan Area. It is the fifth largest city in Colorado, located between the foothills of the Rocky Mountains and 10 minutes from the middle of the metro area. The City considers itself a forward-thinking community and a strong regional partner. The city’s population is 156,500 and it consists of approximately 44 square miles (City of Lakewood, 2020). Lakewood has more than 47.4 million square feet of office, commercial and retail space developed across the city, which provides for an active real estate market for leasing and purchasing, as well as a variety of development and redevelopment opportunities within the city.

Summary of ADU Policy

Lakewood’s typical permitting process for an ADU begins with a review of conformance with zoning requirements and other site standards. Once these items have been reviewed, an ADU may be constructed with application for review and approval of a building permit.

According to City staff, there were many challenges to overcome when implementing its ADU ordinance. In some instances, the City continues grappling with these challenges in an effort to make ADUs more flexible and applicable throughout the community. The most debated issue pertains to the permitted locations for ADUs: currently they are limited to single-family lots with 9,000 or more square feet. In addition, Lakewood struggles with high construction costs, which are not just limited to construction materials. The City has 26 water districts, each with its own fees for the provision of a second water meter to service an ADU. As these fees are quite significant, ADU construction can easily become cost prohibitive.

The City of Lakewood has been proactive in enacting additional and enhanced ADU policies to make ADUs more viable. The City has invested heavily in providing a variety of resources for residents to understand the development processes for a variety of structures and uses. For example, Lakewood has an ADU-specific zoning handout that specifies site requirements, parking, design requirements and more.

Policy Background

- 2008: Complete zoning revision
- 2012: Major zoning ordinance revision adopted with ADU regulations
- 2016: Updated Title 17 Zoning Ordinance
- 2017: ADU Handout Zoning Summary
- 2018: Memorandum for Lakewood Development Dialogue regarding Housing
- 2019: Most recent zoning code update

Code Specifics

As of 2019, Lakewood defines an ADU as “a habitable dwelling unit added to, created within (attached), or detached from and on the same lot with a single-family dwelling that provides basic requirements for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation” (City of Lakewood, 2019). The City does not include ADUs in density calculations for development.

In terms of accessibility, Lakewood’s code is considered moderately complex. A familiarity with zoning codes would be helpful, but
navigating the standards is not unwieldy. A public user would likely find the requirements easy to understand. The code avoids unnecessary jargon and communicates information through tables and graphics. City staff are available for code questions and clarifications. The City’s ADU zoning policy allows for one ADU in conjunction with any detached single-family structure, duplex, triplex, townhome, or other housing unit. Listed below are a selection of other elements common to ADU codes along with Lakewoods specific requirements:

- **Parking Requirements**: Minimum of one additional parking space, but not more than two parking spaces
- **Rental Limitations**: Long-term rentals required.
- **Short-Term Rentals**: N/A
- **Separate Utilities**: Required
- **Cooking Facilities**: Required
- **Maximum Size**: Must comply with dimensional standards of primary structure’s zoning
- **Setbacks**: Dependant on type of ADU
- **Maximum Height**: 30 feet, for detached ADUs
- **Design**: Must be similar in appearance to the primary structure

*Note:* For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.

---

**Measures of Success**

Public input and General Plan updates have helped guide the direction of Lakewood’s successful ADU policy. According to City planning staff, they do not have a process in place that specifically tracks the number of ADUs built, but the City’s existing permitting software has the capability of sorting by project type. A quick search can confirm the number and type of ADU built—opening up possible tracking measures in the future. Further policy adjustments are expected to be made in the future, but for now, the City will continue its current practice.
**Next Steps**

At this time, there are no additional amendments planned for the existing ADU regulations. The City is satisfied with the current regulations and plans to continue monitoring the implementation of its policies throughout the community.

