

**Accessory Dwelling Units:
A Report for Needham Public Health Division
10-11-17**

Acknowledgements

This report was funded by the Needham Public Health Division. The project was directed by Timothy M. McDonald, Director of Health and Human Services and Lynn Schoeff, Project Manager, Public Health Division. It was researched and written by Chris Miara, Advisor to the Public Health Division.

Thanks to the following for their input into the scope of the project and the interview questions: Moe Handel, Board of Selectmen; Karen Sunnarborg, Community Housing Specialist, Planning and Community Development Department; David Roche, Building Commissioner; Colleen Schaller, Chair of the Council on Aging; Jeanne McKnight, Planning Board; Elin Soderholm, League of Women Voters; Dorothea von Herder, Needham resident with an interest in affordable housing.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2

Background on the Report 4

Data Collection Method..... 4

Results of Interviews..... 5

 Background of Bylaws 5

 Key requirements in ADU bylaws in the nine communities..... 5

 Impact of the Bylaws..... 6

 Proposing changes to Bylaws in 7 of the communities..... 9

 Recommendations from town officials re: Informing the community about an ADU Bylaw .. 10

Conclusion: Recommendations for Needham 11

References..... 12

Appendix A: Demographics of Communities Studied 13

Appendix B: Questions for Interviews with Town/City Officials re: ADUs..... 14

Appendix C: Contacts Interviewed and Materials Collected..... 15

Appendix D: Key Requirements in the ADU Bylaws 17

Executive Summary

Background

This report on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) was commissioned as follow up to the report, *Assessment of Housing and Transit Options for Needham Seniors*, released in the fall of 2016. According to a survey conducted for that assessment, seniors want to remain in town as they age but many feel this won't be possible due to: "the high cost of housing (purchase price or rent, and upkeep); costliness of modifying existing homes to increase accessibility; and zoning regulations that prohibit accessory dwelling units." One of the recommendations in the assessment report was to pass a zoning bylaw to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs). An ADU-- also known as accessory or "in-law" apartments-- is defined as "a self-contained apartment in an owner-occupied single family home that is either attached to the principal dwelling or in a separate structure on the same property." (Massachusetts EEA). ADUs are a low-impact, high-value way to address the problem of diminishing housing options. ADUs are of particular benefit to older residents, young adults, people with disabilities, and people with moderate incomes.

The report, *Accessory Dwelling Units: A Report for the Needham Public Health Division*, examines in some depth the experience of nine communities similar to Needham that have passed ADU bylaws. Their experiences, combined with recommendations from the Massachusetts Office on Energy and Environmental Affairs, can serve as an authoritative guide for local debate. The purpose of this study was to learn about the impact of these bylaws on issues of importance to Needham, including cost, density, traffic, appearance, and meeting the changing needs of our residents.

Data Collection Method

Nine cities and towns were selected because, like Needham, they are suburban communities within the I-495 beltway, but unlike Needham, they have had ADU bylaws in place for a number of years. Planning and community development staff in each community were interviewed by phone or in person about: 1) the specific regulations in their bylaws; 2) the impact of the bylaws on various aspects of community life; 3) experiences modifying bylaws; and 4) lessons learned from the process. In addition to interviews, information was collected by reviewing the text of each community's actual bylaw as well as supporting documents and reports from the town.

Results of interviews

Content of the bylaws

The text of the bylaws of all nine towns described similar goals: increase housing options while maintaining the character of the town; help young and older adults and people with disabilities stay in town as their needs change; and provide moderately-priced units in communities with ever-escalating home prices and reduced number of small homes. Two communities explicitly added the goal of helping workers live near their places of employment.

Interviewees noted that their bylaws were drafted to address key concerns residents expressed about ADUs, namely that they might: change the appearance of a neighborhood from one of single family homes to one that looks crowded; allow two-family homes in areas zoned for

single-family homes; and increase density, stress on public services, the number of children, traffic, and cars parked outside a house.

