

# Residential Infill Project – Worksheet for PSC Work Session on June 7, 2018

## Scale of Houses

PROPOSAL	POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS IDENTIFIED BY PSC	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PSC
<p><b>1. Limit the size of houses (R7, R5, and R2.5 zones).</b></p>		
<p>1.1 Establish a limit on house size by zone that is proportional to lot size using a floor area ratio (FAR) calculation.</p>	<p><u>Issue 1: WHAT size for a single house?</u></p> <p><b>Option 1 – No change – retain current code</b> Apply existing height and building coverage limits (BIG HOUSE – e.g. 6,750 sf house in R5 on 5k sf lot)</p> <p><b>Option 2 – Staff proposal – reduce house size</b> Reduce house size based on zone and lot size (SMALLER HOUSE – e.g. 2,500 sf house in R5 on 5k sf lot)</p> <p><b>Option 3 – Reduce house sizes even more</b> Amend proposal. Reduce house size even smaller than staff’s proposal (EVEN SMALLER HOUSE – e.g. 2,000 sf house in R5 on 5k sf lot)</p> <p><b>Option 4 – Reduce house sizes, but not as much as staff proposed</b> Amend proposal. Reduce house size from current code, but not as small as staff proposed (MEDIUM HOUSE – e.g. 3,500 sf house)</p> <p><b>Option 5 – Reduce house sizes, but vary by some measure on neighborhood context</b></p> <p><u>Issue 2: WHAT size for a building with more than one unit?</u></p> <p><b>Option 5 – Staff proposal (same FAR for site, regardless of units).</b> One size box, regardless of number of units.</p> <p><b>Option 6 – Increase the allowed size of the structure as the number of units increases</b> Provide a small increase with additional units. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R5 -- House (.5), house with ADU (.5), duplex (.6), triplex (.7).</li> <li>• R5 -- House (.4), house with ADU (.4), duplex (.5), triplex (.6).</li> </ul>	<p><u>Issue 1: WHAT size for a single house?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the proposed maximum allowable size of a single-family house - .5 FAR or 2,500 square feet - be increased to something closer to what is currently allowed? And should further increases in size be allowed for each additional housing unit? (Bachrach)</li> <li>• The proposal does decent job of addressing policies regarding the neighborhood context. If we retain the FAR concept, then I am concerned that the proposal does not have the limits set correctly (too low)</li> <li>• I am intrigued by the testimony to consider scale by the neighborhood context, but understand this would most likely add to much complexity. (Schultz)</li> <li>• I am wondering about the comments that 2500 sf is huge in some neighborhoods and not unusual in others and would like to go back to how the RIP came up with 2500 sf. (Rudd)</li> <li>• I am having trouble understanding how what appears to be minor FAR adjustments/incentives can have the significant negative impacts or are insufficient to incent achieving RIP objectives. (Houck)</li> <li>• Limiting House Size – I am generally in favor of supporting limitations on house size to decrease the economic incentive for demolitions (as noted in Seattle’s analysis of their code as well as the Johnson economic report). While I am not opposed to property owners choosing to demolish and rebuild homes, I want to see the creation of ADU’s incentivized and believe that maintaining existing homes and adding ADU’s as a way to increase value should be encouraged over the production of “McMansions.” That being said, the reductions in allowable size seem very great on paper even if most homes are not built to the maximum allowed. Can more information be provided as to how many bedrooms are typically in homes of the proposed code maximums? (R7-2,800, R5-2,500 and R2.5-1,250) For example in the multi-family world we would find 2-3 bedroom in 1,250 but I suspect that it is different in the single-family world. I am somewhat inclined to propose an increase to: R7-3,000, R5-2.7500 and R2.5 to 1,500 but would need to understand if that would result in an increase in bedrooms or just larger living areas and how it would affect the potential size of a DADU. (Schultz)</li> </ul> <p><u>Issue 2: WHAT size for a building with more than one unit?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide more allowable buildable area for each housing type (ADU, SF, duplex, triplex etc.) (Bortolazzo)</li> </ul>

