

Duplex dwellings	X P	X P	X P	P ¹	P ¹	P	P	P
Triplex dwellings	P	P	P	P	P	P ²	P ²	P ²
Quadplex dwellings	P	P	P	P	P	P ²	P ²	P ²
Single-family attached dwelling units (townhouses)	R/A ³	R/A P ³	R/A P ³	R/A P ³	R/A P ³	P	P	P
Cottage housing	X P	X P	P	P	P	P	P	P

¹ Expand to permit on all lots; currently limited to corner lots only.

² Create specific use permitted outright; currently permitted as multifamily requiring site plan review.

³ Permit outright; currently limited to PUDs limited by overall density. PUD requirement would continue to apply in R1-20.

We believe this is the right range of housing types for this phase of implantation and provides greater flexibility to allow for a variety of missing middle housing types on underdeveloped lands.

We believe it makes sense to continue to require a PUD for townhouse development in the R1-20 zone to preserve open space and balance density with a high-quality community, but townhouses should be allowed outright in R1-5 through R1-10 zones.

Lot sizes (HO-1, HO-4).

We agree that it is key to scale lot sized appropriately to accommodate an increased density and a variety of housing types. We also believe bold changes are necessary to make a significant impact and match the missing middle housing to density. We think it would be appropriate to reduce the minimum lot size for detached single-family dwellings in the R1-5 through R1-7.5 to at least the minimums noted in bold:

	R1-20	R1-10	R1-7.5	R1-6	R1-5	R-12 OR- 15	R-18 OR- 18	R-22 OR- 22
Single-family detached dwelling	20,000 ????	40,000 <u>8,500</u>	7,500 <u>6,500</u> 6,000	6,000 <u>5,500</u> 4,500	5,000 <u>4,500</u> 3,000	2,800	1,800	1,500
Duplex	<u>20,000</u>	<u>8,500</u>	<u>6,500</u>	40,000 <u>5,500</u>	8,000 <u>4,500</u>	4,000 ¹	4,000 ¹ <u>3,600</u>	4,000 ¹ <u>3,000</u>
Triplex	<u>20,000</u>	<u>8,500</u>	<u>6,500</u>	6,000	<u>6,000</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>5,400</u>	<u>4,500</u>
Quadplex	<u>20,000</u>	<u>8,500</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>7,200</u>	<u>6,000</u>
Townhouse	n/a	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	2,800 <u>2,000</u>	1,800	1,500

We think the minimum lot sizes as proposed for Townhouses is appropriate and that any further restrictions reduce the feasibility of delivering missing middle housing throughout the County.

Density (HO-1, HO-4).

We agree that in order for the new minimum lot sizes and proposed middle housing types to be feasible to develop, concurrent revisions to maximum density standards would be needed to fully implement the strategies. We believe the maximum density permitted per zone should reflect the

housing type *and* be based on the average minimum lot size allowed in that zone. We think there needs to be careful consideration as it relates to maximum density to ensure the full density can be realized per each site and per housing type.

Minimum lot sizes per housing type may be the most appropriate mechanism to effectively address the intensity of missing middle housing development. The concept option to introduce maximum densities specific to each type of housing and the corresponding lot size might be the most effective way to achieve this. Generally, minimum, and maximum density and lot sizes should make sense for each product type and zone so that it provides maximum flexibility and minimizes unintended restrictions or contradictions. Differentiated density standards for individual middle housing types based on proposed minimum lot sizes would be more effective at addressing the overall intensity of development while promoting more efficient and varied development patterns. Incentives for greater flexibility could still be provided in addition the base zone minimums.

Lot coverage (HO-1, HO-4).

We believe that like minimum lot sizes and maximum density, maximum lot coverage should be determined based on product type and zone and that lot coverage and dimensional standards that are the same for all residential development types and zones would significantly reduce product variety and unintentionally restrict missing middle and small lot development. We support the option to explore a tiered approach allowing greater coverage for more, smaller units. We also agree that we do need another way to measure lot coverage that is more specific to building footprints. The lot coverage should incentivize small/missing middle housing types and improve development feasibility. For example, a single-level home in a smaller lot would have a higher lot coverage than a two-story home on the same lot because the building footprint for a single-level home is naturally bigger, but a single-level home may be perceived as less intense/less dense. If the lot coverage requirement were the same for both product types, it would be less feasible to build the small, single-level home as it would require more land to meet the lot coverage standard.

Development standards (HO-1, HO-4, HO-8).

We understand the importance of development standards to ensure quality new development and integration into existing neighborhoods. We think it is less urgent to focus on further limitations as they relate to orientation, garage/driveway location, etc., than to create the opportunity for development of missing middle housing in the County.

Parking reductions (HO-5, HO-6).

We think the parking reductions as proposed for missing middle housing is sufficient. We are also supportive of further reductions.

Compact subdivision (HO-2).

We fully support smaller scale single-family detached homes on smaller lots, increasing densities while downscaling the size of individual homes. We do not think that this strategy should be limited to County mapped parcels. We also do not think that these should be limited to a minimum or maximum site size. A 'small PUD' option is worth exploring as long as it does not limit the site size where a 'small PUD' would be permitted. Highly desirable communities with small homes, small yards on small lots could be designed on sites both smaller and larger than 6-acres and provide much needed and much more attainable opportunities for detached single-family homeownership. A new small/compact subdivision ordinance, separate from existing or prior PUD, infill, or cottage housing options would likely be the most effective to implement this strategy. We support the concept of increasing density (similar to the cottage cluster) of up to 200% and preserving open space by requiring a small percentage to be required per lot (with **no** restrictions or limitations to the location or orientation of the lots/homes or open space). We believe the compact subdivision should be permitted in zones R1-5 through R1-10 at a minimum.

Thanks,
Lindsey

Lindsey Sonnen | Principal Planner

✉ lindsey@ginngrp.com

☎ [360-768-5028](tel:360-768-5028)



GINN
GROUP™



Building Something More

This e-mail message may contain confidential or legally privileged information and is reserved only for the use of the intended recipient(s). Do not forward this message without sender approval.

Unrestricted Content