The regulations in the nine towns are similar in their intent to meet the goals and address the concerns listed above. They ensure that the unit is clearly part of, and smaller than, the main dwelling, and that the ADU doesn't change the overall character of the neighborhood. Most of the regulations are consistent with the recommendations in the Massachusetts Model Bylaw.

Impact of the bylaws

The impact of ADU bylaws on the communities surveyed has been minimal. Only a small number of ADUs have been created over the course of many years.

For residents who have been able to take advantage of this option, ADUs have served their intended purpose. Older adults and their children are able to share a property, or older adults are able to afford to stay in their home by renting out a unit. Other effects of passing an ADU bylaw have been bringing illegal, and possibly unsafe, units into compliance, and creating appropriate housing for people with disabilities.

None of the interviewees reported an increase in the number of school children, traffic, or a change in the character of the town due to the ADU bylaw.

Planning boards and housing advocates in seven of the nine communities decided to liberalize the regulations in the past few years to encourage more people to take advantage of this option. Six of the towns approved changes, indicating overall satisfaction with the general concept of accessory apartments.

Recommendations from interviewees re: advocating for an ADU bylaw

The interviewees in these towns offered several recommendations to Needham should it decide to enact an ADU bylaw, namely:

- Engage key partners with related interests
- Engage older adults
- Tie the proposed bylaw to demonstrated needs
- Educate the public about what the bylaw is, and what it isn't

Conclusion: Recommendations for Needham

The experiences of the nine communities described in this report provide compelling evidence that ADUs could contribute to the overall goal of increasing housing options for older adults, young adults, people with disabilities, and people with moderate incomes without negatively impacting the quality of life. Using the Mass Model Bylaw and the experiences of the nine communities as guides, Needham can create a bylaw that ensures units will be integrated into existing single family neighborhoods with little or no negative impact on the character of the neighborhood or on town services, provide new options for current Needham homeowners, and minimize the regulatory burden on town officials. The report recommends specific bylaw regulations—related to permitting, size, occupants, appearance and parking--to achieve the desired outcome.

Background on the Report

Needham has long been valued as a family-friendly suburban town with a mix of housing types and a population that is committed to setting down roots in the community. However, rapidly escalating housing prices combined with the growing number of tear-downs of small homes threatens to change the character of the town by raising the income level required to live here. One modest, but important, way to address the problem of diminished housing options is passage of a zoning bylaw to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs). An ADU-- also known as accessory or “in-law” apartments-- is defined as “a self-contained apartment in an owner-occupied single family home that is either attached to the principal dwelling or in a separate structure on the same property.” (Massachusetts EEA, n.d.) This bylaw is of particular benefit to older residents, young adults, people with disabilities and people with moderate incomes. The Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs encourages the adoption of ADU bylaws and has published a model ADU bylaw to guide communities interested in pursuing this option. (Massachusetts EEA, n.d.) A number of surrounding communities have passed ADU bylaws, and their experiences are instructive as Needham considers whether to go this route. This report summarizes both the Massachusetts model bylaw and the accessory apartment bylaws in nine cities and towns within the I-495 beltway.

This report on ADUs was commissioned as follow-up to the report, *Assessment of Housing and Transit Options for Needham Seniors*, released by the Needham Council on Aging and the Needham Public Health Division in August 2016. According to a survey conducted for that assessment, seniors want to remain in town as they age, but many feel this won’t be possible, due to “the high cost of housing (purchase price or rent, and upkeep); costliness of modifying existing homes to increase accessibility; and zoning regulations that prohibit accessory dwelling units.” (Needham Council on Aging and Needham Public Health Division, 2016)

While many Needham residents support ADUs, some residents express concerns about the potential impact which may result from that type of policy change. The Public Health Division commissioned a study of the experiences of a sample of towns similar to Needham that have had these zoning bylaws in place for a number of years in order to learn about the impact of these bylaws. Interview questions about zoning bylaws which permit accessory dwelling units were chosen based on issues of importance to Needham, including cost, density, traffic, appearance, and acceptance by residents.