Below is a table summary of the barriers and opportunities for the City of Lakewood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High costs of permitting and construction</td>
<td>Ordinance that allows ADUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupancy requirement</td>
<td>Additional resource handouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space requirement</td>
<td>Education and outreach to residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Takeaways**

After conclusion research and analysis of the City of Lakewood’s approach to ADUs, the following takeaways were identified:

ADU policy should be a part of wider affordable housing strategies and goals. ADUs are effective in increasing density while also providing additional affordable housing stock. ADU policy should not be at odds with existing housing strategies but should be fully integrated to ensure desirable outcomes.

Public input is crucial for effective ADU policy. Lakewood relied heavily upon public input and communication with local stakeholders to establish its ADU policies. This led to community buy-in to ADUs and continues to be an effective practice as the City evaluates its progress.

**Sources**

The City of Oceanside has allowed ADUs since the 1990s. At the time, ADUs required a conditional use permit and were subject to strict development standards. As a result, few ADUs were built in the community. However, in 2016, the State of California passed legislation to address the housing shortage, including language that promoted ADU construction as a means of expanding housing choice. This new law required jurisdictions to remove overburdensome development regulations and review processes, which translated into a new ADU policy for Oceanside.

*Figure 18: Aerial view of Oceanside*
Regional Context

The City of Oceanside is located in Southern California in North San Diego County. Andrew Jackson Myers founded the city in 1883. Within a few years, the city had expanded to include the Bank of Oceanside, grandhotel, a pier, and a wharf company. Today, Oceanside has grown to encompass 43 square-miles. The city is located between San Diego (38 miles) and Los Angeles (83 miles), which provides easy access to job centers and attractions. Oceanside is known for its tourist destinations, including beaches, a pier, a harbor and marina, and shops. They also have well established industrial parks, commercial centers, and agriculture areas. Oceanside has largely consisted of suburban neighborhoods, along with three major commercial corridors. As housing in Oceanside has become more expensive and scarce, affordable housing has become a central issue for the community.

Summary of ADU Policy

In 2017, the City of Oceanside updated their ADU ordinance to comply with State law, making it easier for its residents to build ADUs on their properties. The amendment process took approximately 6 months. The City pursued additional amendments in 2018 and 2020, intended to further reduce the regulatory barriers and costs associated with ADU’s. The City’s primary goal with its ADU ordinance is to promote affordable housing and increase the supply of renting housing.

Policy Background

- 1990s: ADU were allowed in Oceanside
- 2017-2018: The State legislature enacted ADU legislation, with the intent to reduce regulatory barriers and costs, streamline approval, and expand the potential capacity for ADUs in response to California’s housing shortage.
- 2017 and 2018: The City Council adopted revised ADU regulations, conforming to the provisions of Government Code Section 65852.2 as mandated by state law.
- 2020: The State legislature enacted new ADU legislation (SB 13, AB 68, and AB 881), in order to further reduce the regulatory barriers and costs and streamline approval of ADUs.

Code Specifies

Oceanside’s ADU policy seeks to provide the opportunity for its residents to live near job-rich areas, while trying to support the increasing demand for housing. In the last decade, the demand for housing has not kept pace with housing supply, which has increased market pressures. At a state level, California seeks to address this housing shortage, in addition to increasing housing diversity to accommodate low-income residents and boosting overall housing supply. The City’s most recent ADU ordinance amendments (January 2020) aimed to further reduce the regulatory barriers and costs associated with ADUs. The City currently allows for three different ADU types: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU), Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU), and an Efficiency Unit. These ADUs types are allowed in single-family or multifamily zones based on the Government Code Section 65852.2 et seq.
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- **Parking Requirements**: One off-street parking space
- **Rental Limitations**: Rental terms must be longer than 30 days.
- **Short-Term Rentals**: Short term rentals are not permitted
- **Separate Utilities**: ADUs must comply with water and sewer requirements by the Water Utilities Department. For new attached and detached ADUs, the City may require a new or separate utility connection.
- **Cooking Facilities**: ADUs must have an efficient kitchen with cooking facilities and appliances.
- **Maximum Size**: 1,000 square-foot ADU (two bedroom or more) or a detached ADU can be up to 1,200 square-feet subject to standard height, lot coverage, and setbacks of the zoning district or an attached ADU not to exceed 50% of the primary dwelling.
- **Setbacks**: 4 ft. side and rear setbacks are permitted in any circumstance subject to compliance with all building codes. No lot coverage requirements apply.
- **Maximum Height**: 16 feet
- **Design**: The ADU needs to be architecturally similar to the primary dwelling in terms of design, building, roofing materials, colors, and exterior finishes.