## Residential Infill Project – Worksheet for PSC Work Session on June 7, 2018

	<p>Issue 3: <u>HOW to measure the size of buildings?</u></p> <p><b>Option 7 – Staff proposal (FAR).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use floor area ratio based on zone (e.g. R5 5,000 s.f. lot @ .5 FAR = 2,500 sf house)</li> <li>• Allow existing houses to add small (250 sf) additions w/o meeting FAR</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 8 – No FAR. Use building coverage and height limits.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calibrate building coverage limits to height. (e.g. single-story house has greater building coverage, two-story house has less building coverage)</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 9 – No FAR. Combination of building coverage, height, size of street-facing façade and building depth.</b></p> <p><b>Option 10 – Apply FAR limits to new construction. Apply other limits to existing houses.</b></p>	<p>Issue 3: <u>HOW to measure the size of buildings?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider necessity of introducing FAR. Consider using setbacks/height/coverage instead of FAR. (Bortolazzo)</li> <li>• I'm also concerned that BDS has concerns about their ability to enforce the FAR-driven approach. (Smith)</li> <li>• Should the size of the building be controlled through existing regulations - primarily height, as recommended by the Bureau of Development Services (BDS) - or through the new FAR standards proposed in the current draft? (Bachrach)</li> <li>• The introduction of FAR to regulate house size is one of the chief concerns raised in the BDS memo. BDS contends that "measuring floor area ratio for all single dwelling zone proposals would be difficult to implement consistently and overly burdensome for applicants. We feel that changing the reference point for measuring height to lowest grade and reducing the height limit to 25 feet would accomplish the same objectives using existing tools. The building coverage standard already controls for bulk in a way that is calibrated more closely to lot size." (Bachrach)</li> <li>• Is using FAR too complicated for the average home owner to navigate and is this a conflict with the goal "provide clear rules for development" and is this an unintended tilt of the process towards professional development vs homeowners. (St. Martin)</li> <li>• I am not convinced that FAR is the correct vehicle for limiting homes to an appropriate size – I still need to read the appendix on this – but in general it seems like the concept could be greatly simplified through height and lot coverage. (Shultz)</li> <li>• Regulating by FAR. It's a bit surprising to me to read of BDS's concern about regulating by FAR this late in the process. Clearly, doing so adds to permit review complexity. We learned during the RIP SAC process of other cities that regulate single family zones by FAR, and I've been assuming (mistakenly?) that BPS worked this out with BDS long ago – before baking FAR so deeply into the RIP (and, for that matter, Better Housing By Design) framework. If this is still an open topic, we should discuss it. (Spevak)</li> <li>• FAR – I talked with an architect that only does single family homes and am now more convinced that we are adding unnecessary complexity with FAR and not sure what it is gaining us. Using FAR as a calculation will require home owners to provide building sections to prove out their calculations whenever they are going to add to or alter their house – which means that they will be required to provide drawing for the existing house verses just drawing a site plan with a footprint. This is complex and money that is not well spent for modifying an existing house. Per the information that staff provide, FAR was introduced to "prevent disproportionately large buildings, while retaining flexibility – I believe it is possible to use, building coverage, open space requirements, height, stories and setbacks to achieve the same end. Encouraging two-story buildings is also stated as a goal, but that goes against accessibility and while it may encourage more open space on a lot, I think the possibility of adding a DADU negates the aim. I understand that it is also a method to offer incentives for DADUs but believe that can likely be addressed with a building coverage incentive. (Shultz)</li> </ul>
--	---	--

## Residential Infill Project – Worksheet for PSC Work Session on June 7, 2018

<p>1.2 Exclude attics and basements from house size limits.</p>	<p><b>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Bortolazzo):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Exclude wall thickness beyond 6" towards FAR calculation.</b> [change from current practice of measuring to exterior of walls]</li> <li><b>Exclude sloped attic space below 8' towards FAR calculation.</b> [change from staff proposed 6'8" height]</li> <li><b>Exclude basement up to 2'-6" above average ground towards FAR calculation.</b> [change from staff proposed 50% of combined wall area below ground]</li> </ol>	
<p>1.3 Allow an additional .15 FAR for detached accessory structures (e.g. garages, sheds and accessory dwelling units).</p>	<p><b>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Spevak):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Allow FAR to be floated between the main house and detached accessory structures.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply a separate FAR cap on the primary house (to ensure it doesn't get too large).</li> <li>Rely on existing regulations for living area, height and lot coverage to ensure detached accessory structures don't get too large.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>[change from staff proposal for separate FAR limits for primary structures and accessory structures. Amendment would allow FAR to be combined and distributed for primary and accessory structures]</p>	