Data Collection Method

Communities: The following cities and towns were selected because they have had ADU bylaws in place for a number of years, and are suburban communities within the I-495 beltway, and share characteristics with Needham:

- Acton
- Bedford

- Carlisle
- Lexington
- Milton
- Newton
- Scituate
- Sudbury
- Westwood

Appendix A summarizes the demographics of these communities and Needham, including population, median household income, land size, and number of housing units.

Interview questions: The interview form used the Massachusetts model bylaw as a framework. It also contained questions on 1) the specific requirements outlined in each town’s bylaws, 2) the impact of the bylaws on various aspects of community life, 3) experiences modifying bylaws and 4) lessons learned from the process. Representatives of several elected and appointed boards in Needham helped develop the questions to ensure they addressed issues of local concern. A copy of the interview tool is in Appendix B.

Data sources: Information was collected by reviewing the text of each community’s actual bylaw as well as supporting documents and reports from the town. In addition, planning and community development staff members in each community were interviewed, either by phone or in person. Names and contact information and bylaws and supplemental resources are in Appendix C.

Results of Interviews

Background of bylaws

Goals: All nine towns expressed similar goals in the text of their ADU bylaws: increase housing options while maintaining the character of the town; help young and older adults and people with disabilities stay in town as their needs change; and provide moderately-priced units in communities with ever-escalating home prices and reduced number of small homes. Newton and Scituate explicitly added the goal of helping workers live near their places of employment.

Concerns: Interviewees noted that their bylaws were drafted with an awareness of key concerns residents expressed about ADUs, namely that they might:

- Change the appearance of a neighborhood from one of single family homes to one that looks crowded
- Allow two-family homes in areas zoned for single-family homes
- Increase density, stress on public services, increased public school enrollment, traffic and cars parked outside a house.

Key requirements in ADU bylaws in the nine communities

The bylaws in the nine towns are similar in their intent to meet the goals and address the concerns listed above. They ensure that the unit is clearly part of, and smaller than, the main

dwelling, and that the ADU doesn't change the overall character of the neighborhood. The bylaws are generally consistent with the Massachusetts model bylaw. The following indicates in italics the recommendations of the Massachusetts model bylaw and summarizes the corresponding key requirements in the nine communities studied. Details of these requirements can be found in Appendix D.

Type of unit: *Mass model bylaw: Only one unit per single family house or house lot.* All the communities interviewed limit ADUs to one per main dwelling. All but one (Bedford) allows ADUs as both an internal unit within the main dwelling and as a detached unit on the property.

Type of permit: *Mass model bylaw: As-of-right for units within existing dwellings with limited or no impact from the street; Special Permit for additions to existing dwelling or detached units.* (Special permits are those given by the zoning board after determining the plan meets the regulations in the bylaw. As-of-right permits do not require special review; the building inspector determines the property meets the requirements of the bylaw.) In four communities, all ADUs are permitted by special permit only. In the other five, ADUs are approved as a combination of special permit and as-of-right.

Size: *Mass model bylaw: Gross area of ADU no more than 900 square feet; no more than three occupants; no more than two bedrooms.* All communities restrict the size of the ADU to ensure it is subsidiary to the main dwelling. The allowable size ranges from 750 square feet for an internal unit in Scituate to 2000 square feet for a detached unit in Acton.

Ownership and tenancy: *Mass model bylaw: Owner must occupy one of the units.* All communities interviewed require the owner to live in either the main dwelling or the ADU, and the other unit cannot be sold. In other words, the owner cannot turn the ADU into a condominium. Only one town (Milton) requires the tenant to be a relative or employee.

Parking: *Mass model bylaw: Off-street parking should be available to owner and tenants.* All communities except Newton require that ADUs have one to two dedicated parking spaces. Most communities also require that screening be built or planted between the additional cars and neighboring property.

Appearance: All bylaws have requirements—most extensively detailed-- that the appearance of the original dwelling be substantially maintained. Most describe the need to retain the look of a one-family house, with no external stairways visible, only one main entrance, etc. Similarly, a detached ADU is required to maintain the look of the original building.

Timing and updates: The majority of communities passed the bylaws in the 1980s and early 1990s. Seven have attempted to liberalize the bylaws in the last two years, six successfully.

