Regular Meeting
Wednesday, March 4, 2015, at 6:30 pm
City Hall, Council Chambers
6000 Main Street SW, Lakewood, Washington

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Minutes from February 4, 2015

4. Public Comments
   (Members of the audience may comment on items that are not included on
   the agenda. Each person will be allowed 3 minutes to speak, to a total of 15
   minutes per topic. Groups with a designated speaker may have a total of 10
   minutes to speak.)

5. Public Hearings
   • None

6. Unfinished Business
   • Election of Chair and Vice Chair
   • Community Visioning Update
   • Comprehensive Plan Update

7. New Business
   • Introduction to Cottage Housing
   • R1/R2 map amendments

8. Reports from Commission Members & Staff
   (Planning Commission members and staff may make committee reports and
   announcements relating to items not on the agenda.)
Enclosures: February 4, 2015 draft minutes  
Staff Report/Exhibits re: Cottage Housing  
Staff report re: R1/R2 map amendments

Members Only:  
Please call Karen Devereaux at 253.983.7767 by Tuesday, March 3, 2015, if you are unable to attend. Thank you.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for MARCH 18, 2015
Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mr. Don Daniels, Chair.

Roll Call
Planning Commission Members Present: Don Daniels, Chair; Robert Pourpasand, Vice-Chair; Robert Estrada, James Guerrero, Paul Wagemann, and Christopher Webber
Planning Commission Members Excused: None
Planning Commission Members Absent: Connie Coleman-Lacadie
Staff Present: Dave Bugher, Assistant City Manager-Development; Dan Catron, Planning Manager, Karen Devereaux, Recording Secretary
Council Liaison: Councilmember Paul Bocchi

Acceptance of Agenda
Mr. Dave Bugher suggested allowing City Attorney, Heidi Wachter, to make a presentation regarding the substantive duties and authority of the Planning Commission to add clarity to the members’ role in the kinds of matters that come before it relative to Lakewood Municipal Code Title 18A as well as the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Lakewood.

During this presentation, Ms. Wachter also noted a commission member contacted her with a question over the process of electing officers at the last meeting. After hearing explanation of a few options available to them the commission agreed to hold another vote in March with all members in attendance.

Approval of Minutes
Mr. James Guerrero noted that his name was missing from the roll call list of members present for the January 21, 2015 meeting. Minutes of the meeting held on January 21, 2015, were unanimously approved with the name correction to show Mr. Guerrero in attendance. M/S/C Pourpasand/Wagemann.

Public Comments
Mr. Glen Spieth, Lakewood, addressed the commission encouraging approval of owner-occupied dwellings, condos, and single family residences in contrast to the apartment communities in the Kiwanis Park neighborhood.
Public Hearing
None

Unfinished Business
None

New Business
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (2015-2020) Amendment
Ms. Desiree Winkler, Public Works Transportation Division Manager, explained how the City may receive grant awards “off-schedule” which then requires an amendment to the 6 Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The City was awarded Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds for two spot-improvement projects. These two projects target specific locations with history of serious and fatal collisions and must specifically be included in the current TIP to utilize the funds.

Ms. Winkler requested the commission support the proposed amendment and recommend that the City Council approve the amendment after public hearing and consideration of public comment.

A motion was made in support of the proposed Six-Year TIP Amendment No. 1. M/S/C Estrada/Webber. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Economic Development Update
Ms. Becky Newton, Economic Development Manager, gave a presentation of economic activities for the period of August through December 2014. The five areas of focus were Business Retention and Expansion, Business Recruitment and Attraction, Target Area Development and Redevelopment Activity, Protecting JBLM from Urban Encroachment, and Increasing Housing Stock Quality and Choices. A handout was provided explaining Land Swap Considerations in Clear Zone/Annexation Area as well as a full-color brochure promoting “The Gateway to Great Business Opportunities” in the City of Lakewood.

The presentation highlighted the many positive projects planned for the future in multiple areas of Lakewood.

Community Visioning Update
Mr. Dan Catron, Planning Manager, shared that the project which began in April 2014 is nearing a conclusion. The commissioners were provided a draft of the Vision Plan Statement and Action Plan Elements which were developed with input from the Visioning Committee. The City Council is expected to receive an initial presentation from the consultant of the Final Community Vision Plan at its study session meetings on February 9th and 23rd.
Comprehensive Plan Update
Mr. Dan Catron, Planning Manager, provided a draft copy of the Washington State Department of Commerce Checklist addressing the Comprehensive Plan Update adopted by Council in December 2014.

It was explained the checklist is intended to help cities that are fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to conduct the “periodic review and update” of comprehensive plans and development regulations required by RCW36.70A.130 (4). Cities can use the checklist to identify components that may need to be updated to reflect the latest local conditions or to comply with changes to the GMA since their last update.

Reports from Commission Members and Staff
Revised Subdivision Code (Title 17A) Amendments
Mr. Dan Catron, Planning Manager, reported on Monday, February 2, 2015, Council adopted the revised Subdivision Code, that includes a policy that requires any property proposing to subdivide to be connected to the public sewer system.

Don Daniels, Chair, commented that action was taken to table the Star-Lite Drive-In satellite parking issue in the air corridor and queried when that may be brought forward. Mr. Bugher noted Council prefers to have the Joint Land Use Study completed before scheduling. Staff expects to receive the study in October and provide the information to the Planning Commission.

Next Meeting: The next Planning Commission meeting will be a Joint Council Meeting scheduled for Monday, February 23, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Don Daniels, Chair
Planning Advisory Board 3/4/2015

Karen Devereaux, Secretary
Planning Commission 3/4/2015
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
STAFF REPORT

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: DAN CATRON, PLANNING MANAGER
MEETING DATE: MARCH 4, 2015
AGENDA ITEM:

SUBJECT: COTTAGE HOUSING- INTRODUCTION

The Community Development Department has been directed to promulgate a cottage housing ordinance for the City of Lakewood. Generally speaking, cottage housing is defined as a multi-unit housing development consisting of small detached units (650-1,100 sq. ft.) arranged around a commonly owned open space area with a congregate parking area. A special cottage housing ordinance is proposed to allow cottage housing developments to exceed the base density otherwise allowed in the underlying zoning district. The proposed ordinance is intended to apply in the City’s single-family residential zones (R1 through R4). Cottage housing developments provide a means for municipalities to:

- Meet affordable housing goals in an attractive way
- Preserve more usable open space
- Maximize land use
- Provide appealing housing options to retain young people and seniors in their hometowns
- Enhance the tax base without adding children to the local school system

-Cottage Advisors Inc.