*Note: For additional comparison of code requirements, see Appendix 1.*

**Measures of Success**

The City of Oceanside tracks the number of building permits received in a calendar year. Over the last few years, ADU applications have increased dramatically, possibly due to the City’s ordinance amendments that have made it easier for owners to construct them. By January 2017, the City had received 36 permit applications for ADUs; since 2018, the City has received over 200 applications. Oceanside has a dedicated ADU webpage (oceanaideau.com) that provides guidance and resources for the public, with a focus on ADU design and construction ideas. The City’s ADU website also includes a video called “Visualizing the Code,” which helps the public navigate the ADU zoning requirements.
Next Steps

The City is currently working on revising and updating its ADU guide to include frequently asked questions. The goal is to provide additional guidance that helps the public navigate the ADU process and relevant code. The Oceanside Planning Department is also evaluating the success of its ADU program and searching for additional opportunities to improve its resources. Oceanside continues to host a public ADU workshop with a panel of experts that include local architects and ADU builders. Residents are taking interest in building ADUs, especially with the changes in regulations and ordinances making it easier to build them.

Below is a table summary of the barriers and opportunities for the City of Oceanside:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navigating state ADU laws, portions of the law are ambiguous and easy to misinterpret</td>
<td>California Dep of Housing and Community Development finally prepared an ADU Handbook, to help cities navigate these laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to account for all possible scenarios when preparing an ADU Ordinance</td>
<td>ADU Workshops are available, with housing and architectural experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

After concluding research and analysis of the City of Oceanside’s ADU approach, numerous valuable takeaways were identified:

1. **Reduction of setbacks allows more flexibility for ADUs.** Oceanside ADU policies permit smaller properties with setbacks as few as four feet. This demonstrates the need for consistent code evaluation and adaptation for new dimensions for ADUs.

2. **Reducing building permit fees and waiving other impact fees allows the public and the City to lower costs.** Residents’ cost savings will only add to the popularity of building an ADU, as well as making the processes easier for them. This is an opportunity for the residents and City officials to both benefit in the end.

3. **ADUs should be prioritized near public transit to increase resident accessibility and mobility.** Neighborhoods with strong public transit access are ideal locations for ADU investments. Not only does this help minimize any traffic and parking concerns that may be associated with ADUs, it can also help reduce carbon footprints, minimize transportation costs, and increase demand for multimodal transportation systems.

Sources:


Chapter 7: Recommendations & Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter is to synthesize the research presented in previous chapters of the report, in order to identify key recommendations from which the City of Peoria can draw as it considers its policy options for ADUs. The first section of this chapter will list and summarize these best practices. The second section will then provide a list of final considerations that Peoria will be wise to keep in mind as it finalizes its policy. The chapter will close with a formal conclusion to the project report.

7.1 Best Practices

The development of an ADU code is an iterative process. Based on our case study review of ADU policies across Arizona and the United States, we observed that the development of an ADU code is an iterative process. In crafting an effective policy, it is important to understand that it will take time to create one that works well for Peoria, so expectations must be managed. Regular evaluation of the program is necessary to understand the limitations and opportunities for improvement. For instance, Santa Cruz’s (CA) program has been in place for decades, yet is monitored on an ongoing basis for any necessary adjustments. Their ADU policy was originally adopted in the 1980s to account for student housing demand; they have since amended the ordinance to allow more flexibility and clarification throughout its lifespan. Relative to Santa Cruz, Flagstaff’s (AZ) ADU program is newer (initially adopted in 2007) and has shown a similar pattern. As a result of ongoing review, they have amended their ordinance to further clarify where ADUs are permitted, as well as adjust maximum size and architectural compatibility requirements (Figures 1 and 2).