Impact of the bylaws

Summary: According to the interviewees and other studies of the effect of ADUs, the impact of ADU bylaws on the communities surveyed is minimal. Only a small number of ADUs have been created. The majority of local government staff members interviewed suggested that the reason for the low number of units added was the expense and the time-consuming nature of the

process, which most homeowners are unable or unwilling to undertake. As a result of the low production, seven of the nine communities interviewed have attempted to liberalize their bylaws in the last few years, reducing obstacles to greater participation.

Interviewees report that the ADU bylaws appear to have served their intended purpose. Older adults and their children are able to share a property, or older adults are able to afford to stay in their home by renting out a unit, or an older adult may bring a live-in health aide into the home.

- *When they come for a permit, it's for family members. Seniors can stay in town and their kids get to stay in town. We're losing 65 plus and recent college grads. ADUs are a way to encourage both to stay here. (Lexington)*
- *I see it as something that helps out families, where you couldn't afford to buy a separate house, prices are out of control/ people can't stay in town. It's a service for those already in town. (Scituate)*
- *We don't offer a lot of services for our seniors. This is one way we've been able to help them. (Sudbury)*

Other effects of passing an ADU bylaw are bringing illegal, and possibly unsafe, units into compliance and creating appropriate housing for people with disabilities.

None of the interviewees reported a significant increase in public school enrollment, traffic, or a change in the character of the town due to the ADU bylaw.

The following describes the responses to specific questions about the impact of the ADU bylaw.

Total number: Some of the towns do not track the number of ADU permits. Of the towns that do, the numbers range from an average of two to seven ADUs per year over the time the bylaw has been in place.

The following information represents reports from each community:

- Carlisle: 18 since 1989.
- Lexington: 200 since 1983. Most of these were grandfathered in, as opposed to newly constructed ADUs.
- Newton: 73 over 20 years.
- Scituate: 88 since 1989. Steady number of applicants; no big increase since they allowed detached units and in ADUs new construction.
- Westwood: 45 since 1992, approximately half are internal and half detached. 13 people are on the waiting list (Westwood caps the total number of ADUs).
- Bedford: Combines ADUs and two-family homes in its tracking system. There are a total of 300; the town staff reported the majority are two-family homes.
- Acton, Milton and Sudbury: Do not keep records. Local officials estimate it is just a few per year.

Who lives in homes with ADUs?: While towns do not keep formal records on the personal situations of homeowners and ADU tenants, most town staff see ADUs primarily serving family needs. Most often, interviewees report that an older parent moves into the ADU created by their adult child. The other circumstances most commonly cited are a relative with a disability--or his/her caretaker--lives in the ADU, and an older resident rents the ADU for additional income.

Concerns had been raised in Newton that college students would occupy ADUs and cause noise and other problems, but Newton reports this has not happened—most likely because of restrictions on number of occupants and the requirement that one dwelling has to be owner occupied.

Impact on schools and traffic: Interviewees noted that these two concerns arise with any proposed changes in zoning. All nine communities reported that ADUs had minimal or no impact on the number of school-age children or traffic. The main reason for the low impact is the small number of ADUs each town has added. In addition, a community development official who used to work in Burlington described a study there which showed that an increase in the number of apartments did not translate to an increase in school children. Apartments were used by young and older adults, not by families with children. In terms of traffic, several interviewees noted that units are scattered around town, minimizing concentration of traffic in any one area.

Change in appearance of neighborhood: Interviewees noted that the appearance and character of neighborhoods were not changed when an ADU was added. They feel this is because the language in their bylaws requires the ADU fits the style of the house, has its entrance on the side or back, disallows external stairways, etc.