There are many considerations to be made when developing a cottage housing ordinance. In the City of Lakewood most residential land-use types (except for manufactured home parks) are either allowed by right as primary permitted uses, or are categorically prohibited, depending on the zoning district, with density controlled through the straightforward development standards of the zoning district. As an example, multi-family residential housing is categorically prohibited in the R1 through R4 zoning districts, but would be allowed outright at different densities in the multi-family residential zoning districts (MF1 through MF3). However, in the case of cottage housing as contemplated, development would be allowed at
densities exceeding the maximum base density of the underlying zoning district as an incentive to provide a cottage housing product. Allowing an increased number of dwelling units and density would be mitigated through the requirement of smaller dwelling units and a higher level of design control. In developing a cottage housing ordinance, the Planning Commission will need to balance development incentives to promote cottage housing against protection of existing neighborhood character. What design and development features are appropriate to justify the granting of a density bonus relative to traditional development?

Issues that the Planning Commission may want to consider include:

1. What is the anticipated role of cottage housing? Will it be implemented as a transition between traditional single family and other zoning districts (i.e. Mukilteo), or as potential infill projects within single family neighborhoods?

The draft regulations as proposed do not make this distinction. The proposed regulations would apply in all single-family residential zoning districts, but would require a minimum separation distance between cottage housing projects.

2. Should cottage housing projects include specific affordability requirements? This may reduce the incentives to build cottage housing.

The draft regulations do not require any specific affordability requirements.

3. Should cottage housing be available for transient recreational use? (i.e vacation cabins by the lakes?)

The draft regulations are silent on this issue, however arguments could be made that such arrangements would be considered commercial lodging and/or subject to the City’s rental housing complex licensing requirements.

4. What forms of ownership should be allowed or encouraged? (rentals, condominiums, binding site plans, or fee-simple ownership w/HOA?) If lots are permitted to be created that are smaller than the minimum lot size for the zone (and may be very small indeed!) are provisions in place to ensure that the cottage housing development endures indefinitely without resulting in negative impacts on the neighborhood?

The regulations as proposed would only allow subdivision of the land with a condominium declaration and binding site plan, or as a condominium without subdividing the land. State regulations regarding these types of instruments (RCW 64.34) are intended to provide for a durable condominium association.

5. How explicit should the City get with regard to cottage character? The City of Mukilteo is specific that cottage housing should “harken back to the size, proportionality and character of Craftsman-style homes built in the 1910’s to 1930s”, however other architectural themes could be appropriate.
The proposed regulations are not specific in this regard, but the building design standards tend to reflect the Craftsman style through the requirements for pitched roofs and front porch areas.

6. What level of density bonus should be provided? Cottage housing is being offered as an "incentive program"—how strong should the incentive be? This has to be balanced against the increased process and design requirements, and questions about neighborhood compatibility. Some cities do not allow any density bonus, just "alternative" development standards including zero lot line development, clustered parking, etc.

The proposed regulations allow for three times the base density in the R1 and R2 zones, and twice the base density in the R3 and R4 zones.

7. Should attached garages be allowed? Cottage housing typically has detached aggregated (clustered) parking facilities. Some jurisdictions strictly prohibit garages attached to the cottage units, presumably because it is not in keeping with the architectural character of the individual cottages or the concept of a "small community of cottages oriented around common open space."

The proposed regulations would allow for small attached garages in some instances.

8. What level of common area maintenance should be required? Should the homeowners association be responsible for all common areas? Landscaping? Building exteriors and roofs?

The regulations as proposed would require "...a mechanism, acceptable to the approval authority, to ensure the continued care and maintenance of all common areas...." The proposed maintenance program would not necessarily include maintenance of the exterior walls and roofs of the individual cottages.

9. Who should make discretionary decisions on cottage housing projects- the Community Development Director (with appeal to the hearing examiner)? Or should the hearing examiner make the initial decision (with appeal to Superior Court)?

The regulations as proposed would require that cottage housing projects be reviewed by the City’s hearing examiner as a Process III conditional use permit.

10. Should a community building or common recreation facility be required?

The proposed regulations would allow, but not require, a common recreation facility.
11. Should “private use outdoor open space” be allowed? Should it be required?

The proposed regulations would require 400 sq. ft. of private use open space per unit.

**Draft Ordinance**

In order to prompt the commission’s consideration of these issues, a draft resolution is provided for the Commission’s review.

**Schedule**

March 4- Introduction to Cottage Housing
March 11 or 25- Report comparing Cottage Housing ordinances from other cities
April- Draft SEPA document, Initiate Dept. of Commerce 60-day review period
June- Commission to conduct public hearing and make recommendation to Council
July- Initiate review before City Council.

Attachments:

1. Draft Planning Commission Resolution
2. *Cottage Housing in Your Community* - The Housing Partnership; June, 2001
CITY OF LAKewood
plAnning CommissioN
resolutioN No. 2015-draft

A resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Lakewood recommending approval of an amendments to the land Use and Development Code- chapter 18A of the Lakewood Municipal Code regarding cottage housing

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood incorporated on February 28, 1996; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Washington State Growth Management Act of 1995, the City of Lakewood adopted a Comprehensive Plan in July, 2000, and a Land Use and Development Code (Chapter 18A of the Lakewood Municipal Code) on August 20, 2001; and,

WHEREAS, since the time of adoption of the Land Use and Development Code the City has received input on the Code from citizens and project proponents, and has identified areas where adjustments to the Code would be appropriate; and,

WHEREAS, the Community Development Director has received suggestions to provide for increased density and housing options within the City’s single family residential zoning districts; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing(s) on ____ , 2015, to receive and consider public testimony on said proposed code changes; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has found that the proposed changes to the Land Use and Development Code are consistent with the adopted Lakewood Comprehensive Plan and will not adversely affect the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the city; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has found affirmatively that the proposed amendments satisfy the applicable findings of LMC 18A.02.415;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission for the City of Lakewood does hereby recommend to the Lakewood City Council that the following amendments to Chapter 18A of the Lakewood Municipal Code be adopted:

(Language to be added is underlined, and language to be deleted is struck through).