Note: Flagstaff City Council holds public hearing on proposed amendments to ADU ordinance Source: https://flagstaffaz.new.swagit.com/videos/54033#33

Figure 1. ADU Spectrum of National Case Studies
**Have a simple and straightforward code.**

Simple and straightforward verbiage within the language of the code allows for flexibility, which can, in turn, help facilitate production of ADUs and increase their accessibility to prospective residents. When the City of Surprise, for example, adopted its recent ADU code (2020), they were keen to keep it simple and flexible. The City believes that simple language will not only help to facilitate ADU production, but also allow for future adjustments to its ADU program as circumstances evolve. By contrast, excessive regulatory language inhibits flexibility and can act as a barrier to production, discouraging homeowners and housing developers who might otherwise be willing to develop ADUs on their properties.

**Barriers to ADUs in infill development must be addressed.**

A City should create avenues to enable ADU production on parcels that are already developed. Various barriers relating to costs, financing, and permitting processes can deter homeowners from pursuing ADU projects. For example, development costs (including city fees) largely fall on homeowners, introducing a significant burden that makes the project nonviable; waiving development and permitting fees can go a long way toward motivating more people to pursue ADUs on their lots. The cities of Santa Cruz (CA), Salem (OR), and Oceanside (CA) have all used this strategy to reduce cost burdens for homeowners.

Financing represents a similar barrier: many homeowners do not have funds readily available for development and must pursue short- or long-term financing. However, the process of finding proper financing can be difficult because lenders may have little to no familiarity with ADUs. As banks become more familiar with this unique housing option, they may become more willing to finance them.

**Figure 3. Example of a backyard casita in the Phoenix**

Lastly, ADUs may not fit squarely into existing permitting processes. Moreover, adding a stand-alone ADU permitting process could further complicate the overall process. Therefore, ADU permitting and other processes should be streamlined and wrapped into existing procedures to make them easier for both residents and city staff. The City of Flagstaff (AZ) exemplifies this, highlighting the ways process-based changes have played a large role in the workflow of developing ADUs.

**Work with developers to guide new, ADU-inclusive development.**

Suburban homes in Sunbelt regions are increasingly in demand. This trend has been further accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, as
some households search for larger homes and more open space. As demand increases, it will continue to put a squeeze on housing supply and reduce affordability. While communities seek to resolve the issue, City staff can work with developers to ensure that newly built units are meeting current demands; these new developments may incorporate ADUs into their site plans to help expand housing choice.

There are a number of reasons that new, ADU-inclusive development projects may be a strong strategy for a city like Peoria. In our research, we saw great examples of these types of projects, including Lennar’s NEXTGEN homes for multigenerational households in the Greater Phoenix area. Furthermore, entire communities with ADUs can be marketed as “ADU communities.” In this context, prospective buyers could have increased familiarity with ADUs as a supplemental housing option, including a better understanding of their potential purpose and value. Relatedly, these “ADU communities” can also offer options that avoid potential confrontations that could arise from ADU development in more established neighborhoods. Lastly, there is a cost argument to be made: ADUs are also less expensive and easier to finance in new construction compared to adding ADUs to existing structures. And, from a broader perspective, ADUs in new construction have the potential to help normalize the tool in other contexts, thereby boosting their reputation for other existing neighborhoods.