Value of property: Newton is the only community that had actually studied the change in a home's value before and after adding an ADU. They determined there was no change, unless the ADU enlarged the house in which case the value increased. Several other interviewees shared their impressions: Milton thought there was no change in property value; Lexington and Westwood thought the value increased. Westwood noted that realtors consider the potential of adding an ADU to a property to be a selling point

Burden on town officials and boards/ Enforcement issues: None of the interviewees felt the ADU bylaw added to the burden of the building inspector or permitting board; inspection and permitting and the associated costs are treated the same as any other request. Issues that are raised by neighbors when an owner requests an ADU permit include parking, lot lines, obtrusiveness of the new unit, etc. These are typical issues raised when any number of zoning or permitting related requests come before a board, planning officials said, and nearly every request is granted. In several communities, including Westwood, the permitting boards were not opposed to recent efforts to expand the options for ADUs, even though it could result in an increase in their work.

The local officials noted that enforcement and tracking of properties would be significantly more difficult if the bylaw restricted ADUs to family members.

Several towns noted that they reduced problems with ADU requests by working with both the owner and sometimes the neighbors to address all issues ahead of time. Several communities (Carlisle, Newton, Scituate and Sudbury) said their on-line information for homeowners reduced time and stress on all parties. (See Appendix C for resources; Carlisle has a particularly good example.)

Grandfathering illegal units: Bringing illegal units into compliance can be a significant benefit of passing an ADU bylaw. These unpermitted, uninspected units can be hazardous, especially those that lack sufficient means of egress and/or have unsafe cooking facilities. One respondent said that the only time they learn about an illegal unit is when there is a fire.

Lexington reports that when they first passed their bylaw, they offered amnesty and most requests for ADUs were actually to legalize existing units. Scituate and Westwood also encourage people to apply for permits for existing units. Newton reported that before their bylaw was recently liberalized, few people came forward because their units were likely to be out of compliance. They hope to see a change in the coming year.

Accessibility: Three towns, Acton, Lexington and Milton, said ADUs provide an opportunity to encourage the creation of dwellings that are accessible for people with disabilities. This is done by allowing some flexibility in waiving certain zoning requirements when units are made accessible for people with disabilities, in compliance with state standards for accessibility.

Solving the housing problem: No one felt ADUs alone solved their housing problem, but, quoting a Newton report: *Responding to the needs generated by changing demographics and workforce requires multiple strategic actions, as described in the Housing Strategy, and a robust accessory apartment policy is an important part of that.* (City of Newton, Nov. 2016)

Proposing changes to bylaws in 7 of the communities

What: As noted above, seven of the towns interviewed have proposed changes to their ADU bylaws within the last two years to encourage more residents to take advantage of them. Changes that were approved included allowing ADUs: 1) in detached structures; 2) as part of new construction; 3) as-of-right right rather than by special permit; and 4) raising the cap on the numbers allowed. The one change that was not approved (in Milton) was to allow non-family to live in ADUs.

Why: Communities were motivated to act in the recent years for several reasons.

- They had recently completed housing plans that called for more housing for families, people with moderate income, and for workers in the town, and ADUs are one way to begin to address the needs of those constituencies.
- They were responding to an increased emphasis on aging in place.
- Tear downs of smaller homes to make way for large, very expensive ones is accelerating the need to act.

Concerns expressed about changing the Bylaw: For the most part, because these communities already had ADU bylaws in place, public hearings on modifications were not particularly contentious. There was push back on proposals to allow detached units, which in one case (Acton) resulted in the requirement that the unit be in existence for several years before being converted. Two towns reported hearing concerns about changes to the character and appearance of the town if more ADUs were created. This concern was allayed by pointing out the large number of requirements to make the ADU ‘invisible from the street.’

The fact that efforts to expand ADU bylaws were successful in six of the seven towns that have had them in place for a number of years indicates the broad support for the concept in communities that have experience with them.

Recommendations from town officials re: informing the community about an ADU bylaw

The interviewees offered several recommendations to Needham should it decide to begin the process of considering an ADU bylaw.

