

Public Comments on FIRST DRAFT Anacortes Muncipal Code Title 19

First Draft Developoment Regulations [made public 11/10/2017]

First Draft Parking Chapter [made public 12/18/2017]

First Draft Signs Chapter [made public 12/8/2017]

First Draft Fences, Walls & Hedges Chapter [made public 2/2/2018]

NOTE:

The comments within this document pertain to the 1st Draft of the proposed devleopment regulations update, and were received between November 2017 and April 26, 2018.

The 2nd Draft was released on April 27, 2018, and included reorganization of some of the chapters; therefore, chapter and section citations may not correspond between the 1st and 2nd Drafts.

DIVISION 1 - General and Legislative Provisions; DIVISION 2 - Procedures; DIVISION 3 - Permits; Division 7 - Environment; DIVISION 8 - Development Agreements

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
1	11/15/2017	Email	Jeff Mount	19.12 Definitions	1) Changing the term assisted living to senior implies that everyone in those facilities is a senior, which is probably not the case.	Term has been changed to assisted living facility.
2	11/15/2017	Email	Jeff Mount	19.12 Definitions	2) The definition of religious institution says they are tax empty. That should probably say tax exempt.	We missed edit in second full draft, but have now updated master doc to say tax "exempt"
3	11/15/2017	Email	Jeff Mount	19.12 Definitions	3) The definition of service station seems to describe something that doesn't exist	Term has been removed from draft
4	11/15/2017	PDF scan	Tom Allen	19.12 Definitions	Definition of open space is unclear. Unclear if decks stacked on top of each other conflicts with definition.	We missed the edit in second full draft, but have now updated master doc to say: "Open space" means that part of a property which is unobstructed by structures from the ground upward, unless otherwise noted for internal open space provisions in AMC 19.62.040.
5	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	D. In the interest of implementing the housing diversity goals, while evidently ignoring the affordable housing goals of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan (See the Housing Element), a variety of "dwelling units" are defined at page 18 of the draft regulations. These various types of dwelling units are not consistent with Table LU-1 of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan and are not fully integrated into the proposed development regulations. Cottage housing, townhouses, small lot units were not addressed in the Residential & Employment Land Capacity Analysis Summary 7/10/15 or at Table LU-1 at Page I-16 of the Comprehensive Plan. As such there has been no analysis of their impact upon the capacity of the City's infrastructure. The housing element goal to provide greater housing diversity doesn't just mean different physical types of houses (high and narrow, wide and expansive, close together or not so close together). Housing diversity refers to affording housing to various types of households, individuals and families at various stages in their life cycle. Just increasing density in a variety of ways does nothing to achieve this goal.	The permitted housing type provisions in draft Table 19.41.040 are consistent with Table LU-1 and Policy LU-6.1 in the comprehensive plan.
6	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	"Low density multifamily" used at P. 74 is undefined anywhere and not used in the permitted uses or form and intensity sections.	The term was removed in the second draft
7	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	Page 24, Lot measurement. On what basis is the Director to determine "width" of "irregularly shaped lots? There has been a long history of applicants abusing the code to their advantage by proposing "irregular shaped lots so as to evade a provision or standard. If this discretion is allowed, all new development in Anacortes will be made up of "irregular" lots.	The term was removed in the second draft and substantial updates have been made to clarify lot design standards.
8	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	Consistent uses of definitions. Search the proposed code including the definitions with every definition. Make sure the definitions are consistently used in the regulatory context. If never used then they probably need not be included. But watch for words that warrant definitions such as: "gross square feet," "low density multifamily," "underlying lots," "frontage" "historical plats," "units" "boundaries" etc. (e.g. Anacortes has a history of established boundaries that are altered by surveyor hired by the developer).	Substantial edits were made to the definitions chapter in the second draft for internal consistency purposes.
9	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	How frontage is determined-"frontage" remains undefined yet it is used throughout the proposed development regulations and been the source of so much historical abuse.	A number of edits were made in the second draft involving the various uses of the term.
10	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	How are flag lot set-backs, side, back and front yards to be defined and measured?	Updated lot type definitions and provisions in 19.42.140 help to clarify this.
11	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	The current code includes a policy of limiting development to "buildable gross acres." How is that policy carried forward in the proposed development regulations?	Gross acre is used in key places in Tables 19.42.020-030.
12	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.12 Definitions	How are "assisted living facilities" managed in the regulations? In the definitions, there is no reference to "assisted living facilities" yet those words are used elsewhere in the code. "Senior citizen assisted housing" is defined but never used elsewhere in the proposed regulations. "Assisted living facilities" appears to be essentially deregulated. The entire history of the K Avenue memory care facility has been ignored or sanctioned.	See the new definition for assisted living in Chapter 19.12, provisions in the updated use charts, and provisions in 19.43.020. Also note that such facilities are subject to the site, building, and other project design standards in Division 6.

DIVISION 1 - General and Legislative Provisions; DIVISION 2 - Procedures; DIVISION 3 - Permits; Division 7 - Environment; DIVISION 8 - Development Agreements

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
13	2/28/2018	Email	Ken Hansen	19.12 Definitions and generally	I reviewed the draft Development Regulations and discussed this document with the Historic Preservation Board on the 14th. We knew the Comprehensive Plan would only provide preservation goals and objectives, so are disappointed that the listed regulations don't include more detail or "teeth." Is this document identifying all intended changes to Building Code, or just a little more detail than the Comp Plan? The statement "Historic resources, character and scale" does not really identify what we are trying to preserve. Understanding purpose of the draft document will help us determine if level of details is sufficient and meaningful. I do have one comment for page 23 - "Landmark building" means a structure recognized as historic or architecturally significant and so designated by the city council. (City Council only designates buildings on the local historic register, so recommend changing to - recognized as historic or architecturally significant through designation on a local, state, or national historic register.) I look forward to learning more on the changes and how we can help.	Some of the existing Old Town standards have been added back in 19.42.170 and supplement other density and dimensional provisions in the Division 4. The landmark definition edit wasn't caught in second draft, but added to the master for Planning Commission consideration. Otherwise, the density and dimensional standards edits, notably the inclusion of FAR maximum, are tools that are intended to promote historic preservation in residential neighborhoods. Other edits to the commercial/multifamily building design standards in Chapter 19.63 will be considered in the review process with the Planning Commission.
14	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.12 Definitions	Floor area. Definition is unclear, does it include garages?	Definition was updated in the second draft. For the purpose of FAR provisions, 500sf of attached or detached garage floor area is exempt from FAR calculations
15	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.12 Definitions	Building height. Roofs are not only flat, gambrel, or gable - most popular now is shed. Roofs are complex and may have many forms and heights. Suggests absolute height limit to provide predictability for expensive views. 35 feet needed for slopes, reduction to 25 feet is severe restriction and reduces possibility of a 3rd level.	The height limit has been updated to 30' in the second draft. This will likely be a topic of discussion in the Planning Commission's review.
16	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.12.020.A	"Area, site" or "site area" definition. A site should receive any FAR or building mass prior to dedication of any required public streets. A site should not be penalized for the street dedications.	Per the definition in the second draft, ROW's internal to the development would be included in the term, but excluding external streets. MAKERS and staff will discuss internally how this applies to additional ROW dedication areas. The intent is that if there are any areas along property edge that need to be dedicated for additional ROW improvements, those areas should be included in site area calculations. Edits consistent with this intent will be considered. ALSO, maximum FAR is no longer included in the mixed use/industrial zones.
17	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.12.020.H	"Height, building" or "building height" definition. This could penalize properties that sit lower in elevation than a city street. If there is an existing public street and your property sits lower, then you are effectively penalized. Don't you want the front door to match street elevation? If you record a final plat, you can modify the topography, so this is a loophole.	The definition and modifications of building height are currently being discussed and will likely be a topic of Planning Commission review.
18	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.12.020.M	"Mixed use". Simplify the definition. Suggest striking "is primarily residential and". Suggest striking the last sentence.	Edits will be made to the master draft consistent with the comments.
19	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.12.020.W	"Weather protection". Suggest replacing "blocks rain, snow, and sun" with "protects pedestrians from inclement weather".	Change made in the second draft
20	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.12.020.V	"Water based service uses". Suggest adding "but is not limited to" after the word "includes".	This term has been removed in the second draft
21	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.12.020.W	"Water based industrial uses". Suggest adding "but is not limited to" after the word "includes".	Already updated in the second draft

