Multi-Family Homes in the Single-Family Zone.

Public Input Summary Report

Currently, there are approximately 50 properties with 3 or more units in the single-family zone of Capitola. In 1994, Ordinance 764 was adopted to require that multifamily properties in a single-family zone apply for an extension from the City Council to continue as a multi-family. The deadline for an extension is June 26, 2019 or fifty years from the date the activity first became nonconforming, whichever is later.

The City of Capitola conducted a survey and public workshop collecting feedback on multifamily structures with 3 or more units that are located in single-family zones. The purpose of the survey and workshop was to gauge the impacts multi-family homes have on single-family neighborhoods and understand how residents would like the city to regulate the existing multi-family homes into the future. The following report includes results and responses from the survey and public workshop.

The report is organized into 3 sections. Shown first are the overall survey results of all respondents. Next are the filtered results of each neighborhood. Each neighborhood section includes public comments as collected during the workshop. Lastly, survey results were filtered to compare responses of owners of multifamily homes versus owners/occupants of single family and duplex homes.

In summary, the survey and public outreach identified that areas with a high concentration of multi-family homes have more prevalent negative impacts and the need to address the impacts is greater. The neighborhood north of Capitola Road along 47th Avenue and 48th Avenue has the highest concentration of multi-family homes followed by the Depot Hill neighborhood. The majority of participants from these two neighborhoods supported modifying the code to become stricter with support to require decreases in density or remove the allowed extension all together. In neighborhoods where there are fewer multi-family homes, the residents expressed more support for the multi-family homes to remain with less oversight. The Jewel Box neighborhood and the Riverview to Monterey neighborhood fit within this category. The majority of respondents from these neighborhoods expressed support to allow the multi-families to continue without the required extension.
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Survey Results: All Respondents

Survey Question: What best describes the influence multi-family homes have on your neighborhoods?

- Positive: 19
- Mix: 21
- Negative: 25
- None: 8

Survey Question: In order of importance, please select the influences multi-family properties have on your neighborhood.

- Affordability: 16
- Diversity: 19
- Year Round Residents: 6
- 2nd Home: 3
- Noise: 1
- EnvImpct: 1
- None: 7
How would you suggest the City of Capitola treat existing multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Survey Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Keep the current code requirement</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Remove the required extension and allow multi-family uses to continue indefinitely provided they do no increase in size of number of units.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Add to the existing requirement that the City Council may require the removal of units to address issues that cannot be addressed due to limited space on the site, such as adequate parking</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Re-zone areas with high concentrations of structures with 3+ units from Single-Family Zoning to Multi-Family Zoning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. All multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods should discontinue by 2019 and the extension process should be removed from the code</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Comments/ Suggestions:
- See individual neighborhood results.
View of non-conforming properties in Depot Hill

Breakdown of Survey Participants that Live or Own Property in Depot Hill

12 Own and occupy a single family home
1 Own a duplex; do not occupy
1 Own & occupy a duplex
2 Own a multi-family home; do not occupy
1 Other:
  • Owner of a duplex home--rent one unit to a single and use other unit for personal vacation about a month/year

Survey Question: What best describes the influence multi-family homes have on your neighborhood?

Neighborhood Influence

- None - 2
- Positive - 2
- Mix - 6
- Negative - 7
Depot Hill

Survey Question: In order of importance, please select the influences multi-family properties have on your neighborhood.

Positive Influences

- Diversity: 6
- 2nd Home: 1
- Year Round Residents: 1
- Affordability: 2
- None: 2

Public Workshop Results
- No comments

Negative Influences

- None: 2
- Parking: 3
- Higher Density: 3
- Overcrowded: 5
- Poor Landscaping Maintenance: 1

Public Workshop Results
- Parking

The City is currently updating the zoning code and would like feedback on this regulation. How would you suggest the City of Capitola treat existing multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Workshop Results</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Keep the current Code</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Removed the required extension and allow multi-family uses to continue indefinitely provided they do not increase in size of number units</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Add to the existing requirement that the City Council may require the removal of units to address issues that cannot be addressed due to limited space on the site such as adequate onsite parking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Rezone areas with high concentrations of structured with 3+ units from single-family zoning to multi-family zoning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. All Multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods should discontinue by 2019 and the extension process should be removed from the code</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Depot Hill**