1. The Commission recommends that Section 18A.02.502 be amended so that the Section reads as follows:

18A.02.502 - Process Types – Permits
### TABLE 3: APPLICATION PROCESSING PROCEDURES

Permit Process Types. Permit applications for review pursuant to this section shall be classified as a Process I, Process II, Process III, or Process IV action. Process V actions are legislative in nature. Permit applications and decisions are categorized by process type as set forth in Table 3. The differences between the processes are generally associated with the different nature of the decisions and the decision-making body as described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Zoning certification; Building permit; Design Review; Sign permit; Temporary Sign permit; Accessory Living Quarters; Limited Home Occupation; Temporary Use; Manufactured or Mobile Home permit; Boundary Line Adjustments; Minor modification of Process II and III permits; Final Site Certification; Certificate of Occupancy; ***Sexually Oriented Business extensions</td>
<td>Administrative Uses; Short Plat; SEPA; Home Occupation; Administrative Variance; Binding Site Plans, Minor Plat Amendment, Major modification of Process II permits</td>
<td>Conditional Use; Major Variance; Preliminary Plat; Major Plat Amendment; Major modification of Process III permits; Shoreline Conditional Use; Shoreline Variance; Shoreline Substantial Development Permit; Public Facilities Master Plan; Cottage Housing Development (may be considered together with residential binding site plan)</td>
<td>Zoning Map Amendments; Site-specific Comprehensive Plan map amendments; Specific Comprehensive Plan text amendments; Shoreline Redesignation, <strong>Final Plat</strong>; <strong>Development Agreement</strong>; <strong>No hearing required or recommendation made by Planning Advisory Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal or no effect on others, so issuance of permit is not dependent on others</td>
<td>Application of the standards may require some knowledge of impacts and effect upon others</td>
<td>Potential significant effect on some persons or broad impact on a number of persons</td>
<td>Potential significant effect on some persons or broad impact on a number of persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice &amp; Comment</td>
<td>Participation of applicant only</td>
<td>Nearby property owners invited to comment on an application</td>
<td>In addition to applicant, others affected invited to present initial information</td>
<td>In addition to applicant, others affected invited to present initial information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Community Development Department Staff</td>
<td>Planning Advisory Board, except for Final Plat and Development Agreement as noted ** above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Body</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner Community Development Director's decision on permits noted *** above is appealable to Superior Court</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>Superior Court</td>
<td>Superior Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Board recommends that a new Section 18A.10.800 through 880 be added to read as follows:

**18A.10.800 - Cottage Housing**

**18A.10.810 - Purpose and Intent - Cottage Housing**

The purpose of this chapter is to provide for a specific residential development type ("cottage housing") featuring modestly sized single family (or two-family) detached residences with commonly held community amenities, and oriented around commonly held open space areas. Specific design standards must be met. An increase in allowable density over the maximum density allowed in the underlying zoning district is provided as an incentive to encourage development of this type of housing, and in recognition of the reduced impacts expected from this type of housing versus typical single-family residential development. This housing type is intended to:

A. Promote a variety of housing choices to meet the needs of a population diverse in age, income, household composition, and individual needs.

B. Provide opportunities for more affordable housing choices within single-family neighborhoods.

C. Encourage creation of functional usable open space in residential communities.

D. Promote neighborhood interaction and safety through design.

E. Ensure compatibility with neighboring land uses.

F. Provide opportunities for infill development that support the growth management goal of more efficient use of urban residential land.

**Intent:** It is the intent of this section to provide specific standards for an increased density residential development type that is compatible with moderate density single family residential environments. This housing type will be strictly regulated to provide design amenities that make the development more attractive and compatible as infill in existing single family neighborhoods. Specific design features include limited-size detached building forms with a high level of design quality, increased minimum levels of landscaping and open space, and professionally maintained landscaping, common areas and building exteriors.

Approval of a cottage housing development project exceeding the maximum density allowed in the underlying zoning district shall only be granted if the project complies with the specific development and design standards contained in this section. Nothing in this section is intended
prohibit or limit the development of housing projects that otherwise meet the provisions of the underlying zoning district.

18A.10.815 — Applicability — Cottage Housing

Cottage housing is permitted in the R1, R2, R3 and R4 zoning districts. The provisions of individual zoning districts shall be applicable to cottage housing developments; provided, that where a conflict exists, the provisions of this section shall control.

18A.10.875 - General Provisions — Cottage Housing

A. Cottage housing projects are permitted with the approval of a Cottage Housing Development Plan. Discrete ownerships may only be created through the residential binding site plan and/or condominium declaration process pursuant to RCW 64.34 as applicable. Cottage housing development plans shall be subject to review and approval as a conditional use permit subject to Process III permit procedures. Adherence to all applicable development standards shall be determined by the City’s Hearing Examiner as a component of the review process.

B. A community building of up to 2,500 square feet in size may be provided for the residents of the cottage housing development. Roof pitch, architecture, materials and colors shall be similar to that of the dwelling units within the cottage housing development.

C. Accessory dwelling units shall not be permitted in cottage housing developments.

18A.10.820 - Development Standards — Cottage Housing

Cottage housing development shall be subject to the following development standards.

A. Density.

1. In the R1 and R2 zoning districts, cottage housing development shall be allowed a density not to exceed three (3) times the base density allowed in the underlying zone.

2. In R3 and R4 zoning districts, cottage housing developments shall be allowed a density not to exceed two (2) times the base density allowed in the underlying zone.

3. On a site to be used for a cottage housing development, existing detached single-family residential structures, which may be nonconforming with respect to the standards of this section, may be permitted to remain at the discretion of the hearing examiner, but the extent of the nonconformity may not be increased. The number of any such nonconforming dwelling unit(s) shall be multiplied by the factors noted in sections 1 or 2 above, and included in calculating the density of the cottage housing development.

B. Locational criteria.
1. The minimum area for a cottage housing project is 0.75 acre, which may include more than one contiguous lot.

2. Cottage housing development shall be separated from another cottage housing development by a minimum of 400 feet measured between the closest points of the subject properties.

C. Site design.

1. Cottage housing development shall be clustered and shall consist of a minimum of four (4) dwelling units and a maximum of twelve (12) dwelling units.

2. At least seventy-five (75) percent of dwelling units shall abut the common open space.

3. Common open spaces shall have dwelling units abutting at least two (2) sides.

4. Creation of individual lots shall only be permitted through the residential binding site plan process provided in LMC 17.34 and Chapter 64.34. RCW.

5. Siting of dwelling units or common open space in areas with slopes exceeding fifteen (15) percent is discouraged. Dwelling units shall not be placed in such areas if extensive use of retaining walls is necessary to create building pads or open space areas.

D. Setbacks and building separation.

1. Dwelling units shall have at least a fifteen (15) foot front and five (5) foot side and rear yard setback.

2. Dwelling units shall be separated from one another by a minimum of ten (10) feet, not including projections.

3. Dwelling units and accessory buildings shall be separated by at least six (6) feet.

4. Dwelling units not abutting or oriented toward a right of way shall have a front yard oriented towards the common open space. The approval authority may use appropriate discretion, consistent with the intent of this chapter, in determining orientation of yards.