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
1	11/15/2017	PDF scan	Tom Allen	19.42.020 Residential Form and Intensity	Should maximum density of R4-A be 18 units per acre? Current is 28 and proposal is zero.	There is no proposed change from current 18du/acre max density in R4a (17.30.020)
2	11/15/2017	PDF scan	Tom Allen	19.43.030 Bonus Heights	Building owners, builders, or developers will shy away from annual monitoring disclosures and fee payments regarding affordable housing. May defeat intent of creating more housing.	We acknowledge the challenge. Staff has been meeting with stakeholders on the issue and further adjustments will likely be made
3	11/15/2017	PDF scan	Tom Allen	19.43.070 Building Height	Reduced 25 feet height maximum is too restrictive. Suggests raising to 30 feet or not changing this provision.	The updated draft shows 30'
4	11/16/2017	MS Word	Carl Colson	19.42 Building Height	The proposed 25' height limit (for the midpoint of sloped roofs) is in my opinion, a bit too low to allow for interesting home designs that are influenced by the steeper roof pitches of classic and traditional American homes. As an Architect who has designed hundreds of single family homes throughout Washington State, I have seen the effects of the different building heights allowed by different cities in our region. (I am also a property owner in Anacortes). I believe that the height limit of 28' would be much better and would allow more variety and visual appeal in homes designed with a sloping roof.	The updated draft shows 30'
5	11/16/2017	MS Word	Carl Colson	19.42 Building Height	Why do I feel that a 28' height limit would be better? Starting from the ground up, these are the following reasons: 1) Crawl space vents (Add 10"): Residential builders have put foundation vents in between the floor joists. This is not a good practice as it causes water damage and reduces the amount of floor insulation at these areas. The crawl space vents need to be installed in the concrete foundation wall and the building needs to be raised slightly to allow for proper venting of the crawl space to avoid moisture and mold problems. 2) Level 1 Ceiling Height (add 12"): Today's open space floor plans need a 9' ceiling height in order to avoid a cramped, low ceiling appearance in the living spaces. This additional ceiling height allows 12" more of windows, which are very important in letting light into our homes, so important in the winter months. 3) Level 2 Floor framing depth (add 8"): Washington States Energy Code state that putting the heating / cooling ducts within a conditioned air space greatly reduces the amount of heating / cooling that is lost if ducts are located in the attic or a crawl space. As a result, the ductwork should be located within the 2nd floor framing system. This framing system (open web wood joists) needs to be 18" deep to accommodate the ductwork. 4) Roof truss height at exterior wall (add 10"): Because Washington State Energy code requires R-49 attic insulation (15" thick), it is better to raise the roof truss at the exterior wall in order to have the full attic insulation thickness at the exterior wall, resulting in reduced energy needs and costs to the homeowner.	The updated draft shows 30'
6	11/16/2017	MS Word	Carl Colson	19.42 Building Height	How does a 25' height limit affect the design of homes in Anacortes? My thoughts are as follow: 5) One of the appeal of Anacortes is its collection of classic American home designs, many which have a roof pitch of 7-in-12, or greater. Based on the example on Page 2, a house 34' wide would only allow a roof pitch of 5.5-in-12, which visually results in a less visually appealing appearance. Many homes would be wider than 34', which would result in their roof pitch being even lower than the 5.5-in-12. 6) The vast majority of classic homes that many find appealing have roof slopes of 7-in-12 or greater, which is not possible for a great number of homes designed under the proposed 25' height limit 7) Many of the nice and very visually appealing homes in the older neighborhoods of Anacortes could not have been built if a 25' height limit was in effect at the time of their construction. 8) The proposed code changes have the 25' height limit both for cottage developments and for single family residential. This makes sense for the cottages, as they have a much smaller footprint. With larger homes having a larger footprint than cottages, their roofs would have to be a much shallower pitch to fit within the 25' height limit. 9) In the City's previous meeting documents, Makers Architects (the city's Planning Consultants) had included a building height of 30' and now the city is proposing a height limit of 25'. Having a compromise height of 28' would, in my opinion, result in a more visually appealing and energy efficient home design.	The updated draft shows 30'
7	11/16/2017	MS Word	Carl Colson	19.42 Building Height	This diagram below shows the roof pitch of a 34' wide house – many homes in Anacortes would be wider than this, which would result in even a lower roof pitch. The house below allows for a roof pitch of only 5.5-in-12, which is not very visually appealing. This drawing includes the items (listed on the previous page) that show why the building height needs to be raised to 28', rather than the proposed 25'. [MAKERS NOTE: SEE REFERENCED IMAGE IN WORD DOC]	The updated draft shows 30'
8	11/16/2017	MS Word	Carl Colson	19.42 Building Height	Anacortes Zoning Code Proposed Revisions for Single Family Residential Garage Setbacks The proposed code residential garage setback of 25' (from front property line) is increased 5' from the current code. The city wants to avoid the "Snout House" effect in which garages are located forward from the house, which results in a visually unappealing streetscape. As an architect, I agree with this in principal, however I feel that this code setback should not be applicable in all situations. If the garage doors face the street, then I think this code provision would be acceptable. If the garage doors are perpendicular to the street (as in a side-entry garage), I feel that the current code of a 20' setback for the garage sidewalls should be kept.	We've clarified the standard that the 25' setback applies to garages/doors that face the street.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
9	11/16/2017	MS Word	Carl Colson	19.42 Building Height	<p>Why do I feel that there should be this 20' setback for side loaded garages?</p> <p>1) Side loaded garages can have windows, modulated walls, and roofs that can give the garage side wall (which faces the street), much more appeal than a front loaded garage.</p> <p>2) When a car is parked in the driveway of a front loaded garage, the car is much closer to the street than a car parked in the driveway of a side loaded garage.</p> <p>3) When a car is parked in the driveway of a side loaded garage, the car is much further away from the street. Landscaping bushes and plants can be planted at the edge of the side loaded driveway to make the cars in the driveway even less visually dominant.</p> <p>4) For homes designed with a side entry garage, if they have to meet the 25' setback, this results in the loss of 5' in their backyard as a result of having to push the house further away from the street. On many of the smaller lots, a loss of 5' of usable backyard area is a significant loss.</p> <p>5) There are neighborhoods in Anacortes that have Home Owners Associations with rules (CCR's) that do not allow for front loaded garages to allow direct access from the street. With new homes to be built in those neighborhoods, the new owners face an immediate loss of 5' of their backyard areas, whereas all of their neighbors (who also have side loaded garages) have the full use of their backyards since their homes were built with their side loaded garages with a 20' setback, which is the current code standard.</p> <p>6) Many cities and counties in our area have the code requirement for garages being located a certain distance from the front property line. Only a few of the codes address the issue of setbacks of garage doors facing the street vs. side entry garage doors. The City of Anacortes should, in my opinion, allow for side entry garages to have a 20' setback, provided that this side wall (which faces the street) is not a "blank wall".</p> <p>7) The neighborhood on Washington Blvd. (near Washington Park) has a majority of the homes with side loaded garages (due to their HOA and CCR's) and these homes were all built with the 20' setback, which included garages at the 20' setback.. This streetscape is visually quite appealing proving that side loaded garages with 20' setbacks should be still allowed under the Anacortes Code requirements.</p>	We've clarified the standard that the 25' setback applies to garages/doors that face the street.