PROPOSAL	POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS IDENTIFIED BY PSC	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PSC
<p><b>2. Revise how height is measured (all zones).</b></p>		
<p>2.1 Measure height from the <i>lowest</i> point near the house, not the <i>highest</i> point.</p>	<p><b>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Bortolazzo):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Calculate building height by averaging high/low point. (Bortolazzo)</b> [change from current practice of measuring from highest grade, and change from staff proposed method to measure from lowest grade]</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height – I support the proposed language. When I first read the proposed language, my gut was that it was incentivizing flat roofs, so that is a concern. It seems to me if you added a limit to stories (excluding basements) you should be able to avoid incentivizing flat roofs. (Schultz)</li> </ul>
<p>2.2 Clarify that small dormers are excluded from the height measurement.</p>		
<p>2.3 Continue to allow 2½ story houses (30 feet high) on standard lots.</p>		

## Residential Infill Project – Worksheet for PSC Work Session on June 7, 2018

PROPOSAL	POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS IDENTIFIED BY PSC	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PSC
<b>3. Improve front setbacks to better reflect those of adjacent houses.</b>		
3.1 Increase front setbacks from 10 feet to 15 feet in the R5 zone.	<b>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Houck):</b> <b>1. Maintain the existing 10 ft setback in R5 zone, do not increase to 15 ft.</b> [retain current code, reject staff proposed setback increase]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain the existing 10-ft setback in R5 zone, do not increase to 15 ft. This will give additional flexibility to retain and protect existing trees in front, side or back yards as needed. Do not force the owner or developer to get a front setback adjustment to gain flexibility to protect trees. That will be a significant disincentive to tree protection. The objective of this amendment is to maximize flexibility with regard to tree protection which should outweigh which seems to seek consistency for aesthetic reasons which should not trump tree preservation. The city has a goal of INCREASING tree canopy to 33% or more city wide and the RIP has the potential to go in the opposite direction. (Houck)</li> <li>Front Setbacks – I do not support increasing the front setback to 15 feet. If a majority does, then I do support averaging with neighbors even though I feel this adds complexity. (Schultz)</li> </ul>
3.2 - Allow a front setback reduction to align with the house next door in R7, R5 and R2.5 zones.		

PROPOSAL	POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS IDENTIFIED BY PSC	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PSC
<b>4. Improve building design (R10, R7, R5 and R2.5 zones).</b>	<b>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Spevak):</b> <b>1. Delete covered entry requirements for all housing types</b> (p. 45 - 33.110.235.C.1.b. & 33.110.235.C.2). [reject staff proposed min. 2'x4' covered entry requirement for main entrances] <b>2. Delete requirements that main entry doors on corner duplexes face different streets</b> (p. 93 - 33.110.270.E.5.a, p. 145 – 33.405.040.C) [change current code to remove requirement that corner lot duplex entrances face separate streets]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does zoning need to regulate roof coverings of entry doors? I'm not convinced this is a problem in need of regulation. The market typically builds covered porch roofs even without zoning requiring it. And it's not all that essential anyway. For instance, I and others have lived in plenty of lovely 1930's courtyard apts with roof coverings smaller than what's proposed in this code update – that are just fine. (Spevak)</li> <li>Some of the provisions in the proposal seem more like design guidelines – e.g. the front porch requirement. Was there consideration of having neighborhoods identify the design elements that make the most sense for their neighborhoods instead of making blanket requirements? (Schultz)</li> <li>Although it's sometimes nice to have [duplex] entries face different streets and the market will probably usually build this way, there's no compelling reason to require it. If someone has reason to put two doors on a corner duplex facing the same street, why not let them? Note also that mid-block duplexes in the "a" overlay zone would, I believe, be allowed to have 2 doors facing the same street. So not allowing this for corner duplexes seems strange. (Spevak)</li> </ul>
4.1 Limit how high the front door can be above the ground.	<b>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Schultz):</b> <b>1. Exempt houses in the floodplain from this standard OR required houses in the floodplain to have their front door no more than 4' above flood level (instead of grade).</b> [nuance to staff's proposal]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building Design – while I support the concept for limiting the height of the front door, an exception for homes in areas that are prone to flooding needs to be added. So I would propose an amendment that either fully exempts homes in the flood plain to have an exemption or to be limited to 4' above flood level. I would look to staff to advise on whether this would be for major flood events (100 year floods) or minor events. (Schultz)</li> </ul>
4.2 Allow eaves to project up to 2 feet into setbacks.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building Design – eave extensions – I support, but request that staff confirm this does not conflict with building codes for fire separation if it hasn't been confirmed already. (Schultz)</li> </ul>
4.3 – On a lot abutting an alley, require access from the alley	<b>See parking proposals, at end of worksheet.</b>	