E. Lot coverage.

Lot coverage shall not exceed sixty (60) percent of gross site area. Lot coverage shall be calculated for the overall cottage housing development, not for individual lots. Paved components of common open space areas and walkways shall not be counted in lot coverage calculations.

18A.10.835 - Open Space – Cottage Housing
A. Common open space.

1. A minimum of five hundred (500) square feet of common open space shall be provided per dwelling unit.

2. Common open space shall be a minimum of three thousand (3,000) square feet in size, regardless of number of dwelling units.

3. No dimension of a common open space area used to satisfy the minimum square footage requirement shall be less than ten (10) feet, unless part of a pathway or trail.

4. In subdivisions and short subdivisions, common open space shall be located in a separate tract or tracts.

5. Required common open space shall be divided into no more than two (2) separate areas per cluster of dwelling units.

6. Common open space shall be improved for passive or active recreational use. Examples may include but are not limited to courtyards, orchards, landscaped picnic areas or gardens. Common open space shall include amenities such as but not limited to seating, landscaping, trails, gazebos, barbecue facilities, covered shelters or water features.

7. Surface water management facilities may be commonly held, but shall not counted toward meeting the common open space requirement.

B. Private open space.

1. Each dwelling unit shall be provided a minimum of four hundred (400) square feet of private open space which may be used for lawn area, courtyards and patios.

2. No dimension of a private open space area used to satisfy the minimum square footage requirement shall be less than nine (9) feet.

18A.10.845 – Building Design Standards – Cottage Housing

A. Roofs.

1. Dwelling units shall have a minimum 6:12 roof pitch. Up to thirty-five (35) percent of roof area may have a slope not less than 4:12. Portions of a roof with a pitch of less than 6:12 shall be limited to architectural features such as dormers, porch roofs and shed roofs.

2. Garages and carports shall have a minimum 6:12 roof pitch.

B. Entries and porches.
1. Each dwelling unit abutting a public right of way (excluding alleys) shall have a primary entry and covered porch a minimum of eighty (80) square feet in size, oriented toward the public right of way. If abutting more than one public right of way, the developer and City shall collaborate to determine which right of way the entrance and covered porch shall be oriented toward.

2. Each dwelling unit shall have an entry and covered porch oriented toward the common open space. If the dwelling unit abuts a public right of way, this may be a secondary entrance, and the minimum porch size shall be fifty (50) square feet. If not abutting a public right of way, this shall be the primary entrance, and the minimum porch size shall be eighty (80) square feet.

3. Covered porches shall be a minimum of six (6) feet deep.

C. Dwelling units shall not include attached garages unless the garage abuts an alley or shared parking lot. The first 200 square feet of attached garage space shall not be counted towards maximum dwelling unit size allowance.

D. Detached garages and carports associated with individual dwelling units shall not exceed five hundred (500) square feet in size. No shared garage or carport may exceed eight hundred (800) square feet in size.

18A.10.850 – Parking – Cottage Housing

A. A minimum of 1.8 parking spaces per cottage shall be provided for the entire development. Fifteen (15) percent of total required spaces shall be designated for guests.

B. All or a portion of new on-street parking provided as a component of the development may be counted towards minimum parking requirements if the approval authority finds that such parking configuration will result in adequate parking, and is compatible with the character and context of the surrounding area.

C. No more than fifty (50) percent of covered parking spaces may be carports.

D. Garage doors shall not be oriented toward a public right of way with the exception of an alley.

E. Garages and carports shall not be located between the common open space and the dwelling units.

F. Parking lots shall be broken into sub-lots of no more than eight (8) parking spaces. Sub-lots shall be separated by landscaped bulb-outs a minimum of 12 (twelve) feet in width.

G. Parking in the form of garages, carports or lots may occupy no more than forty (40) percent of site frontage on a public right of way, except in the case of an alley, in which case no restriction applies. On-street parking is permitted along the entire frontage.
H. Parking lots shall be set back at least fifteen (15) feet from front property lines and ten (10) feet from external side and rear property lines.

I. Parking lots of more than two (2) spaces, visible from a public right of way (excluding alleys) or adjacent single-family uses or zones shall be screened by landscaping consistent with LMC 18A.50.430.

18A.10.870 - Common Area Maintenance – Cottage Housing

Cottage housing development shall be required to implement a mechanism, acceptable to the approval authority, to ensure the continued care and maintenance of all common areas including common open space, parking, surface water management facilities (if applicable) and any other common area. Such a mechanism might include creation of a homeowners' or condominium association with authority and funding necessary to maintain the common areas.

18A.10.880 – Modifications – Cottage Housing

Applicants may request modifications to the open space, site design, design standards, setbacks and parking provisions of this chapter. The approval authority may modify the above referenced provisions of this chapter if both of the following apply:

A. The site is constrained due to unusual shape, topography, easements or critical areas; and

B. The modification will not result in a project that is less compatible with neighboring land uses than would have occurred under strict adherence to the provisions of this chapter.

3. The Commission recommends that Section 18A.90.200 be amended to add the following definitions:

18A.90.200 - Definitions

COTTAGE. A single-story Single Family Detached Dwelling containing at least eight hundred (800) and no more than one thousand (1,000) square feet of gross floor area, constructed as part of a cottage housing development project and meeting the general requirements of LMC section 18A.10.800.

COTTAGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. An alternative type of development comprised of small, Single Family Detached Dwellings ("cottages") clustered around common open space, usually with detached garages and parking area.

GROSS FLOOR AREA. (insert)

18A.90.200A - Definitions
SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED DWELLING. A residential dwelling unit that is not attached to another residential dwelling unit by any means and provides living accommodations for a single individual or family. Dwelling units shall be separately located, with a maximum of one (1) dwelling unit per individual lot, except as may be allowed in conjunction with approved Cottage Housing Development.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on ____, 2015, by the following vote:

AYES: BOARDMEMBERS:

NOES: BOARDMEMBERS:

ABSENT: BOARDMEMBERS:

DON DANIELS, CHAIRMAN
PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD

ATTEST:

KAREN DEVERAUX, SECRETARY
Cottage Housing in Your Community
A guide to drafting a cottage housing ordinance
June, 2001

The Housing Partnership
1301 Fifth Avenue Suite 2400
Seattle, Washington 98101-2603
425-453-5123
425-462-0776 fax
mluis@seanet.com

The Housing Partnership is a non-profit organization (officially known as the King County Housing Alliance) dedicated to increasing the supply of affordable housing in King County. This is achieved, in part, through policies of local government that foster increased housing development while preserving affordability and neighborhood character. The Partnership pursues these goals by: (a) building public awareness of housing affordability issues; (b) promoting design and regulatory solutions; and (c) acting as a convener of public, private and community leaders concerned about housing. The Partnership's officers for 2000 are: Rich Bennion, HomeStreet Bank, Chair; Paige Miller, Port of Seattle, Vice Chair; Gary Ackerman, Foster Pepper & Shefelman, Secretary; Tom Witte, Bank of America, Chair, Finance Committee; J. Tayloe Washburn, Foster Pepper & Shefelman, Chair, Land Use Committee.
Cottage Housing in Your Community
A Guide to Drafting a Cottage Housing Ordinance

Introduction

Cottage housing is receiving increased attention as a way to meet the needs of a significant and growing share of the housing market. A number of successful examples in the region provide useful lessons.