10	11/16/2017	MS Word	Carl Colson	19.42 Building Height	<p>Anacortes Zoning Code Proposed Revisions for Single Family Residential Upper Floor Side Yard Setbacks</p> <p>The proposed code requires a 7'-6" setback for the side yard setbacks for upper floors. This makes sense in a development or neighborhood where lots are adjacent to each other and where homes could be built with the first floor setbacks at 5'. This helps avoid the narrow "canyon" look between adjacent homes. What this section of the proposed code does not address are lots that have side easements on adjacent properties in which the easements cannot be built upon and thus, there is not a chance for these narrow "canyon" look between houses and daylight entering into the windows on the side walls is not reduced. I believe that there needs to be an exception in the code for lots in which their adjacent lots have conditions that they cannot build within 5' of the property line due to easements, wet areas, or slopes.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to provide you with my thoughts and comments on the proposed changes to residential section of the Anacortes code for single family residential projects. If you have any questions, comments, or would like to meet with me to review these items, please contact me.</p>	MAKERS discussed the issue with staff. Ultimately, it was suggested to keep the language as is (lot sizes large enough to allow options in placement of homes onsite, concern about providing for too many exceptions, limited application of issue, etc.)
11	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>The 11/10/17 draft regulations propose doing away with residential lot coverage limits, adding a limit on FAR ratios, and changing the way the heights are measured (both at the roof level and at the grade). These are significant changes to the rules that have been in place for many decades and should only be made if they achieve a substantial benefit or solve a serious problem.</p> <p>Since most of the city's homes have been built under those rules, it makes sense to ask questions like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a perceived problem just a few isolated instances about which someone is complaining loudly or a widespread concern? • Will the new rules actually solve the perceived problem? • Will the new rules create new problems in different situations? • Will the new rules support goals of the Comprehensive Plan in the long term, even if they create some neighborhood anomalies in the short term? • Will changing the rules improve a situation in one neighborhood but create new problems in another neighborhood with different existing structures? • What about application of the rules to uphill and downhill sloping lots, those oriented N-S vs. E-W, areas with or without storm sewers or sidewalks, large lots vs. small lots, etc. <p>I am particularly concerned that doing away with lot coverage limits and using FAR instead will have some negative consequences, especially with larger homes on larger lots (although setback increases could mitigate some of those).</p> <p>Here are a few of my specific concerns and comments about the proposed 11/10/17 draft code:</p>	The draft provisions are based on a combination of goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, stakeholder interviews, and public workshops about concerns of new developments being out of scale with existing development. We surveyed workshop participants and others about various concepts including FARs and we retained those concepts that received public support.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
12	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>FAR RATIOS</p> <p>The zoning code should be concerned with external impacts and appearances, bulk and scale, not how much floor area is inside the building. Decide how high the building can be, how far it must set back from the neighbors, and how much area it can cover, then let the user decide how many floors to put inside, how tall the ceilings are, and how to subdivide the spaces.</p> <p>For many decades our codes have allowed two-story and three-story houses to cover the same lot area as single-story houses, and this has not created a problem. The proposed FAR limits say that you can't have a full size second or third story unless you reduce the size of the ground level. Why? What are you trying to achieve? Does FAR, in fact, achieve it? What is "visual bulk"? If I'm standing next to it at ground level, even a single story may seem bulky. This draft doesn't deal with different impacts depending on where the structure is located on the property - it would still allow a taller structure to be 5' from the side lot lines even if the footprint is smaller.</p> <p>And it doesn't acknowledge that the "visual bulk" appears different if you are standing uphill or downhill from a structure on a sloping lot. The public view from the street may be very different from the adjacent neighbor's view at the side or rear.</p> <p>The proposed exclusions (below) would disadvantage someone with a garage or ADU that is within the house structure, because it would count against the FAR but a detached one wouldn't.</p>	
13	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>19.42.060 – Floor area ratio calculations. (NEW)</p> <p>The maximum floor area ratio calculations set forth in AMC 19.42.020 above, include the total floor area of all buildings on a lot, excluding elements described below, divided by the area of the lot. Floor area with ceilings over 17.5 feet in height are counted twice. why does empty space count? why are tall ceilings penalized? what does this accomplish?</p> <p>Certain elements which do not contribute to visual bulk what is "visual bulk"? why are we trying to limit it? what are reasonable limits? are exempt from floor area ratio calculations:</p> <p>A. Subterranean basements, including underground parking areas.</p> <p>If we are regulating floor area ratio (rather than lot coverage) why should someone with a basement be allowed to build substantially more floor area than someone on a flat lot?</p> <p>B. Daylight basements.</p> <p>If we are regulating floor area ratio (rather than lot coverage) why should someone with a sloping lot be allowed to build substantially more floor area than someone on a flat lot?</p> <p>And if we are regulating "visual bulk" why is there no difference whether it slopes up or down from the street or the adjacent neighbor?</p> <p>C. Detached accessory dwelling units.</p> <p>If there is no lot coverage limit, an ADU on an alley could cover most of the rear setback with no compensating reduction in the size of the main structure with this exemption. It should count in the total.</p> <p>D. Detached garages accessed from an alley.</p> <p>If there is no lot coverage limit, a garage on an alley could cover most of the rear setback with no compensating reduction in the size of the main structure with this exemption. It should count in the total.</p> <p>E. Accessory storage structures and sheds no larger than 144 square feet and 12 feet in height.</p> <p>This makes sense, but only one shed should be exempted.</p>	<p>The 17.5' height floor spaces add extra bulk to the structure - at least that was the intent in including that provision. Per comments received, we're suggesting that provision be removed in the updated draft.</p> <p>Notable adjustments being examined in the updated draft: (1) We've added a minimum landscaped area for all the residential zones (after examining lot development concepts for each); (2) We're suggesting that accessory structures be located so that lots meet minimum usable open space provisions.</p>
14	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>With these proposed exemptions, you would be allowed to cover virtually the entire rear setback with accessory structures (garage and ADU) if on an alley, and they wouldn't count if detached. That reduces the usable rear yard open space to virtually nothing.</p> <p>But if you want to put the ADU and/or garage within the house volume, or you want to attach them, or you have no alley, everything has to fit in the area available within the setbacks.</p> <p>That's not treating people equally. If the detached garage and ADU is NOT exempted, then whether they are attached or not, the same limits would apply to everyone with the same size lot in the same zone. That would be more fair.</p> <p>On larger lots there is a discrepancy in how various zones are treated because the proposed FARs are so different (.80 in R3 and .45 in R2). Take the case of a 12,000 sf lot (two 60x100's). If it's in an R3 zone you could build 9600 sf of floor area (plus a 1,000 sf garage and 900 sf ADU if you're on an alley). But if you have a 12,000 sf lot in an R2 zone you can only build 5,400 sf of floor area and you probably don't have an alley. Do we really want to make it possible to build almost twice as big a house in the R3 zones as in the R2 zones on the same size lot?</p>	<p>See note above about requiring minimum usable open space when siting accessory structures. Otherwise, the exemption for detached garages/ADUs off of alleys were to promote alley access and to encourage the development of ADU's</p>