1. **Engage key partners with related interests:** Early in the process, reach out to groups whose interests will be served by ADUs. The Council on Aging is an essential partner. Other key partners mentioned by towns are housing advocates, environmental groups, the Commission on Disabilities, and the business community. Newton was particularly successful in its partnership with businesses. Retailers had reported that they were not able to get workers who are willing to travel to Newton; ADUs allow workers to live in town. The Newton/Needham Chamber of Commerce was very supportive of the recent successful initiative to liberalize Newton's ADU bylaw.
2. **Engage older adults:** Seek out older adults and their families who have concerns about the affordability and accessibility of housing. Ask them to share their perspectives and participate in public discussions and in community meetings.
3. **Tie the proposed bylaw to demonstrated needs:** Show how the bylaw fits into existing housing plans and how it addresses identified needs of older adults and families in town.
4. **Educate the public:** Distribute accurate information about what the bylaw is, and what it isn't. Clarify that it does not increase development of two-family homes or create crowding. Emphasize that there are strict requirements on *size, ownership, and appearance*. Focus on the fact that in communities with ADUs, most are used to help older and younger adults, and to support families already in town. Since concerns about the appearance of a house with an ADU are often expressed, one town (Westwood) used photos of homes with ADUs as part of their presentation to Town Meeting members. The photos show that ADUs are virtually invisible from the street.
5. **Consider the pros and cons of using a special permit or permitting as-of-right:** Several towns felt that requiring a special permit is more palatable to residents when first considering passage of an ADU bylaw, as it provides more control and oversight. On the other hand, towns with as-of-right permits contend that they reduce burdens on homeowners and permitting boards while still maintaining strict requirements.
6. **Consider the pros and cons of restricting ADUs to family members:** Limiting the ADU to family members may seem like a way to increase the likelihood the bylaw will pass. However, all local officials interviewed cautioned that this bylaw puts much more burden on town boards and officials to verify and enforce compliance. Further, it reduces the value of the bylaw by limiting flexibility for owners. According to a recommendation

in the Massachusetts model bylaw: “Allowing only family members is easiest politically and may limit the overall impact of the units, but it will also limit the use (and reuse) of these units and may result in additional administration costs associated with enforcement. Having no restrictions on accessory dwelling unit tenants gives greater control over the unit to the homeowner while offering more diverse housing opportunities.”
(Massachusetts EEA)

Conclusion: Recommendations for Needham

The experiences of the nine communities described in this report provide compelling evidence that ADUs could contribute to the overall goal of increasing housing options in Needham for older adults, young adults, people with disabilities, and people with moderate incomes. Many interviewees expressed agreement with the views articulated in a recent Newton report: *The benefits of creating such units include providing opportunity for seniors to remain in their homes longer, creating a low-impact form of generally affordable housing, assisting in the preservation of historic homes and accessory structures, and addressing the issue of unsafe illegal accessory apartments.* (City of Newton, Feb 2017)

Using the Massachusetts model bylaw and bylaw language from the nine communities, it is possible to create a bylaw that ensures units will be integrated into existing single family neighborhoods with little or no negative impact on the character of the neighborhood or on town services. The bylaw can be crafted to provide flexibility for current Needham homeowners and minimize the burden on town officials.

Key elements that will support positive outcomes and minimize negative impacts:

- Specific permit types: As-of-right for units within the existing footprint of the main dwelling; special permit for units that are added onto the main dwelling or are detached from it.
- Size and occupant restrictions: Set a maximum square footage for the ADU and a maximum percentage of the main dwelling allowed for the ADU; allow whichever is smaller. Limit number of occupants in ADU.
- Occupants: One unit must be owner occupied. No restrictions on relationship of tenants to owner.
- Appearance: Requirements that the ADU is in keeping with the character of the main dwelling.
- Parking: One space per unit.
- Grandfathering illegal units: Offer amnesty to owners of existing ADUs who apply for a permit and comply with all ADU regulations.