**Other Comments/Suggestions:**
- Multifamily units should be defined by rent collected
- Provide minimum required on-site parking
- Two units okay
- Better define separate units ($ exchanged)
- Public hearing good
- For the most part Depot Hill is charming and I would leave it as it is.
- Please get rid of the Monarch Cove Inn and let it become a true monarch Sanctuary

**Map Notes:**
- 100 Oakland Avenue - Multi-family –remodeling
- 112 Oakland Avenue - Single Family house (Note: Staff researched this property and there is a single family home on 112 Oakland and a duplex on 405 El Salto that are located on one parcel. This parcel has 3 units total.)
- 101 Grand Avenue - has an extension
View of non-confirming properties in the Riverview to Monterey neighborhood

Breakdown of Survey Participants that Live or Own Property in Riverview to Monterey

10 Own and occupy a single-family home in Capitola
1 Own a duplex home in Capitola
1 Owner and occupier of a multi-family home (3+ units) in Capitola
3 Other:
  - Three year renter and currently under contract to purchase
  - Owner of a duplex in City of Capitola

Survey Question: What best describes the influence multi-family homes have on your neighborhood?

Neighborhood Influence

- Positive: 12
- Negative: 3
- Mix: 4
- None: 0

- Owner/Occupier of a single family home in Capitola and owner of a duplex home in Capitola (do not occupy)
Riverview to Monterey

Survey Question: In order of importance, please select the influences multi-family properties have on your neighborhood.

**Positive Influences**

- Year Round Residents - 3
- Diversity - 6
- Affordability - 9

**Public Workshop Results:**

- 407, 409, 411 built with style and character. Estate of Jean Palmer. Beautifully maintains – owner occupied one unit as a vacation getaway and is home once a week. Rose’s hydrangeas gardens are delights.
- I do not see this as a big problem. Tweak the details a bit and that is it
- The units that are non-conforming in this region are well-kept and not a major issue
- I see no problems in this neighborhood.

**Negative Influences**

- None - 2
- Parking - 4
- Overcrowded - 1
- Poor Building Maintenance - 1
- Poor Landscaping Maintenance - 1
- 2nd Home - 1
- Higher Density - 1
- Pets - 1
- Noise - 1
- None - 2

**Public Workshop Results:**

- Parking due to small lots and large number of dwelling units
Riverview to Monterey

The City is currently updating the zoning code and would like feedback on this regulation. How would you suggest the City of Capitola treat existing multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Workshop Results</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Keep the current Code</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Removed the required extension and allow multi-family uses to continue indefinitely provided they do not increase in size of number units</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Add to the existing requirement that the City Council may require the removal of units to address issues that cannot be addressed due to limited space on the site such as adequate onsite parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Rezone areas with high concentrations of structured with 3+ units from single-family zoning to multi-family zoning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. All Multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods should discontinue by 2019 and the extension process should be removed from the code</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Comments/ Suggestions:
- I think each property/parcel should be addressed individually as to the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. In 20 yrs, my home could be considered as a historical landmark and would maintain the beauty of our small wonderful city.
- Keep the current code, but change the last sentence to, "Extensions granted are for a minimum of 10 years."

Map Notes:
- 407 Oak and 411 Oak - Lot split 2006 – created monster house in back with no yard zero lot line and looms over 407-409-411 Beverly
North of Capitola Road

View of the non-conforming properties North of Capitola Road

Breakdown of Survey Participants that Live or Own Property in North of Capitola Road
11 Own and occupy a single-family home in Capitola
1 Rent a single-family home in Capitola
1 Own and Occupy a duplex home
3 Own a multi-family home; do not occupy
2 Other:
   • Owner with tenants
   • Owner(non full time occupier) of single family home

Survey Question: What best describes the influence multi-family homes have on your neighborhood?

Neighborhood Influence

- Positive - 19
- Mix - 21
- Negative - 25
- None - 8
Survey Question: In order of importance, please select the influences multi-family properties have on your neighborhood.