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
15	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>LOT COVERAGE</p> <p>Lot coverage is a tried and true way to assure a certain percentage of open space on a lot. All structures that occupy part of the open space count, regardless of their height or purpose or location on the lot. Lot coverage is easy to compute and does not require complicated definitions of ceiling heights or whether the structure is detached.</p> <p>The current lot coverage percentages allow a larger house to be built in the R3 zones than on the same size lot in the R2 zones. I don't see the value in that. Requiring larger minimum lot sizes in the R2 zones already creates less density. Why is it reasonable to also require smaller houses on the same size lots? Suggest changing these percentages.</p> <p>I disagree with the comment that using lot coverage encourages more surface parking. People like garages. But what's wrong with surface parking? Control it with limits on impervious surface if it's a problem, rather than dictating where residents and their guests.</p> <p>I urge you to keep the lot coverage concept and forget about FARs. Keep it simple.</p>	We've added new minimum landscaped area standards and minimum usable open space standards - if and when accessory structures are proposed.
16	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>SETBACKS FOR DETACHED STRUCTURES</p> <p>The draft includes these clauses:</p> <p>c. Detached garages placed off of an alley must be setback at least 15 feet from the primary structure.</p> <p>c. Detached ADUs placed off of an alley must be setback at least 15 feet from the primary structure.</p> <p>While the intent to provide some open space is laudable, this is totally unworkable in real life. It would prohibit adding any such structures on most existing developed lots, because the available rear setback is only 20 ft. so would not be enough space for a garage. For a new house, assuming 20 ft. is needed for the garage, it would require the house to be 35 ft. from the alley (or 45 ft. if it's entered perpendicularly). That doesn't leave much space for the house.</p> <p>A more sensible approach would be to require open space on each lot, but not dictate that it has to be between two structures. Let the particulars of the design determine the best location.</p> <p>This requirement also discriminates between someone with a detached garage or ADU and one with an attached garage or ADU (which does not require such a separation).</p>	We're suggesting to delete the 15' setback between structures and apply the minimum usable open space provision - which should allow more flexibility to place detached structures and meet the open space objective. Also - we figure the building/fire code will somewhat address the seperation issue.
17	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>SECOND STORY SETBACKS</p> <p>The intent of this requirement is unclear. Is it (1) to provide more daylight between houses, (2) keep a tall house from "looming" over a shorter house, (3) reduce looking into neighboring yards from upper windows, (4) reduce the apparent bulk of the house - or what? I doubt that it will accomplish any of those objectives.</p> <p>Draft code proposes:</p> <p>Interior side setback, minimum 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</p> <p>Interior side setback - second story, minimum 10 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5</p> <p>(1) It makes no sense structurally in building a house to set the second story walls in 2.5 ft from the first story walls because they would not be resting on the walls below and would require separate (more costly to build) support plus a roof on the lower floor projection.</p> <p>Since lots are oriented many different directions, and roofs may slope many different ways, this requirement would only increase the useful "daylight plane" in a few cases and elsewhere would just result in unnecessary complexity with little or no benefit. If more daylight between houses is truly needed, just increase the setback, don't add complexity</p>	The intent is to preserve livability and compatibility while minimize negative impacts to owners who want to build on their property. The 7.5 setback is a compromise and seemingly easier to understand than the previous proposed daylight plane provision. Currently, the setbacks are 5'min but 15' combined in R-2 and up. So the two 7.5 setbacks are =. If builders don't want to have a building with a setback, they can simply set the whole building back 7.5 feet.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
18	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>(2) A 2-story wall only "looms" over the neighbor if they have a 1-story house. If most of the houses in the neighborhood are 2-story, it would fit right in, and a typical neighborhood has a variety of one and two story homes. Two-story homes are normal in an urban area. Rather than have a second-story setback requirement, it makes more sense to relate the whole required setback to the total height of that section of the wall. For example, a wall up to 12 ft. high could have a 5 ft. setback, a wall over 12 feet high must be set back 10 ft. Thus, a 2-story house would have a 10 ft. setback, but could have a single-story wing with only a 5 ft. setback. A dormer or gable end that's within the roof volume wouldn't count. Keep it simple.</p> <p>(3) Setting a wall back 2.5 ft. won't prevent looking into neighboring yards or windows. And if they're both two-story houses people can look directly across into the neighboring windows no matter how far apart they are.</p> <p>In fact, any time there is a second story window, no matter how far it's set back, one can see into adjacent yards and windows. So a setback requirement will not address that concern.</p> <p>(4) The setback method suggested under (2) above could also reduce the apparent bulk of a taller house by giving it more space on the sides, thus making it feel less crowded on the lot.</p> <p>There are many examples in Old Town of large older homes that don't feel out of scale because they have nice wide side yards.</p> <p>One way of addressing the concern about an unusually large house overpowering a neighborhood, would be to increase the side setbacks as the total width of the structure increases, so that a wider house would require a proportionally wider lot with more "breathing room" between it and the neighbors.</p> <p>Possible way to address bulk (if it's really a problem):</p> <p>If the structure is up to 60 ft. wide (i.e. a 75 ft. wide lot with 15 ft. total setbacks, which has been the norm for many years, and has not created significant issues) then the basic side setbacks would apply. Then if the width is over 60 ft. the minimum would be 10 ft. per side, and the setback on each side would increase by 1 inch per foot of added width. Thus an 80 ft. wide house would require 11'-8" setbacks on each side (10'+20"), so it would need a lot at least 103'-8" ft. wide (or if it's a narrower lot you have to make the house narrower).</p>	This concept was (and still could be) considered. For this draft - the simple 7,5 second story setback was selected for its simplicity and fairness from current code provisions.
19	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>VIEW CORRIDORS IN NON-RESIDENTIAL ZONES</p> <p>This is well intentioned, but doesn't work in real life. Skinny little "view corridors" really don't add any value, since most people are driving by and you can't actually see the bay unless you're looking straight east between buildings - in a few seconds you've passed the "view". Instead of a bonus height, why not simply allow 40 ft. height (same as R4 across the street) and keep it simple. Streets and parking lots can be the view opportunities.</p> <p>Or if you want to offer height bonus for a view corridor, make it at least 50 ft wide so there really is a view. Views from R Ave. can be blocked by off-site buildings east of T Ave.</p> <p>View corridors do not provide views for residents on the west side of R because apartment window rarely line up directly with the view corridor.</p> <p>People on the hill by the high school may not appreciate taller buildings being "bonused" into their view of the bay just so drivers on R can get a peek-a-boo of the water.</p>	The 11 references to "view corridor" in the draft have all been deleted. However, one concept has been added in on the central waterfront site to implement a policy from the Comprehensive Plan - to provide a continuous east west mixed or pedestrian only access through the site to the water. While the ultimate views won't be likely be substantial, such provision will provide a good physical connection leading to the water.