References

City of Newton Department of Planning and Development. Public Hearing Memorandum. (November 10, 2016)

City of Newton Department of Planning and Development. Public Hearing Memorandum. (February 24, 2017)

Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA). Smart Growth/ Smart Energy Toolkit: Model Bylaw for Accessory Dwelling Units. (n.d.)
http://www.mass.gov/envir/smart_growth_toolkit/bylaws/ADU-Bylaw.pdf

Needham Council on Aging and Needham Public Health Division. Assessment of Housing and Transit Options for Needham Seniors. (August 2016)
<http://www.needhamma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/13894>

Appendix A: Demographics of Communities Studied *

Towns	Population	Median household income 2011-2015	Land size Square miles	Housing units	% 65+
Needham	28,961	\$132,237	12.29	11,122	16.3%
Acton	21,924	\$125,635	19.87	8,530	11.0%
Bedford	13,320	\$113,729	13.66	5,368	18.6%
Carlisle	4,852	\$166,111	15.27	1,758	12.9%
Lexington	31,394	\$149,306	16.43	12,019	18.6%
Milton	27,012	\$116,444	13.01	9,700	15.4%
Newton	85,119	\$122,080	17.94	32,648	15.2%
Scituate	18,135	\$102,210	17.63	8,035	17.2%
Sudbury	17,659	\$165,745	24.2	6,221	12.2%
Westwood	14,622	\$135,884	10.88	5,431	18.2%

*=Data from US Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/MA/PST045216>
 All data from 2010, except median household income which is 2011-2015, presented in 2015 dollars

Appendix B: Questions for Interviews with Town/City Officials re: ADUs

1. Brief description of by law

- By right or special permit/ or combination of both?
- Size requirements
- Parking requirements
- Restrictions---owner occupied? relationship to tenant? attached vs detached? transfer on sale of property? Time limit to permit? In certain areas of town only, or anyplace?
- Provisions to grandfather in illegal units?—Do they have to go through special permit process?
- How is it enforced?

2. Adoption process

- What were objections? How were they overcome?
- Recommendation for other towns wanting to pass bylaws?
- Key partners to involve?

3. Modifications to law since originally passed

- What has been changed?
- Why?

4. Impact of the bylaw

- Any unintended consequence?
- # of new units created per year/ change over time?
- # of illegal units grandfathered in
- Any data on who is using ADUs? (eg, relatives, caretakers, students, etc)
- Increase in school age population due to ADUs?
- Increase in traffic due to ADUs?
- Increase in transient population? How defined?
- Any information on impact on older adults due to ADUs? ie, report they are able to stay in the community?
- Any issues with enforcement?
- Types of complaints received?
- Any moves to eliminate bylaw?
- Evidence that adding an ADU changes value of home and therefore property tax?
- Any additional burden on town departments?
- Recommendation to other towns on ways to maximize benefits of ADUs and minimize problems—both for the town in general and for owners/tenants?

Appendix C: Contacts Interviewed and Materials Collected

Acton

<http://www.acton-ma.gov/164/Planning>

Robert Hummels, Assistant Planner

Bylaw: <http://www.acton-ma.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/659>

Bedford

<http://www.bedfordma.gov/planning>

Tony Fields, Planning Director

Bylaw in packet for homeowners:

http://www.bedfordma.gov/sites/bedfordma/files/file/file/code-accessory-apartment_0.pdf

Carlisle

http://www.carlislema.gov/Pages/CarlisleMA_Planning/index

George Mansfield, Planning Administrator

Document for residents:

http://www.carlislema.gov/Pages/CarlisleMA_Planning/AAA%20RR%201-26-09.pdf

Draft bylaw (subsequently passed in May 2017)

http://www.carlislema.gov/Pages/CarlisleMA_PBNA/0592862C-000F8513

Lexington

<http://www.lexingtonma.gov/planning-office>

David Fields, Planner

Background on 2016 proposal to update bylaw and text of bylaw which subsequently passed

http://www.lexingtonma.gov/sites/lexingtonma/files/pages/art_40_-_accessory_apartments_report_03-18-2016.pdf

Milton

<http://www.townofmilton.org/planning-and-community-development>

William Clark, Director of Planning & Community Development

Proposed update: http://www.townofmilton.org/sites/miltonma/files/uploads/pb_article-accessory_dwelling_unit_080415.pdf