With the high price of multi-family zoned land, cottage development is really only practical in single family zones. Several jurisdictions in the Puget Sound area have adopted, or are considering adoption of ordinances to allow construction of cottage housing in those zones.

It should be emphasized that cottage housing does not represent a completely new type of zoning, but rather an alternative use of land with an existing underlying zoning. In some respects cottage housing is similar to single family housing and in some respects it is more like multi-family housing.

Approaches to allowing cottage housing will vary by jurisdiction, existing land uses and market conditions. What works well in one area will not necessarily be appropriate in another. This report provides guidance to those looking for an approach that will both encourage cottage construction and ensure that the developments fit well into existing neighborhoods.

General considerations

When drafting a cottage housing ordinance the following should be kept in mind:

Entitlement. Most cottage projects will be built on infill sites in established single family neighborhoods, so jurisdictions will need some process to determine if a proposed cottage development is appropriate. This process should not be so cumbersome and uncertain that it scares away potential cottage developers and results in conventional single family development on parcels of land that would work well for cottages. An administrative conditional use permit seems to strike a good balance between developer certainty and community input.

Making cottage development pay. Because of the high price of land in multi-family zones, infill cottage development is, for the most part, only practical in single family zones. But for builders to want to undertake cottage development, as opposed to building single family houses as the zoning would allow, cottage development has to be at least an equal, if not a better business proposition than single family. A cottage ordinance and its accompanying processes must not be so restrictive that they tend to make single family construction a better option.
Most jurisdictions measure allowable densities by units-per-acre or by minimum lot sizes. But all units are not created equal, and such measures foster a misperception of cottage housing.

Re-defining density. Most jurisdictions measure allowable densities by units-per-acre or by minimum lot sizes. But all units are not created equal, and such measures foster a misperception of cottage housing. For cottages it is more helpful to think of:

Floor area ratio (FAR). By measuring the total floor area of a cottage development against the parcel size, cottages will likely have a smaller impact than the single family homes that would be allowed in the zone.

Population. A cottage development will likely have the same, or fewer people than the single family homes that could be built on the site.

Cars and traffic. A cottage development that attracts a mix of singles and couples will have no more cars than a group of houses, especially those with teenagers.

Another way to think about cottage housing is to measure intensity of use rather than counting the number of structures.

What is the market? Cottage developments built to-date have attracted large numbers of buyers who are single. Some developments have attracted young or empty-nester couples. Children are rarely seen in cottage housing built thus far. A somewhat larger cottage could work for families with children, but parking may become an issue as those children get to driving age.

Planning decisions can affect the ability of builders to target certain market segments. Holding cottages to too small a size limit may eliminate couples or small families (single parent with one child, for example) from the market. Zoning that makes a single floor possible will make cottages attractive to seniors who want to avoid stairs. Parking requirements (either minimums or maximums) will strongly influence marketability.

Meeting a neighborhood need. Cottage housing provides a way for people to give up their large house but stay in their neighborhood. The reason that many people hold onto large single family houses long after they need all the bedrooms and the big yard is simply that they want to stay in an area they are familiar with. Cottages allow empty-nesters, seniors, the newly-single to get the equity out of their large house but still have a detached home in a comfortable setting near friends and family.

Affordability. Although cottages are small, they are not necessarily inexpensive to build. A cottage includes all of the most expensive rooms of a house (kitchen, bathrooms) as well as heating, ventilation and other systems. Moreover, it can be expensive to do construction work in the tight spaces of a cottage cluster.

Nevertheless, cottages and small lot houses have been built to sell at modest prices and have introduced some affordability into desirable neighborhoods. Some requirements, however, will affect costs and the ability of a developer to build an affordable cottage cluster. For instance, full two-story framing is less expensive than story-and-a-half framing, so, ironically, height restrictions can drive up construction costs. Excessive setbacks, separations and parking requirements can use land that could otherwise accommodate
Rather than codifying all parameters of cottage development, jurisdictions should consider a more informal approach of design guidelines and design review.

A two-for-one cottage ordinance can work where land is relatively inexpensive. In high demand areas... an increase in the number of cottages allowed may tip the economic scales in favor of a cottage housing development.

more cottages or common buildings. If impact fees, permit fees and utility hook-up fees are based on single family housing, they may be unreasonably high.

Utilities. The treatment of public utilities is not a land use issue, but it needs attention. Because most cottages are sold in condominium ownership, the water utility can provide a single water meter and leave it up to the owners association to install sub-meters and collect water and sewer fees from residents. Where sewer rates are tied to water use, offset meters should be allowed to account for water used in site irrigation. The stormwater run-off from cottages will be about the same as the equivalent single family development and should be treated the same.

Design guidelines and review. Rather than codifying all parameters of cottage development, jurisdictions should consider a more informal approach of design guidelines and design review. These processes, which should be handled administratively, allow a developer and city to work together to craft a development that meets community needs and works well with the site and the target market.

Parameters for Cottage Housing

Following are descriptions of the key parameters that make up a cottage housing ordinance, as well as some possible approaches. For illustration, the application of each parameter within three cottage developments is shown. (Descriptions of these projects are at the back of the report.) Comments address both market and neighborhood factors.

Cottage Units Allowed

One way to determine the number of cottages that can be built on a site is to work through the underlying zoning. Cottage ordinances adopted thus far in the region allow up to two cottages in place of each single family house that would otherwise be built on the site. Where the zoning is more dense and/or the cottages are larger, this might be reduced to something like 1.75 cottages per house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulsbo Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 for 1, not counting carriage units; 4.5 to 1 counting carriage units.</td>
<td>2 for 1</td>
<td>Part of a planned unit development. Cottages are 12 units/acre on land zoned up to 22 units/acre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: A two-for-one cottage ordinance can work where land is relatively inexpensive. In high demand areas a developer could easily find that building one large house is easier and more profitable than building two cottages. In that case, an increase in the number of cottages allowed may tip the economic scales in favor of a cottage housing development.
Creating a sense of community requires at least four cottages around a common open space. If a cottage cluster gets too big it begins to lose the sense of intimacy.