20	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>FARS IN NON-RESIDENTIAL ZONES</p> <p>Get rid of FARs. Decide how high the building can be and how much area it can cover, then let the user decide how many floors to put inside and how to subdivide it. Keep it simple. Give the businesses flexibility depending on the use. This also gives flexibility if the use changes over time (for example, if they want to add a mezzanine in a high-bay area). Floor area is useful for parking requirements, exiting and some other things, but not as a concept for deciding how big the building can be.</p>	There are no proposed FARs in nonresidential zones.
21	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>IMPERVIOUS SURFACE LIMITS</p> <p>Limits on impervious surface serve at least three purposes: ground water recharge (which may not be an issue in an developed urban area with a remote water source), reducing volume in the stormwater system (which is a problem here, especially during storms), and providing space for trees and other green growing vegetation.</p> <p>If limits on impervious surface are developed, be sure they achieve those purposes and are coordinated with stormwater management requirements and landscaping regulations, while allowing a reasonable paved area for driveways and patios beyond the lot coverage percentages.</p>	After much consideration, we've removed minimum impervious area standards and added minimum landscaped area standards. Why? Stormwater requirements are likely to play a stronger role in influencing pervious and impervious area while accommodating functional flexibility whereas the landscaped area provision ensures a minimum. The standards are purposely higher for residential zones where the landscaped environment is most important.
22	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	<p>DENSITY</p> <p>I thought we had decided to eliminate density measures and let the market determine how many units to fit in a building of a certain size. For example, if the building footprint is 3,000 sf, with 3 floors, there could be two 1,500 sf units per floor or four 750 sf units per floor or three 500 sf units per floor (or some combination of sizes). The bulk and scale of the building would be the same for neighborhood appearance (bulk and scale) regardless of the unit configuration, and we would be likely to get more variety of units. Parking requirements might limit some options.</p>	The density maximums have only been retained in certain residential districts - particularly as a measure to limit the use of multi-unit housing units in subdivisions (as most zones allow some mix of these) consistent with comprehensive plan policies and community preferences.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
23	12/4/2017	MS Word	Cynthia Richardson	19.42 Form and Intensity	MAP Since the zone edges extend into the water, the map will be more useful if it shows the shoreline so one can see what LAND the zone applies to.	Concept will be considered in map edits.
24	12/8/2017	MS Word	Tom Decker	19.43.030 Bonus Heights	Height bonus provisions: The height bonus incentive program is an example of new approach that should work better for our community as we promote more housing density. My concern, however, is in the details. One interpretation is that builders and owners would be required to pay annual monitoring fees as part of the program. If the cost of these "bonuses" in the form of fees and monitoring expense becomes too high, builders and owners will be much less likely to take advantage of the program. If so, the flexibility offered by the city will go unused. I recommend keeping the bonus program as inexpensive, simple and straightforward as possible to increase its use. On a related point, as an incentive to provide appropriate housing density, I would like to see the "height bonus" available to multi-family structures that include smaller footprints. This approach would help provide a housing scale that fits with the flavor in Anacortes. Another positive step would be reductions in building impact fees to encourage multi-family projects.	City staff has been speaking with stakeholders about the bonus provisions and the City will be discussing/considering options for the bonuses (attempting to structure the provisions to encourage their use, while meeting community objectives to provide compatible forms of affordable housing).
25	12/8/2017	MS Word	Tom Decker	19.42 Form and Intensity	Encourage smaller homes. Anacortes needs to encourage housing at a variety of price points to benefit families and seniors. As a general comment, I encourage the planning commission and City Council to look for ways to encourage compact, well-designed development of individual smaller homes in the 600 to 900 square foot range, separate from the Accessory Dwelling Unit concept.	Cottage housing is the primary concept in the draft code that encourages such homes. But while these housing types are cheaper than their larger standard counterparts, they often aren't the most affordable forms of housing due to their detached nature typically higher cost/sf. Nevertheless, they provide a good niche housing option that's not currently available.
26	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.41 Permitted Uses	<input type="checkbox"/> At Page 83 and 84, "townhouses" are permitted conditionally or outright in the R3, R3A, R4 and R4A zones. At page 117, there are no form or intensity standards other than footnote 2 at page 85 (4 units per structure). How many townhouses will be permitted given either a 4500 square foot minimum lot size or a 3000 square foot lot size? Why make the limit 18 dwelling units in the R4A zone but otherwise unlimited? Like cottage housing, how will permitting townhouses impact the capacity limit of the waste water treatment plant? Will any of the land cost reductions help to meet any of the affordable housing goals of the Plan? See the above regarding cottage housing. Macro analysis infrastructure capacity is not sufficient, the existing infrastructure down to the individual block level must be addressed and upgrade costs appropriately assessed	The maximum density or minimum lot size provisions were intentionally included in all but the R4 zone to limit the number of townhomes that could be integrated on sites the the zones. In the R4 zone, the density of townhomes will be limited by parking, setbacks, floor area ratio limits, and various site and building design standards in 19.43.010.H and Chapters 19.62-63.
27	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.44.090 Townhouses	At page 117, "townhouses" are subject to the "frontage standards" of Sec. 19.61.060 but at page 152, Ch. 19.61 only applies to non-residential and "multi-family" development. By definition "townhouses" are not "non-residential or "multi-family" and none of the residential zones are mentioned in Ch. 19.61. Sec. 19.44.080 only applies to single family small lot, duplex and triplex units so the 20 foot wide street frontage does not apply to townhouses. Do the drafters intend to allow townhouses to be aligned edgewise with the street like the single family homes on "H" Avenue?	The Landscaped block frontage provision has been removed and replaced with similar entry/façade provisions for townhouses.
28	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.44.080 Small Lots	"Small lot" is defined at page 18 as "less than 5000 square feet." Thus every lot in R3, R3A, R4 and R4A would be a deemed "small lot." At page 95, the proposed development regulations would allow an 80% FAR ratio on such small lots or 2400 square foot single family residence on a 3000 square foot lot. At page 142, the dwelling unit could be placed right on the property line with no set-back on one side of lot (18" of the eaves are evidently permitted to intrude on to the land of the adjacent property (?)).The opposite side yard could be as little as 10 feet wide and the lot could be as little as 30 feet wide (See page 94). Frontage to a road, private, drive or alley could be as little as 20 feet. (See page 115). Such provisions would allow a series of adjacent lots 30' wide by 100' deep each accommodating a two story dwelling 20' by 60' or 2400 square feet separated by a 10' strip. "Small lot" housing as envisioned in the proposed regulations was not addressed in the Residential & Employment Land Capacity Analysis Summary 7/10/15. How will the "small lot" deregulation in the R3, R3A, R4 and R4A zones impact the capacity limits of the wastewater treatment plant? Moreover, given the current market, a "small lot" home could readily sell for perhaps \$500,000 to \$700,000. Land costs for development have been reduced by at least half. Who benefits from this "small lot" regulation? What goal of the Comprehensive Plan is being implemented by the proposed "small lot" standards? And, how do "townhouses" fit with the "small lot" standards that include all of the R3, R3A, R4 and R4A zones. Does the Comprehensive Plan envision row housing on 3000 square foot lots aligned edgewise with a street or an alley separated by a distance of just 10 feet? The regulations would seem to allow such development? Again, for what purpose?	The residential zoning and small lot provisions are within the goal and policy provisions of the adopted comprehensive plan. The updated draft includes a combination of tools that don't exist today to help provide compatability while promoting infill development: Minimum usable open space, minimum landscaped area, and floor area ratio maximums.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