Community outreach is crucial. Effective communication, cooperation, and education will be critical as the City of Peoria launches its community-level strategies. By educating the public on the characteristics and benefits of ADUs, the City will be better able to increase community interest and resolve whatever misconceptions the public may have. One significant way the City can do this is by deciding on their goals and vision for the ADU program—and clearly articulating their intentions to the community—from the very beginning. For a successful ADU program to grow, it is crucial that the City build trust and understanding between planners, residents, and any other community stakeholders. Homeowners’ associations (HOAs), for example, were not part of the stakeholder engagement on this project, however they are a group that the City should communicate with as potential ADU policies evolve. We saw evidence of this approach in our case study analysis. For instance, the planner from Vancouver (WA) discussed the importance of hearing more from the public about what they want to build. Good communication and community outreach will allow planners to more thoroughly understand residents’ needs, and will likewise allow residents to develop more informed and accurate perceptions of ADUs.

Source: http://thekimberlylowegroup.com/
7.2 Things to Keep in Mind

Identify the primary purpose of an ADU policy and draft it with this purpose in mind.

In our research, housing advocates stressed the importance of identifying the primary goal of an ADU policy as a first step: whatever the intent is, it must be incorporated into the code from the beginning. Having clear and agreed-upon goals for a program will guide the decisions that need to be made (e.g., parking and lot size requirements) when drafting the code. Some case studies also supported this strategy. Flagstaff (AZ), for example, established affordability as a foundational principle for their overall housing strategy. As the community faces rising housing costs due to external demand, Flagstaff’s program aims to add more housing units to the supply. This is reflected in their decision to allow ADUs in all residential districts. Additionally, Flagstaff has revised its ADU program multiple times to improve readability. This illustrates the City’s desire to make it as easy as possible for residents to build ADUs on their properties.

Supplementary resources are secondary priorities to a straightforward code.

As recommended in the stakeholder interviews, supplementary resources—including guidebooks and an FAQ page on the city website—can be very helpful for local residents to understand what they need to know about ADUs, whether they are interested in building one on their property or they simply want to learn more. It is important to note that a City’s first priority should be to develop a user-friendly code; supplementary materials are an important, but secondary, concern. If the code is difficult to navigate, it will do little to promote—and may stifle—ADU production.

Note: Website features an instructional video on building an ADU.
Source: https://www.ci.oceanside.ca.us/gov/dev/planning/adu/default.asp

We found that supplementary resources develop differently in each community, so it is important to align the approach to the local context. The City of Oceanside (CA) created a webpage that provides ADU resources for the public, including an official video explaining how to build an ADU (see Figure 5). The Town of Queen Creek (AZ) developed a user-friendly guidebook to help the public navigate the ADU design and construction process. This guidebook provides stakeholders with definitions, contact information for Town officials, and design guidelines to facilitate a smooth process. Supplementary resources such as these are a smart way for the city to inform and connect with...
the public beyond the language in the code. By actively providing ways for the public to learn more about ADUs and how they can more readily develop one on their own, the city can aid in facilitating production.

**Short-term rentals are controversial among some stakeholders.**

It bears repeating that short-term rentals were a major concern among some stakeholders in Peoria (as they are in many other communities). ADUs are the perfect size for short-term rentals, so it can be enticing for homeowners to list them on short-term rental sites (e.g., Airbnb, VRBO). There are concerns that this could invite various nuisances associated with guests, such as added traffic and noise. Moreover, if new ADUs become short-term rental listings, they are likely not adding to the existing housing stock and will, therefore, do nothing to reach affordability goals. It is worth noting, however, that existing literature does suggest that perceptions may not align with reality—a recent study found that a limited percentage of ADUs (approximately 12%) were used as short-term rentals and most were, in fact, used for permanent housing (see Chapter 3, Literature Review). More research may be needed within the Arizona context, but, in the meantime, it may be fruitful to educate the public on the data available and identify strategies to mitigate potential concerns. For example, while Arizona’s state legislation currently bans localities from prohibiting short-term rentals outright, Peoria could work around this by imposing a requirement for owners to occupy the primary dwelling. This would mean that owners are subject to any possible nuisance complaints, and would therefore find it in their best interest to deter such issues.