Positive Influences
- Diversity - 5
- Affordability - 4
- Noise - 1
- None - 2

Public Workshop Results:
- May allow for more affordable housing
- Adds diversity to neighborhood
- Adds diversity to schools
- Diversity is good
- Affordable housing is good
- We need more low income housing in Capitola for seniors, students, working families, and people with disabilities

Negative Influences
- Parking - 7
- Trash - 2
- None - 2
- Safety - 1
- Poor Building Maintenance - 3
- Overcrowded - 1

Public Workshop Results:
- Over stuffed with parking especially as compared to parking requirements for single family homes
- And as a result of above, frequent noise from rearranging the cars
- Parking under carports is single file, with one car parked behind another and often hang out into street
- Carport design with parking as described above negates the possibility of a viable sidewalk
- Apartments seem shoddily built and their designs wouldn’t pass muster by current standard
- Apartments, with some exception, aren’t maintained to the standards most of the other homes on the street North of Capitola Road
North of Capitola Road

Negative Influences: Public Workshop Results Cont.

- Patio decks above the carports are noisy and impede privacy on homes across the street
- Carports are loud echo chambers affecting the houses across the street
- Carports are often used for storage in an unsightly way
- Garbage cans and dumpsters are a constant blight and pest buffet table
- The fourplex on 47th & 48th Ave are health hazards in every single sense of the world. Holes in drive, trash spilled everywhere, over occupied, run-down construction, etc. They are dangerous
- *yes people are walking sitting, sun bathing on the flimsy carport roofs (not on patio deck).
- When two or more non-conforming multi-family units are located next to each other (ie 1710, 1720, 1730 48th Ave.) then the compound effects are multiplied exponentially. Three units (two fourplexes and one 3 three plex) equals 20 plus car

The City is currently updating the zoning code and would like feedback on this regulation. How would you suggest the City of Capitola treat existing multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Workshop Results</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Keep the current Code</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Removed the required extension and allow multi-family uses to continue indefinitely provided they do not increase in size of number units</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Add to the existing requirement that the City Council may require the removal of units to address issues that cannot be addressed due to limited space on the site such as adequate onsite parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Rezone areas with high concentrations of structured with 3+ units from single-family zoning to multi-family zoning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. All Multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods should discontinue by 2019 and the extension process should b removed from the code</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North of Capitola Road

Other Comments/ Suggestions:

- Use this opportunity to compel owners of building to upgrade building to more attractive state. Better landscaping, removal of carports, and over carport decks. Add sidewalks, improve facades and repave driveways

- By adding sidewalks (which would impinge on street) can we begin to improve the street: i.e. traffic control to stop people “cutting through” especially on 47th & 48th at excessive rates of speed?

- The existing zoning code makes getting a 30 year loan questionable

- Convert from 4 plex to duplex?

- Consider an extension only if the owner of the Property lives in one of the units *Oh, I don’t agree with that”

Map Notes:

- 1720 48th - Cluster of three non-conforming units = terrible parking & trash issues. Crime and parking is a major issue with four plexes having 8-10 plus cars each.

- 1720 48th - Dead non-running cars in the carports are triple parked forcing additional cars to park in street and take all available parking

- 1710 48th - Easement/ alley is full of cars blocking access, yet the two car garage is full of storage and not park-able

- 1725 47th - This is actually a nice implementation. Landscaped in front, parking hidden, one story on interior, they fit the character of the neighborhood.

- 1795 47th - Two of these units (south two units) have been upgraded. Their rents are relatively high, and they are a bit nicer, but the same parking issues persist

- 1780 47th Ave - A bad parking problem offender, plus generally low level of maintenance like crumbling asphalt in drive way

- 1745 47th - No backyard, no front yard, no decks, residents are forced to hang out in the driveway

- 1795 47th, 1725 47th - Design makes a huge difference. Lack of carports almost seems like a defining difference

- 1795 47th & 1730 48th Ave - having three of these in a row anywhere is blight on any SFR neighborhood

- 1730 – 48th Ave - When two or more non-conforming multi-family units are located next to each other (i.e. 1710, 1720, 1730 48th Ave.) then the compound effects are multiplied exponentially. Three units (two four plexes and one 3 three plex) equals 20 plus cars.
Jewel Box

Breakdown of Survey Participants that Live or Own Property in Jewel Box

11 – Own and occupy a single-family home in Capitola
3 – Own and occupy a duplex home
1 – Own a duplex home; do not occupy
3 – Own and occupy a multi-family home (3+units)
3 – Other:
  - Vacation single-family home owner
  - Owner and summer occupier of a single family home
  - Owner of a retirement condo currently being rented

Survey Question: What best describes the influence multi-family home have on your neighborhood?