29	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.40.030 R1 Zone	Page 73 Sec. 19.40.030. The proposal to allow "other dwelling types, such as "accessory dwellings, cottage housing in the R1 zone, even conditioned on a CUP, are inconsistent with Table LU-1 of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan. What is more, the proposal is inconsistent with the stated purpose of the R1 "low density" zone including the lack of sufficient public facilities and is also inconsistent with 19.10.010, 19.12.040, 19.40.020 and 19.40.030. The phrase "other dwelling types, such as" is ambiguous. Is the language suggesting that townhouses for, example, might also be allowed with a CUP? One of the stated purposes for the time and money involved in this major rewrite of the development regulations is to "reduce ambiguity". "Other dwelling types such as" does not reduce ambiguity but rather increases it as noted above. This comment applies to all zones.	The proposed R1 provisions fall within the parameters of Table LU-1 in the comprehensive plan for the R1 designation: Principal uses & density: <i>Single-family detached dwellings are the predominant dwelling type. Other dwelling types, such as accessory dwellings and cottage housing, may be allowed under certain circumstances. The permitted base density is up to 2 dwelling unit per gross acre. Densities up to 4 units per gross acre may be permitted via a special review process.</i>
30	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.41.020 Uses permitted in Residential zones	Page 84 and 85 Sec. 19.41.020. The permitted use for cottage housing is inconsistent with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan at Table LU-1 and is also inconsistent with 19.10.010, 19.12.040, 19.40.020 and 19.40.030.	Table LU-1 also allows for cottage housing within the R2 and R3 designations
31	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.42.020 Uses permitted in residential zones	Bonus density is inconsistent with 2016 Comprehensive Plan at Table LU-1 and is also inconsistent with 19.10.010, 19.12.040, 19.40.020 and 19.40.030. R-1 density bonus is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan at LU-1.	Table LU-1 allows for bonus densities of up to 4 units/acre - same as what's proposed in the draft code
32	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.40.030.B Residential Low Density 2 (R2)	Page 73 Sec. 19.40.030B. The phrase "other dwelling types, such as" is ambiguous. Is the language suggesting that townhouses might also be allowed with a CUP? One of the stated purposes for the time and money involved in this major rewrite of the development regulations is to "reduce ambiguity". "Other dwelling types such as "does not reduce ambiguity but rather increases it as noted above.	Subject language has been removed.
33	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.41.020 Uses permitted in Residential zones	Page 83 Sec. 19.41.020 A and B are inconsistent with 2016 Comprehensive Plan at Page I-16, Table LU-1, and Sec. 19.40.030 of the proposed development regulation update.	Both the permitted use and density and dimensional charts fall within the parameters of the comprehensive plan for the whole range of zones.
34	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.41.020 Uses permitted in Residential zones	At 19.41.020, is it necessary to have both A and B tables. One with spots/circle and pictures and another with letters?	The first table has been removed.
35	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.41 Permitted Uses	Page 83, 84, and 85 are inconsistent with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan at P. I-16, Table LU-1 and internally inconsistent with Page 74 of the proposed development regulations. At Page 74, R3A is defined as "areas characterized by historical patterns of generally 3000 square foot lots" But at Page 94 the R3A zone is designated as 4500 square foot lots. Likewise R3 is not consistently used at page 74 and page 94.	The R3a concept was included in Table LU-1 of the comprehensive plan under the <i>Special topics to explore</i> " section under Residential Medium Density designation.
36	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.40.030.E Old Town (OT)	At page 75 Sec. 19.40.030E. One of the stated purposes for the time and money involved in this major rewrite of the development regulations is to "reduce ambiguity." "Other dwelling types such as "does not reduce ambiguity but rather increases it as noted above. <input type="checkbox"/> Page 75 is inconsistent with pages 83 and 84 with respect to "cottage housing."	Subject language has been removed.
37	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.41 Permitted Uses	Pages 75 through 77 are inconsistent with pages 83 and 89. Every type of residential use allowed in the R4 and R4A zones including townhouses, multifamily and live-work units are allowed in the CBD, Commercial and MMU zones. While this arguably might be appropriate, nothing in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan or the Residential & Employment Land Capacity Analysis Summary 7/10/15 support the ability of the City's infrastructure to accommodate the likely number of new dwelling units allowed.	Table LU-1 under the Residential High Density designation: Principal uses & density: <i>A mixture of single and multifamily dwelling units. Some commercial uses may be permitted. There is no prescribed density limit, except in designated areas away from downtown and South Commercial Avenue (up to 18 dwelling units per gross acre).</i>
38	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.43 Bonus Incentives	Bonus incentives, at page 104. All high density development is nothing short of a subsidy for development and should be conditioned upon meeting affordable housing goals in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Moreover, how would "bonus incentives" be greater than the density already being proposed? As such, there is no incentive and the provisions are likely to be ignored.	R1 is the only zone that includes a density bonus incentive. The other zones largely include height bonuses. Both are in-line with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan.
39	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.40.020 Zoning Map	Page 71 and 72, lots divided by zone boundary. This is the time to adjust boundaries so as to eliminate all such lots.	Staff agrees
40	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.42.080.F.3 Setback measurements for irregular lots	Page 102, why would a property line not be "readily determinable." Presumably the Director would decide whether a property line was not "readily determinable."	Per discussion with staff, suggest deleting the words: "any of the property lines are not readily determinable, or where"
41	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.44.080 Dwelling, single family - small lot, duplex & triplex	Page 115, why would there ever be circumstances where frontage would not be on an improved road.	The provision has been removed in the draft.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
42				19.41 Permitted Uses	Uses by zone. In the current code, most of the regulatory provisions are organized by a specific geographic zone. The proposed code is organized by regulatory function i.e., permitted uses, form and intensity, supplemental use criteria, block frontage, design, landscaping etc. All these regulatory functions must be treated consistently within each zone. There are a finite number of zones but a potentially unlimited number of regulatory functions. The current code has been poorly administered in the past. The propose code will be even more difficult to administer. There must be cross references throughout the code linking all applicable provisions.	The use chart has been substantially updated - including applicable cross references for each use to clarify the use definition and applicable standards.
43	2/14/2018	Email	Tom and Pam Allen	19.41 Permitted Uses	1) Where exactly will anyone who wants to build a detached living unit that is not an ADU, cottage, or townhouse on allowable medium density R2, R3, R4 & C parcels with an existing house going to be rejected? Will they be told that they can only build under the ADU or cottage square footage and design rules? A separate living unit such as the one we designed on H Ave will not be allowed because it does not pass the ADU or cottage rules? Point out where in Title 19 that this exclusion is applied.	19.43.010(B)(2)(b) in the new draft allows for a second detached single family dwelling unit on a lot provided the applicable one dwelling unit/minimum lot area for single-family dwellings is met