The size of a cottage will play a large part in determining what market segments find it appealing. . . . A cottage cluster could have several different sized cottages, giving buyers a variety of choices and encouraging some diversity of household sizes and make-ups.

Cluster Size
The clustering of cottages is an important design feature. Creating a sense of community requires at least four cottages around a common open space. If a cottage cluster gets too big -- more than a dozen units -- it begins to lose the sense of intimacy. A masterplanned community may have as many units as space will allow and the market will absorb. These units should, however, be arranged in their own smaller clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulsbo Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six cottages and three carriage units in one cluster</td>
<td>Eight cottages and one common building in one cluster</td>
<td>Six clusters with between five and ten cottages per cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: The cluster and its central open space is meant to provide a quasi-public space for residents, with a presumption of a certain amount of sociability. Planning and design guidelines, however, should not try to force this too much. Experience and site-specific considerations will be the best guide to what configurations and features will work best.

Total Floor Area per Cottage
To be defined as a "cottage," some upper limit may be placed on total floor area. The examples top out at 1265 square feet, but it is suggested that a cottage could be larger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulsbo Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>850 sf</td>
<td>768 to 998 sf</td>
<td>870 to 1265 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: The size of a cottage will play a large part in determining what market segments find it appealing. Smaller cottages -- under 1000 square feet or so -- will attract mostly single buyers with some couples, whereas larger cottages work well for couples or even small families. A cottage cluster could have several different sized cottages, giving buyers a variety of choices and encouraging some diversity of household sizes and make-ups.

The option of a larger cottage will be attractive to developers since the additional space, such as an extra bedroom, is less expensive to build, but may increase the value of the building significantly. If larger cottages are part of a development, however, provision must be made for some additional parking that would be needed for teenagers with cars.

Main and Second Level Floor Areas
Regulating the main floor area controls the footprint and scale of each cottage. Some jurisdictions have then imposed a maximum for the second floor as a percentage of the first floor area, in order to minimize mass and bulk. These parameters can vary within the cluster.
Another consideration comes from viewing cottages as senior housing. Many seniors will look for a one-story home so they do not have to worry about stairs as they become older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulsbo Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>425 sf main floor, 425 sf upper floor</td>
<td>648 to 798 sf main floor, 118 to 203 sf upper floor</td>
<td>805 sf main floor, 460 sf upper floor in two-story cottage, 870 sf main floor in rambler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comment:* Instituting complex formulas for floor areas can give neighbors some assurance that the cottage development will not overwhelm its surroundings. At the same time, rigid formulas will complicate the design process and may foreclose options that would work well on a given site (for example, a daylight basement on a steep site).

Another consideration comes from viewing cottages as senior housing. Many seniors will look for a one-story home so they do not have to worry about stairs as they become older.

**Height Limit**
A number of factors determine appropriate height limits for cottage development. The underlying zoning will have a height maximum. Additional height can be granted for steeply pitched roofs (greater than 6:12, for example).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulsbo Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 feet max</td>
<td>22 feet max</td>
<td>20 feet max</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:* The architectural styles favored in cottage developments built thus far tend to include lower plate heights on the second floor, placing part of the living space in the roof. This building style is common in most neighborhoods, so cottages built this way will fit in. But because this style uses dormers and results in complicated interior and exterior angles, it is a more expensive style of construction, as compared to a full two-story building with an attic. Going to a full two stories must be approached with great care, however, due to concerns about "skinny houses."

Another architectural feature that will affect height is the desire to raise cottages off the ground. When cottages are clustered close together, a few steps up to a porch allows for a visual separation between community space and private space.

**Common Open Space**
Cottage developments generally cluster around some common open space. The size of this space will be determined by the overall density of the project, the footprints of the cottages as well as the setbacks and separations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulsbo Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 square feet per unit</td>
<td>575 square feet per unit</td>
<td>Common space in clusters ranges from 259 sf to 780 sf per unit, 370 sf average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building codes specify a minimum of six feet between structures for fire safety, and this may be sufficient in many developments.

**Comments:** More dense projects on expensive land will, naturally, have less open space, so it is important to maximize the common space by minimizing space in setbacks and separations.

**Distance between Structures**
The buyer of a cottage home is presumed to be more concerned with ownership of four walls and the simple fact of detachment, than with the distance from the neighbors. Building codes specify a minimum of six feet between structures for fire safety, and this may be sufficient in many developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulso Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six feet</td>
<td>10 feet minimum</td>
<td>Six feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** For projects with high land cost, the site plan will need to emphasize the maximum footprint of the cottages for economic reasons, and put as much of the remaining space as possible into the common areas. Such a site plan will need to have minimal separations. Careful design can preserve privacy.

**Setbacks**
Front, side and rear yard setbacks will likely begin with those in the underlying zoning. An averaging of setbacks around the side and rear yards can provide design flexibility while not overwhelming the neighbors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulso Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 feet front, five feet side, two feet along alley</td>
<td>Average of 10 feet side and rear, Front setback N/A</td>
<td>Three feet side and rear, 10 feet front</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** Setbacks from the street and from adjacent property represent land that cannot be used very productively in a cottage cluster. Because the emphasis of a cottage development is on common central open space, peripheral areas should not be expected to have much utility. Therefore, setbacks should be minimized so the central common space can be maximized. If setback averaging is used, the cottages closest to the property line may be those with the least bulk.

**Parking**
Parking is perhaps the most significant factor in the economics of cottage housing. The space needed to maneuver and park a car is nearly the same as the footprint of a small cottage. Moreover, clustering does not generally allow parking immediately adjacent to each cottage. Cottage projects must have enough land to provide a separate parking area, preferably out of view of the street. The presence of an alley can eliminate the need for a driveway and turn-around space.

The number of spaces required per unit will be determined primarily by the market segment the development is targeting. Smaller cottages (under 1000 square feet) will typically be owned by single adults, who will probably own just one car. Larger cottages are suitable for couples who may own two cars.
One way to recoup the cost of providing parking is to build carriage houses over the parking area. A likely configuration would be one unit over three or four spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravenna</th>
<th>Greenwood Avenue</th>
<th>Poulsbo Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One enclosed space per unit. Three carriage units on top of nine-car parking structure. On-street parking available.</td>
<td>One enclosed space per unit and seven uncovered spaces. No on-street parking.</td>
<td>One enclosed space per unit. Some attached to unit. On-street parking available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evolutionary process

Although the region has seen several successful cottage developments, both new and old, the concept is still evolving. Developers continue to learn what designs and configurations work best for various market segments. Communities continue to learn how to make cottages fit well into existing neighborhoods.