Neighborhood Influence

- Positive - 3
- None - 5
- Negative - 5
- Mix - 7
Jewel Box

Survey Question: In order of importance, please select the influences multi-family properties have on your neighborhood.

Positive Influences

- Diversity - 3
- Year Round Residents - 2
- 2nd Home - 2
- Affordability - 1
- Env Impct - 1
- None - 3

Public Workshop Results:
- Slows gentrification/ allows diversification. Critical student housing provided

Negative Influences

- Parking - 5
- Poor Building Maintenance - 3
- Overcrowded - 2
- Higher Density - 1
- None - 3
- Poor Landscaping Maintenance - 1

Public Workshop Results:
- None
Jewel Box

The City is currently updating the zoning code and would like feedback on this regulation. How would you suggest the City of Capitola treat existing multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Workshop Results</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Keep the current Code</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Removed the required extension and allow multi-family uses to</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continue indefinitely provided they do not increase in size of number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Add to the existing requirement that the City Council may require</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the removal of units to address issues that cannot be addressed due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited space on the site such as adequate onsite parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Rezone areas with high concentrations of structured with 3+ units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from single-family zoning to multi-family zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. All Multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods should</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discontinue by 2019 and the extension process should b removed from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Comments/ Suggestions:
- Each neighborhood is different. Need to take a neighborhood approach to the issue
- This area has a sparse number of multi-family units with a low impact on parking for example
- I think this neighborhood is fine as is
- There are properties with a single family and a duplex on them. Same tax parcel. These properties were originally two but combined (likely for taxes). These properties should be handled differently.
- The appearance is that of a single family residence alongside a duplex each on a lot the size of all the other 40’x80’ lots in the neighborhood.

Map Notes:
- 4820 Cliff Drive - Rezone multi-family (2 buildings)
- 4800 Cliff Drive - As above
- 4605 Opal Street - Keeps single family character single family and duplex on double lot.
Owner &/or Occupants of a Multi-Family Home (3+ units) VS Owner &/or Occupants of a Single-Family Homes or Duplex Homes

Breakdown of Survey Participants that Live in or Own a Multi-family Home
4 – Own and occupy a multi-family home
8 – Own a multi-family home; do not occupy

Which neighborhood do you live/own property in?
3 – Jewel Box
3 – Riverview Terrace
3 – 41st/West Capitola
1 – Cliffwood Heights
2 – Depot Hill

Breakdown of Survey Participants that Live in or Own a Single-Family Home or Duplex Home
45 – Own and occupy a single-family home
1 – Rent a single Family Home
5 – Own & occupy a duplex home
4 – Own a duplex Home; do not occupy
10 – Other

What neighborhood do you live/own property in?
15 – Depot Hill
7 – Cliffwood Heights
2 – Upper Village
6 – Riverview Terrace
15 – 41st/West Capitola
18 – Jewel Box
Survey Question: What best describes the influence multi-family homes have on your neighborhoods?
Survey Question: Select the most important positive influence multi-family properties have on your neighborhood.
Owner &/or Occupants of a Multi-Family Home (3+ units) vs Owner &/or Occupants of a Single-Family Homes or Duplex Homes

Survey Question: Select the most important negative influence multi-family properties have on your neighborhood

Negative Influences

None - 7
Parking - 1
Noise - 1

Negative Influences

None - 13
Parking - 18
Trash - 2
2nd Home - 1
Higher Density - 5
Overcrowded - 9
Poor Building Maintenance - 7
Poor Landscaping Maintenance - 3
Pets - 1
Safety - 1
The City is currently updating the zoning code and would like feedback on this regulation. How would you suggest the City of Capitola treat existing multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Owner/Occupant of Multi-family Home</th>
<th>Owner/Occupant of single family home or duplex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Keep the current Code</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Removed the required extension and allow multi-family uses to continue indefinitely provided they do not increase in size of number units</td>
<td>10 (91%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Add to the existing requirement that the City Council may require the removal of units to address issues that cannot be addressed due to limited space on the site such as adequate onsite parking</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Rezone areas with high concentrations of structured with 3+ units from single-family zoning to multi-family zoning</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. All Multi-family uses in single family neighborhoods should discontinue by 2019 and the extension process should be removed from the code</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>22 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>