

June 2, 2016  
Public Hearing

Public hearing began at 6:45 p.m.

Present: Bill Muse, Mayor; Steve Cox, Farlan Behunin, Gladys LeFevre, Pete Benson, Council Members; Judi Davis, Clerk.

Public present: Mary Behunin, Carla Saccomano. \*, \*\*

The Mayor opened the public hearing to receive comment on the Planning Commission's recommendation to allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in MDR, LDR, GMU, and Commercial zones. Mark McIff has drafted an ordinance, and Bruce Parker submitted comments. Because Bruce didn't know that the purpose is to provide extra housing for residents, many of his comments referred to the usual meaning of ADU's, which is to provide housing for relatives or guests of the owner of the primary structure.

Carla asked whether, with our ordinance allowing density of only one family/five acres, that is met through the statement in the recommendation that "[the ADU] is a separate additional living unit, including kitchen, sleeping, and bathroom facilities [and] does not constitute a two-family dwelling"? Gladys suggested that the wording making the entire unit the property of one entity might make it a single unit. Bill wondered if it also applies to a home that is not on five acres but is grandfathered in. There is nothing that would indicate that such a dwelling would not qualify.

Gladys asked what Donna Jean's concerns were. Pete stated that her conflict with it was that the existing ordinance doesn't allow more than one family per lot, but obviously this change would. He's not too concerned about that, but it may conflict with the general plan. Bill stated that, if the consensus of all of the town is that we don't care about that, we could change the ordinance by possibly changing the definition of a single-family home. There was a review of the history of the "big house" (Hell's Backbone Grill employee house) and how it came to allow many unrelated people to live in it. (\*Amelia LeFevre)

Steve still is not sure of the intent of this change. He originally thought it was to cover those places that have been built as completely separate structures, thereby creating accessory dwelling units, but this is not that, so what does this fix? Pete stated that it is to create more seasonal rentals. It doesn't affect any places already in existence, as far as he knows, except Bevin's. Gladys wonders how we will determine the residents are two different "families"? What if they split the rent? Pete thinks it is too much enforcement for the Town. Bruce suggested that we consider better ways to allow more housing, such

as multi-family units (duplexes, etc.) Pete agrees with that recommendation, as it would be all above-board with no tricks. (\*\*Ashley Coombs)

Steve wondered if there was any discussion in the PC to bring into compliance those properties which are already existing, such as John Veranth's which are two separate units, one of which is his house and the other which could be a rental. Pete has heard John say that the barn/garage/apartment is not actually a dwelling unit; they were just camping there while building their house. There is some thought that some places could be brought into compliance, but it would have to be initiated by the landowner. There doesn't seem to be a move to create another avenue to qualify. Steve thought that was the intent of this movement.

There were no more comments, and the public hearing was closed at 7:00.