Cottage ordinances should recognize the continuing evolution of cottage housing and be written with enough flexibility so that builders and communities can work together to create great projects. Jurisdictions should anticipate fine-tuning their approach to cottage housing after some projects are on the ground.
SECTION 0.00.000 COTTAGE HOUSING

A. Cottage Housing is permitted in all residential zones by administrative Conditional Use Permit or Site Plan Approval.

B. General development standards are listed in Table 0.00.000(A) and in this chapter.

**TABLE 0.00.000(A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Single Family Zone - DU/Acre or SF/DU</th>
<th>R-4 or R-10,000</th>
<th>R-6 or R-7,200</th>
<th>R-8 or R-5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Floor Area per Cottage</td>
<td>1,000 to 1,400 SF</td>
<td>975 to 1,200 SF</td>
<td>950 to 1,100 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Level Max Floor Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Percentage of Cottages</td>
<td>700 to 800 SF</td>
<td>675 to 750 SF</td>
<td>650 to 700 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>800 to 900 SF</td>
<td>800 to 850 SF</td>
<td>700 to 800 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Units Allowed in Place of Each Zone:</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR Allowed by Main floor &lt; 701 to 751 SF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main floor &gt; 750 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Size - Min and Max</td>
<td>4 and 12</td>
<td>4 and 12</td>
<td>4 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Limit - Average</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Height if &gt; 6:12 pitch</td>
<td>25 to 28 feet</td>
<td>25 to 28 feet</td>
<td>25 to 28 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Common Open Space/Cottage</td>
<td>400 to 500 SF</td>
<td>250 to 350 SF</td>
<td>200 to 300 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Distance between Structures</td>
<td>10 to 15 feet</td>
<td>6 to 10 feet</td>
<td>6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space per Cottage* (See also 0.00.000(C))</td>
<td>1.5 to 2.0</td>
<td>1.0 to 1.5</td>
<td>1.0 to 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Floor &lt; 701 SF</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0 to 2.0</td>
<td>1.0 to 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Floor &gt; 700 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Setbacks from Adjacent Property:</td>
<td>15 to 20 feet</td>
<td>7 to 10 feet</td>
<td>7 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15 to 20 feet</td>
<td>5 to 7 feet</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not less than</td>
<td>15 to 20 feet</td>
<td>7 to 10 feet</td>
<td>5 to 10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback from Public Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15 to 20 feet</td>
<td>10 to 15 feet</td>
<td>7 to 12 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Less than</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>7 to 10 feet</td>
<td>5 to 10 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Additional parking requirements and methods of modification.

1. 50% of adjacent street parking spaces may count towards meeting minimum parking space requirements; however, at least 1.0 space per cottage must be provided on site.

2. Parking may be reduced by 25% if there is bus service within 500 feet walking distance; however, there must still be at least 1.0 parking space per cottage on site.

3. Parking spaces that are provided on site shall be clustered to the side or rear of the development unless the site is accessed directly from an alley and the parking is screened from the public streets and adjacent properties.

D. Cottage orientation and application of current lot size requirements.

1. Cottages shall be oriented around the common open space.

2. Cottages may be developed as multiple cottages per parcel. Minimum lot sizes per unit do not apply. *(Note: An exception for cottage housing should be noted in the code where minimum lot sizes for residential zones are prescribed).*

E. Additional restrictions.

*(Additional possible restrictions include covered porches; pitched roofs; private yards; some parking with direct backup into the street.)*

**NOTES ON FORM OF MODEL ORDINANCE**

This model ordinance is not intended for adoption as is. The ordinance must be tailored to the needs of each individual jurisdiction. Also, the current code must be reviewed to ensure that the new cottage housing ordinance is consistent with all other code provisions. If amendments to other code language is necessary this can not be done by mere reference in this ordinance but requires a specific amendment. Each jurisdiction will have their own preferred form of adoption which will include such as things as a valid enacting clause, an effective date, a severability clause, and signatures of the appropriate officials.
Cottage Housing Examples

Ravenna Cottages

The Ravenna Cottages is a nine-unit project in Seattle's Ravenna/Greenlake neighborhood. Threshold Housing developed the project and all units have been sold to individual buyers at market prices. The project consists of six cottages facing each other across a central courtyard, and three carriage units that sit above a nine-car above-ground parking structure accessed from the alley. The Ravenna Cottages were built under the Seattle design demonstration program, which allows projects to be built that would not otherwise conform with existing zoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>10,500 sf. 0.25 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>Nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>37 units/acre net (no on-site right of way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type/Size of Units</td>
<td>Six detached cottages 850 sf. Three carriage units 830 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Lowest point on site to highest point of a structure is 40 feet. Tallest structure is 30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-backs</td>
<td>Fifteen feet front yard, Five feet side yard. Zero along alley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>Structures cover 55 percent of lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Courtyard of approx. 1800 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Nine covered stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year built</td>
<td>2000/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Condominium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales price</td>
<td>Cottages $288,000 to 308,000. Carriage units $258,000 to 268,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer profile</td>
<td>Single professionals, retirees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cottages at Poulsbo Place

Poulsbo Place is a planned unit development (PUD) just north of downtown Poulsbo, in Kitsap County. It is being developed by Security Properties. The 17.3 acre development was the former site of military housing. Four types of homes are being built, ranging from 870 square feet to 2250 square feet. The project includes a 3.7 acre section with 45 cottages arranged in clusters around common yards. Some front on the street while others front on walkways. Some have attached garages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>Overall development is 17.3 acres. Cottage portion covers 3.7 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>45 cottages in six clusters within the larger development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>12.2 units/acre, gross (including private roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type/Size of Units</td>
<td>Cottages. 870 to 1265 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Up to 20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-backs</td>
<td>3 feet side and rear, 10 feet front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>33.3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Courtyards within each cluster vary in size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>One covered space per unit. Some detached, some attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year built</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Fee simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales price</td>
<td>$149,000 to 180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer profile</td>
<td>Empty nester, retirees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenwood Avenue Cottage Homes