**Housing unaffordability is a systemic problem: ADUs are simply one tool in the toolbox.**

As lack of affordable housing continues to stress markets across the United States, ADUs have been promoted as one of several potential solutions—especially for young and/or elderly residents seeking to age in place. They are also one of many possible answers to the current lack of diversity in Peoria’s housing stock. Beyond detached single-family houses and multi-family apartments, there is significant demand for “missing middle” housing that ADUs will help to fulfill. However, it must be stressed that the current affordability crisis is a systemic problem that extends well beyond Peoria. Across Arizona, and indeed throughout the country, the shortage of affordable land on which to build new homes—be it vacant greenfield land suitable for new development or brownfield land suitable for redevelopment—poses a significant barrier that will be difficult to overcome (See Figure 7). Likewise, ADUs alone will not be sufficient...
to solve the problem: They must be considered as one of several viable “tools in the toolbox,” rather than as a one-size-fits-all solution.

Public acceptance of ADUs may be more difficult in established neighborhoods.

ADUs will likely be more difficult to pass in well-established neighborhoods, as the Tempe case study illustrates. Historic districts are especially challenging to implement ADUs, as residents are often keen on retaining their existing neighborhood character. While ADUs do not drastically alter neighborhoods, this concern must be addressed. ADUs can be highlighted as a way to ease market demand on the neighborhood, as well as a way to promote “gentle density.” Both of these methods can help ease concerns regarding neighborhood character. Nonetheless, neighborhood and character design standards are important. Queen Creek’s (AZ) standards, for example, require an ADU to maintain a similar design as the main house. Preserving neighborhood character and design elements will look different in each community, however it will be necessary when devising the code (See Figure 8).

7.3 Conclusion

This report provides the City of Peoria with the necessary insights to guide the development of an effective ADU policy. Our team gathered knowledge from stakeholders, the literature, and other municipalities, which we hope will enable City staff to create a policy that reflects the unique characteristics of the community. This information will assist Peoria in addressing challenges associated with housing, both now and into the future. ADUs are a unique option that can play multiple roles in housing. While we understand that many further discussions are needed and many concerns remain to be addressed, we see that ADUs can be one of many valuable tools for Peoria going forward.
Chapter 8: Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff, Arizona</td>
<td>72,402</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-40.60.030 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)</td>
<td>6,000 sq ft</td>
<td>Lots less than 1 acre: 600 sq ft; Lots equal or greater than 1 acre: 1,000 sq ft</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>24 ft</td>
<td>R(1)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Similar to main structure</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Creek, Arizona</td>
<td>43,129</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Section 6.1 Accessory Buildings and Uses</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>30% of rear yard</td>
<td>Zoning or 15 ft</td>
<td>Zoning or 15 ft</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Similar to main structure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise, Arizona</td>
<td>135,450</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>106-10.2 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>800 sq ft or 50% (whichever is less)</td>
<td>Attached: Zoning; Detached: 5 ft rear/side</td>
<td>Attached: 9’ at setback line</td>
<td>R(1)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Similar to main structure</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe, Arizona</td>
<td>187,454</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Section 3-402 - Accessory Dwellings</td>
<td>8000 sq ft</td>
<td>800 sq ft</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood, Colorado</td>
<td>156,798</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Article 4 17.4.1.1</td>
<td>9,000 sq ft</td>
<td>700 sq ft</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>R(1)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Similar to main structure</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem, Oregon</td>
<td>173,442</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sec. 700.007</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>900 sq ft or 60% (whichever is less)</td>
<td>Provided in Table 700-1 (detached)</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, Washington</td>
<td>183,012</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Title 20.800</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>800 sq ft or 50% (whichever is less)</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Similar to main structure</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz, California</td>
<td>273,213</td>
<td>2012 2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Section 24.16.100</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>800 sq ft or 50% (whichever is more)</td>
<td>Zoning Detached: 3 ft (Attached)</td>
<td>Zoning Detached: 16 ft (Detached)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Similar to main structure</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside, California</td>
<td>176,080</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ordinance No. 29-OR0507-1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4 ft</td>
<td>16 ft</td>
<td>R(1)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Similar to main structure</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>