## Residential Infill Project – Worksheet for PSC Work Session on June 7, 2018

PROPOSAL	POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS IDENTIFIED BY PSC	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PSC
<p><b>Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)</b></p> <p><u>Current rules:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ADUs are accessory to a house or attached house</li> <li>▪ Maximum 800 sf of living area or 75% the living area of the house, whichever is less</li> <li>▪ Detached ADUs are treated the same as other detached accessory structures (for height, setback, building coverage).</li> </ul> <p><u>Staff proposal affecting ADU scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All the above, plus:</li> <li>▪ Exempt basements in older houses that are converted to ADUs from ADU size limit (800 sf/75%)</li> <li>▪ FAR limit on detached accessory structure limits the size of detached ADUs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Spevak):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Delete proposed additional height limit of 4' more than height of primary dwelling for ADUs (but preserve universal ADU height cap of 20')</b> [Reject staff proposed additional height limit on detached accessory structures. Staff's proposal is intended to prevent accessory structures that are significantly taller than the primary structure. A 20' max height would still apply.]</li> <li><b>2. Allow any combination of internal and detached ADUs, so long as they comply with FAR caps and other base zone regulations.</b> [This is currently only proposed as an incentive for historic resources]</li> <li><b>3. Delete requirement that internal ADUs can only have one door facing the street</b> [Change current code to remove requirement that ADU doors cannot be on same façade as house main entrance]</li> <li><b>4. Allow basement ADUs to match size of entire floor in all zones, not just within the "a" overlay</b> [No change to proposal. This is already proposed, see Vol.2, pg.119 33.205.040.C.3.]</li> <li><b>5. Revise definition of "Accessory Dwelling Unit" to change language stating that they are 'always smaller' than primary unit to 'generally smaller', since they can be equal to the size of the main house if it's a 1-story house with an ADU basement.</b> [Modify current code definition, for accuracy]</li> </ol> <p><b>PROPOSED AMENDMENT (Bortolazzo):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>6. Limit [detached] ADU area to 800 sf, no FAR.</b> [Reject staff proposed FAR limit for detached accessory structures and allow at least 800 sf for ADUs.]</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Let's keep it simple, particularly for home-owner driven redevelopment. Making ADUs more complex or restricted is not a good thing. (Smith)</li> <li>• Also, numerous parties testified that the proposed changes to ADU standards are counterproductive. The program has been well-accepted and well-used. The city should be extremely cautious about imposing new or modified regulatory requirements on ADUs through the RIP process. (Bachrach)</li> <li>• Ways to continue supporting the creation of ADUs, in the context of FAR caps. Although the most likely combination is 1 internal ADU and 1 detached ADU, there could certainly be property-specific situations where both ADUs would be of the same type and it would still be possible to meet standards for FAR, setbacks, heights, lot coverage percentage caps... If those standards can be met, I think it should be OK to have 2 ADUs of the same type. (Spevak)</li> <li>• On a 5,000sf lot, ADUs are currently capped at 800sf of living area, measured in such a way that excludes exterior walls. But as proposed, the ADU would be capped at 750sf including exterior walls. In practice, this significantly suppresses the size of detached ADUs. It's even more severe in undersized R5 lots or any R2.5 lot. Adjust FAR caps so they don't decrease size allowances for ADUs from what code currently allows. (p. 55 - 33.110.250.C.1 and other places) (Spevak)</li> <li>• [The restriction on ADU doors not being allowed on the same façade as the main entrance to the house] can force awkward layouts and sometimes adjustments (to locate roof or steps inside a setback) to comply. Note that code has nothing to say about how many doors face the street in a single-family house without an internal ADU. If there's resistance to this amendment, a compromise would be to drop the requirement in homes more than 5 years old but still make it apply for new construction. (Spevak)</li> <li>• While the 80%MFI requirement for an additional ADU is laudable, I am concerned that the current proposal will stifle the creation of multiple ADU's. (Schultz)</li> </ul>