44	2/14/2018	Email	Tom and Pam Allen	19.41 Permitted Uses	2) If I have an R4 vacant parcel and I want to build two separated buildings, where will I be told that I failed to meet the criteria? Will we be forced to build one large building that is a more massive addition to a residential neighborhood? Point out where in Title 19 that this plan of two separated buildings will be rejected.	The draft code has been clarified that multiple single family dwellings can be placed on one lot. In the case of the R4 zone, you would need 6,000 square feet to have two detached single family dwellings. Multifamily forms of housing here are encouraged on purpose, to provide more efficient and affordable housing forms, provided they meet other applicable design standards.
45	2/14/2018	Email	Tom and Pam Allen	19.41 Permitted Uses	3) What if I own a medium density parcel (R3, R4) with an existing home that I have lived in for 20 years and I want my children to build a home on the parcel right next to me that they can live in? Are they forced to only be able to build an ADU or cottage type under those restricted rules? Or do they have to attach their home to mine by breezeway or shared garage? This forces stupid design and trust us people will try to design around a stupid code.	The draft code has been clarified that multiple single family dwellings can be placed on one lot, provided they meet applicable maximum density standards (R1, R2, and R2a), or in R3 or R4 zone case, the minimum lot size standard (R3 zone, 2 units allowed on a 9,000 square foot lot). Note that the parameters included here were directed by the adopted comprehensive plan.
46	2/14/2018	Email	Tom and Pam Allen	19.41 Permitted Uses	4) Are we asking for more detail wording in the 19.40.030 Residential Zones Established area of the code with an additional defined "type" of building, such as "detached residential"? Or, are we needing to get an additional "type" of use added to the Chapter 19.63 Building Design? We need an answer to this to be knowledgeable when talking to other contractors, realtors, developers and community members about these upcoming code changes.	This language has been removed.
47	2/14/2018	Email	Tom and Pam Allen	19.41 Permitted Uses	The Makers/COA staff team that is writing this code should be applying "what if scenarios" (like #1, #2 and #3 above) to the new code. If they are not, then they are leaving bombs in the code for the community to suffer the fallout. I know several community members that have purchased or have been living on larger parcels with existing homes that are planning on adding their own new retirement unit to the parcel later. Your current code will prevent them from doing that without tearing down the perfectly acceptable living unit that already exists on the property or attaching their new residence to the existing unit that has a large enough land area for an additional home. This question is for non-ADU and cottage housing. It is also for detached multi-family.	We agree - and we've been testing the form and intensity standards with numerous site development examples to help test the full range of form and intensity standards. We've adjusted standards in some cases as a result of this testing.
48	2/14/2018	Email	Tom and Pam Allen	19.41 Permitted Uses	The lack of conversation in the code about residential units that are other than ADUs or cottages or townhouses appears to be targeted very specifically at "leaving out" the ability to build any other type of detached living units except under the strict interpretation and design rules of ADUs, cottages, and townhouses. I see this a having a big negative impact on more workforce housing or market housing in the multi-family sector. It also forces building design of a singular massive footprint instead of multiple footprints. I don't care how many articulation or bump out design rules you insert in the code. One big building is more massive than two medium buildings.	The current code's allowance of multiple detached structures to meet the definition of multifamily has been removed, as it's been recognized as a loop hole to allow single family dwellings smaller than the lot size minimum. The cottage housing provisions are a unique exception to this and come with their own unique set of design standards.
49	3/16/2016	PDF letter	Cory Ertel	19.42 Form and Intensity	50 feet height limit and CUP beyond that height is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of permitting uses and current use patterns. New 50 foot structures would not be readably visible beyond the refinery and past installations have not required a CUP. Other large refineries do not have height limits in their zones in Washington state; a small refinery in Tacoma is subject to a 100 feet limit. Option 1: add "refinery facilities" to the exemptions in 19.42.070.D. Option 2: No height limit, but 1 foot setback for each additional foot of height over 50 feet. Option 3: Seattle approach with no height limit to start with, but height limits closer to adjoining land uses (least desired option).	The updated draft includes option 2.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
50	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42 Form and Intensity	Why FAR? More complicated than current lot coverage and height restrictions, unclear if those existing provisions are not working. Are homes too big?	FAR has been suggested as a way to ensure that homes are compatible with the scale and character of existing homes in the neighborhood/zone. Some adjustments have been made to what's included and excluded in FAR to allow greater flexibility in the design of homes
51	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42.060 Floor area ratio calculations	Unclear why 17.5 feet or more high ceilings are double counted, would force builders to not build "open to below" features	Provision was originally added - as such features add to the visual bulk of a home. This provision, however, has been removed from the updated draft.
52	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42.060 Floor area ratio calculations	Parking areas already exempt from definition from "floor area", don't need to say it twice by exempting it in FAR.	This provision along with floor area definition have been updated to provide clarification
53	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42.060 Floor area ratio calculations	Daylight basement FAR exemption exempts two floors as most homes have daylight basements. Could be a loophole and more people will build them, resulting in larger homes.	Term has been removed in the updated draft.
54	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42.060 Floor area ratio calculations	Why are detached garages off alleys exempt?	The intent was to encourage use of alleys for garage access. In updated draft, the garage exemption has been extended to include garages attached to house (up to 500sf)
55	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42.060 Floor area ratio calculations	Other FAR comments. Encourages large one-story homes, not great if trying to reduce mass and impervious surface. Exempting decks/porches open on two sides could encourage large ones. Not clear how lot coverage either discourages or encourages surface parking.	Again, some FAR provisions have been made in response to comments received.
56	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42 Form and Intensity, setbacks	7.5 foot upper setback is impractical and expensive	The upper level setback isn't required - homes can simply be setback 7.5' and go straight up.
57	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.42 Form and Intensity, setbacks	Why increase the front setback to 25 feet? Clients use rear yard more than front yard. Saving trees in front yards is difficult due to utilities.	The 25' front setback is just for garages facing the street - to provide enough space that cars back part in driveway and not block sidewalk, and as a measure to deemphasize garage.
58	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.44.085 Cottages	Why require specific roof pitch?	The intent was to promote traditional cottage character
59	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.44.085 Cottages	Would like to see slightly larger size e.g. 1200 square feet livable area regardless of number of floors. Could help homebuying population who don't like stairs.	Subject standard has been updated to allow single story 1200sf cottages.
60	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.44.085 Cottages	Screening - what if there is a public street within the cottage community?	If a cottage development is divided by a public street, then the developments would need to meet applicable frontage and parking lot location and screening requirements. If it's just a private internal drive, those street frontage provisions would not apply.
61	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.44.085 Cottages	200 square feet garage is too small, suggest up to 300 square feet	Subject standard has been adjusted to 300sf
62	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	19.44.085 Cottages	Unclear what the street design standards are for cottages, e.g. legal framework and dimensions	Street design depends on the street classification. Most likely classification is a local street. See updated provisions in Chapter 19.52