This cluster of eight cottages is being built in Shoreline, under its cottage zoning ordinance which permits cottages as a conditional use. The 35,000 square foot parcel sits behind two single family homes fronting on the street. The cottages in the rear are accessed by a driveway between the houses. The cluster employs six different designs, with two models repeated. They surround a lawn and pea patch garden and share a common building and storage shed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>34,755 sf. 0.8 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>10 units/acre gross (includes drive and parking area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type/Size of Units</td>
<td>Cottages. Between 968 sf. and 998 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>18-22 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-backs</td>
<td>Average of 10 feet on side and rear. Parking structure is five feet on front. Closest cottage 30 feet on front.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>575 sf per cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Eight covered spaces, seven uncovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year built</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Condominium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales price</td>
<td>$220,000 to 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer profile</td>
<td>Single professionals, women, empty nesters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STAFF REPORT

TO: Lakewood Planning Commission

FROM: M. David Bugher, Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director

MEETING DATE: March 4, 2015

SUBJECT: R1 and R2 Zoning Analysis

The community & economic development (CED) staff has been requested by the city manager and city council to examine methods by which to increase housing production in the City’s R1 and R2 zoning districts. To do this, amendments to the City’s land use and development regulations will likely be necessary. The attached PowerPoint provides information on current comprehensive plan designations and zoning classifications, identifies vacant and underutilized properties, reviews existing conditions and development patterns, and shows constraints. In future meetings, recommendations will follow for initiating amendments to the comprehensive plan and zoning maps.
RESIDENTIAL ESTATE

DESIGNATED LANDS

R1 & R2 ZONING DISTRICTS

Lakewood Planning Commission

March 4, 2015

Community Development & Economic Development Department
Purpose of this Presentation

Examine methods by which to increase housing production in the R1 & R2 zones:

- Review comprehensive plan;
- Review existing development regulations;
- Identify vacant & underutilized properties;
- Review existing conditions & current development patterns;
- Show constraints; &
- Resolution of Intent to amend comprehensive plan & zoning.
Comprehensive Plan Policies (2014)

LU-2.1: Target ten (10) percent of new housing units annually through 2030 to be affordable to upper income households that earn over 120 percent of county median income.

LU-2.2: Provide opportunities for large and medium lot single-family development.

LU-2.3: Utilize low-density, single family areas designations to provide opportunities for upper income development.

LU-2.4: Encourage larger lots on parcels with physical amenity features of the land such as views, significant vegetation, or steep slopes.

LU-2.5: Encourage construction of upper income homes on larger existing parcels.

LU-2.6: Encourage the construction of luxury condominiums adjacent to the lakes.

LU-2.7: Support site plans and subdivisions incorporating amenity features such as private recreation facilities, e.g., pools, tennis courts, and private parks to serve luxury developments.

LU-2.8: Increase public awareness of upper income housing opportunities in Lakewood.
R1 & R2 Purpose

18A.30.110

- The Residential 1 (R1) and Residential 2 (R2) zoning districts provide for a continuation of large residential lots in specific areas where a pattern of large lots and extensive tree coverage exists.

These zoning districts seek to:

- Preserve the identity of these residential areas;
- Preserve significant tree stands and riparian environments along lake shores and within stream corridors; &
- Reduce traffic volumes in the east-west arterial corridors.
Primary Permitted Uses R1 & R2 Zoning Districts 18A.30.130

- Single-Family Residential (Level 1)
- Type 1 Group Home
- Type 2 Group Home (Level 1)
- Daycare Facilities (Level 1)
- Outdoor Recreation (Level 1/2)
- Public Maintenance Facilities (Level 1)
- Transportation Facilities (Level 1)
- Communication Facilities (Level 1)
- Electrical Facilities (Level 1)
- Natural Gas Facilities (Level 1)
- Sewage Collection Facilities
- Stormwater Facilities (Level 1)
- Water Supply Facilities (Level 1)
- Residential Accessory Uses
- Continuation of private and commercial equestrian facilities already legally existing within the zone at the time of adoption of this title. Maintenance, repair and replacement of existing equestrian structures shall be permitted.
Administrative Uses R1 & R2 Zoning Districts
18A.30.140

- Type 2 Group Home (Level 2)
- Community and Cultural Services (Level 1)
- Daycare Facilities (Level 2)
- Religious Assembly (Level 1)
- Social Services (Level 1)
- Communication Facilities (Level 2)
- Lodging (Level 1)
- Expansion of private and commercial equestrian facilities already legally existing within the zone at the time of adoption of the zoning code (2001)
Conditional Uses R1 & R2 Zoning Districts

18A.30.150

- Community and Cultural Services (Level 2)
- Education (Level 1)
- Outdoor Recreation (Level 3)
- Public Safety Facilities (Level 2)
- Religious Assembly (Level 2)
- Electical Facilities (Level 2)
- Stormwater Facilities (Level 2/3)
- Waste Transfer Facilities (Level 1)
- Water Supply Facilities (Level 2/3)
# Development Standards

## R1 & R2 Zoning Districts

### 18A.30.160

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Maximum Density</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1.45 DUA</td>
<td>25,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>2.20 DUA</td>
<td>17,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Building Coverage</th>
<th>Impervious Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>Front yard/street setback</td>
<td>Garage/carpot setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development Standards**

R1 & R2 Zoning Districts

18A.30.160
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standards R1 &amp; R2 Zoning Districts 18A.30.160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: 35 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Design: Not required (18A.50.221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Preservation: Not required (18A.50.310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping &amp; Street Trees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (multiple citations):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two spaces per unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate paved vehicular maneuvering area shall be provided in front of any residential garage or carport. The minimum depth of paving shall be twenty (20) feet from the front of the garage or carport and the minimum width shall be the total width of the garage or carport vehicular access opening(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paving w/asphalt &amp; concrete is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Garage can be attached or detached, but must be located on the same property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence w/height at 6 feet is allowed when the property is adjacent to arterial streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Acres (Minus Open Space &amp; Private Roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Tax Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Lot Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units Per Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unique Features of R1 & R2 Lots

- A substantial number of lots have access using private roads.
  - Country Club Drive
  - Country Club Circle
  - Thornewood
  - Evergreen Terrace
  - Greendale
  - Numerous private driveways along Gravelly Lake Drive
  - Madera subdivision
  - Greystone subdivision

- Many of these roads are narrow and do not meet current fire code standards.

- Many of the lots are irregularly shaped.

- Underlying critical areas and flood plain regulations will restrict all future development on Chambers and Clover creeks.

- 25% of the lands along Chambers Creek, even though zoned R2, are under existing conservation easements (RCW 84.34).
Where Do We Go Next?

- At an upcoming Commission meeting, CED staff will submit preliminary proposals for comprehensive and zoning map changes.
- Focus areas will be on selected parcels in the Interlaaken area.
- No ‘spot zoning’.
- Options will be provided.
- Staff will seek consensus from the commission for the consideration of a Resolution of Intent to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning maps.
Questions?