Newton

<http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/default.asp>

James Freas, Deputy Director, Office of Planning and Development

Bylaw: <http://www.newtonma.gov/civicax/filebank/documents/82048>

FAQs: <http://www.newtonma.gov/civicax/filebank/documents/81178>

Scituate

Laura Harbottle Town Planner

Q & A for homeowners: <http://www.scituatema.gov/planning-board/faq/how-do-i-add-an-accessory-dwelling-in-law-to-my-house>

Bylaw (p 54): http://www.scituatema.gov/sites/scituatema/files/pages/15-11-02_zoning_bylaw_as_amended_for_web_printing.pdf

Sudbury

<https://sudbury.ma.us/pcd/>

Meagen Donoghue Director of Planning and Mark Herweck, Building Inspector

Bylaw (p 93): [https://sudbury.ma.us/clerk/wp-](https://sudbury.ma.us/clerk/wp-content/uploads/sites/270/2014/08/SUDBURYZONINGBYLAW2014Completeforprintingandposting.pdf)

[content/uploads/sites/270/2014/08/SUDBURYZONINGBYLAW2014Completeforprintingandposting.pdf](https://sudbury.ma.us/clerk/wp-content/uploads/sites/270/2014/08/SUDBURYZONINGBYLAW2014Completeforprintingandposting.pdf)

Information for residents: <https://sudbury.ma.us/boardofappeals/accessory-dwelling-guidelines/>

Housing production plan, includes ADUs: <file:///C:/Users/Chris/Downloads/Sudbury-HPP-2016-FINAL-4.21.2016.pdf>

Westwood

<http://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/gov/depts/commdevdepts/plandiv/default.htm>

Abigail McCabe, Town Planner and Sarah Bouchard, Housing and Zoning Agent

Bylaw (8-21): [http://westwood-](http://westwood-prod.civica.granicusops.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=28617)

[prod.civica.granicusops.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=28617](http://westwood-prod.civica.granicusops.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=28617)

Appendix D: Key Requirements in the ADU Bylaws

Town	Year passed	Year updated	Type of unit / actions allowed after update *	Detached allowed?	Permit: By Right (BR) or Special Permit (SP)	Max size: Square feet/ Percent of main dwelling/ # bedrooms	# Parking spaces for ADU	Miscellaneous
Acton	DK	2016	Detached units/ Existing footprint can be expanded	Yes: in 1950-2010 bldg	Int: BR Det: SP	Int: 800sf/ 50% of main/ 2 bed Det: 2000sf/ 3 bed	1	1 st floor of ADU must be accessible
Bedford	1997	==		No	BR	30% of main	2	
Carlisle	1989	2017	Detached units	Yes; # limited	SP	1200sf/ 35% of main	# Not specified	Total permits allowed: 75
Lexington	1983	2016	Detached units/ ADU in new construction	Yes	Int in existing footprint: BR Int in expanded footprint & Det: SP	Basic int:1000sf/ 2 bed Expanded int: 40% of main Det: 1000sf	1	Owner can be away for 2 years
Milton	DK	2015 failed	Non family occupants	Yes	Int in existing footprint: BR Int in expanded & Det: SP	800 sf/ 2 bed/ ≤ 3 occupants	1	Occupants must be family or employed SP good for 5 years; then must reapply
Newton	1987	2017	Internal unit: By Right/ ADU on any size lot	Yes	Int: BR Det: SP	Int: 1000sf/ 33% of main Det:1200sf/40% of main	0	Total occupants in ADU and main: no more than would be allowed in main house alone
Scituate	1989	2015	Detached/ ADU in new construction	Yes	SP	750 sf/ 40% of main	2	Encouraged in business district
Sudbury	2009	--		Yes: in bldg. at least 5 yo	SP	Int: 800sf/ 30% of main Det: 850sf/ ≤4 occupants	1	No more than 5% of town's dwellings can have ADU Must recertify every 4 years
Westwood	1992	2017	Increased cap on total #	Yes	SP	900sf	1	No more than 2% of town's dwellings can have ADU Must recertify every 4 years

*=Type of Unit: Detached (Det) Separate building on property of main dwelling Internal (Int) Part of the main dwelling