# Residential Infill Project – Worksheet for PSC Work Session on June 7, 2018

PROPOSAL	POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS IDENTIFIED BY PSC	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PSC
<p><b>PARKING</b></p> <p><u>Current rules:</u>            One space per unit, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Within 500’ of “peak service”</li> <li>▪ ADUs</li> <li>▪ Historically narrow lots</li> </ul> <p><u>Proposed additional exceptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No parking required for lots abutting alleys. If parking is provided, parking access must be from alley</li> <li>▪ No parking required inside ‘a’ overlay for:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ House w/2 ADUs</li> <li>▪ Duplex</li> <li>▪ Duplex w/ADU</li> <li>▪ Triplex</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Parking and driveways on narrow lots are prohibited between the building and the street</li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 1 – No change to code.</b>            Retain current parking code.</p> <p><b>Option 2 – Staff proposal.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize alley access (proposal 4.3, above)</li> <li>• Reduce parking for additional housing types in the ‘a’ overlay (proposal 5.4)</li> <li>• Restrict garages and driveways on narrow lots (proposal 10.2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 3 – Further reduce minimum parking requirements.</b>            Eliminate off-street parking requirements in residential zones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All residential zones? Single- and multi-dwelling?</li> <li>• For residential uses only (not institutions?)</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 4 – Attach requirements to non-required parking.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When parking is provided, require one unit be affordable</li> <li>b. When parking is provided, require one unit be visitable</li> <li>c. When parking is provided, restrict width of curb cut, and require driveway to accommodate at least two cars.</li> <li>d. When parking is provided, the site is not eligible for parking permits (where parking program permits are in use)</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree that over time fewer people will own cars but that we aren’t there yet. My expectation of the missing middle was that we would look for opportunities to provide more units in the same “box” as the single family “box” we established was reasonable. I agree with staff that families were larger in the past so neighborhoods likely had more people than they do now with smaller households. I think we need to recognize, however, that as we add more adults to the neighborhood we are adding impacts as the additional adults are, for the foreseeable future likely to come with cars. (Rudd)</li> <li>• I don't have a preliminary position on the issue of requiring parking but I wonder if this is an area where we need to advise the City to couple zoning changes with other tools. For example, I appreciate the undesirability of surface parking but could the City in some cases land bank property for future housing projects and in the interim allow the use of the land for remote parking, perhaps over green pavers? I have some personal experience in another state with buying housing without off street parking despite having a car and it worked because when there wasn't a place to park on the street, we had access to a remote lot. (Rudd)</li> <li>• I know of instances where a job announcement has required the person have access to a car in order to get the job. Can the City somehow encourage entities that have this requirement provide the car and a place to park it to the employee? (Rudd)</li> <li>• On the other hand, are garages today necessarily bad if they are coupled with a parking permit program? If they are adaptable to studio apartments as ownership of cars decreases? (Rudd)</li> <li>• Remove all parking minimums in single-family zones (Smith)</li> <li>• Preserving the street. I took the comments about tuck-under garages and wide curb cuts/driveways with 'wings' to heart. I'd like us to put a premium on minimizing curb cuts and preserving streetscapes. (Smith)</li> <li>• It seems to me that a lot of the testimony in favor of required parking is really concern about keeping on-street parking available. I have two thoughts on this and wonder how my colleagues would react to the following amendment ideas:           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prohibit curb cuts for parking unless the curb cut provides access to space for at least two vehicles (i.e., no one-for-one privatization of curbside parking)?</li> <li>2. Where curb cuts are allowed, specify in the zoning code that this reduces entitlements in any current or future on-street parking permit programs by the number of spaces created off-street (this goes to using your garage for storage of things other than autos)? (Smith)</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Drop off-street parking requirements (p. 123 – Table 266-2). I have a hard time interpreting proposed language. As written, it seems to exempt all kinds of housing allowed in SD zones except homes in single-lot PDs and SROs. (Spevak)</li> <li>• Eliminate off-street parking requirements in residential zones. This will allow for less expensive construction, create more space for housing units, and help protect trees and provide for more greenspace. This is consistent with recent Council action for new multifamily housing and the Better Housing by Design proposal. For new residential zone projects that do include on-site parking, there should be a requirement to provide at least one affordable unit as a condition. (Houck)</li> </ul>