63	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.40.040(C)(2)(b) Marine Mixed Use	Suggest striking "provided they are mixed with other permitted uses either vertically or horizontally." Allow residential use as a single use building.	All such purpose statements for zones are deleted in the second draft.
64	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.40.040(C)(2)(c) Marine Mixed Use	Suggest striking "and oriented to maximize public marine views and". MJB Properties has committed to the extension of 17th Street, 20th Street and 22nd Street through the site and establishing these as the primary public view corridors. Any other view regulations should be eliminated.	All such purpose statements for zones are deleted in the second draft.
65	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.40.040(E)(2) Commercial Marine 2	Suggest striking "above the ground floor". Should allow for residential uses in a single use building.	The CMI zone is being eliminated.
66	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A) Permitted retail sales, service, and industrial uses in mixed-use and industrial zones	Allow retail use larger than 50K NLA as a conditional use.	Update to allow in second draft.
67	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow retail greater than 5K – 50K NLA as a permitted use in MMU.	Update to allow in second draft.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
68	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow drive through uses as permitted in MMU?	Resolved in 2nd draft, drive-throughs generally allowed with new design standards.
69	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow boat & marine equipment sales as a permitted use in I.	Marine sales/rental are allowed in the Industrial zone in the 2nd draft.
70	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow boat & marine equipment service as a permitted use in I.	Use qualifies as a type of light industrial use, which is allowed in the zone
71	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow medical office as a permitted use in MMU.	Medical Office is conditional in all districts except for the Medical Overlay per discussions from the comprehensive planning proces. The topic will be considered by the Planning Commission in their review.
72	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow water-based service uses as a permitted use in MMU.	Subject use is not listed in the permitted use chart. If the specific use is considered a type of general service use, then it's permitted in the MMU zone. If it falls as a type of Light Industrial use, then it's conditionally permitted.
73	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow boat launch facility as a permitted use in MMU.	Per discussion with staff, suggest calling out "boat launch" (like "boat lift") to be a permitted use in the MMU zone (under Water-oriented industrial use category)
74	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Allow self service storage uses as a permitted use in I.	Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission.
75	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Remove development conditions 2 from office use in I.	Condition limiting office uses to 50% of ground level of buildings in I was accidentally left out in the second draft. Issue to be discussed by Planning Commission.
76	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(A)	Potentially could limit retail uses greater than 50K NLA to only grocery stores. Anticipate future drive through uses, driven by on-line ordering, such as grocery store pickup.	Retail sales uses (not just grocery stores) are conditionally permitted above 25,000sf with no cap.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
77	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(B) Permitted residential, temporary lodging, civic, cultural, recreation, entertainment and accessory uses in mixed-use and industrial zones	Remove Development Condition 3 from MMU zone.	This condition refers to a maximum of 1/3 of site include single purpose townhouses/multifamily - which is based on policies in the comprehensive plan.
78	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(B)	Add Hotel/Motel as a permitted use in the MMU zone.	Hotel/motel is permitted in MMU in the 2nd draft.
79	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(B)	Add Marinas and boat moorage as a permitted use in the MMU zone.	Marinas and boat moorage permitted in MMU in the 2nd draft.
80	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(B)	Add Parks and plazas as a permitted use in the MMU and I zone.	Parks and plazas allowed in all zones in 2nd draft.
81	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(B)	Add Pier/float/dock as a permitted use in the MMU zone. How does the existing Barge dock be allowed as a permitted use? Do not make this a non-conforming use.	Piers are a water-oriented industrial use, which are conditional in the MMU zone. Suggest adding it as a new use category and allowing by right in MMU.
82	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.41.030(B)	Why allow a Yacht Club as a permitted use and not a Marina and boat moorage?	In the 2nd draft Marinas and boat storage are allowed in MMU under Recreation, outdoor. Yacht clubs are reclassified as one of many types of "private recreational, social and/or cultural clubs" under Civic, which are also allowed in MMU.
83	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.42.030 Form and intensity standards for mixed-use ad industrial zones	What is the maximum impervious area?	In the 2nd draft we replaced maximum impervious area with a minimum landscaped area standard.
84	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.42.030	Increase maximum height with bonus to seventy (70) feet to comply with IBC wood frame maximum.	Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
85	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.42.030	Delete CUP process to achieve height above base. Bonus height should be based on a standard table or inclusion of public benefits.	Comment refers to CUP requirement to exceed base height in CM2, LM and I zones (19.42.080 in 2nd Draft). Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
86	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.030	Add open space and other public amenity spaces eligible for bonus heights.	Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
87	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.030	Increase income eligibility to 60%. Non-profits and other NGO's should provide for income groups between 30% - 60%.	Comment refers to the level of income eligibility for affordable units required to achieve bonus height. Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission.
88	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.030	What happens with the Affordability agreement if an apartment converts to a condominium?	Such a change wouldn't be consistent with the standards
89	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.030	Minimum size of affordable units should have a process for reducing below absolutes.	Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
90	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.030	Provide fee in-lieu provisions as an option to satisfy affordable housing requirements.	Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
91	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.050(B) CM2, LM and I zone bonus provisions	Change from Conditional Use Permit to a different process.	Comment refers to CUP requirement to exceed base height in CM2, LM and I zones. Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
92	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.050(B)	Create more predictability, identify critical views now and not leave to the discretion of the Director.	Comment refers to visual analysis requirements for increasing building height. Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
93	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.43.050(B)	This whole process needs to be more predictable and flexible for the developer.	Comment refers to CUP process for increased building height. Issue to be discussed with Planning Commission
94	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.44.090(E)(1) Usable open space (for townhouses)	Reduce open space minimum dimensions of 12 feet on all sides to six (6) feet.	12 feet was recommended to provide minimum usability - could be met by ground level space in front or behind unit or on roof deck/balcony within or on top of unit.

DIVISION 4: Zoning & Land Uses						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
95	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.44.090(F)(1) Building design (for townhouses)	Thus – if individual units are 15 feet wide, the building must include at least three articulation features for all facades facing a public street or public open space, common or other shared open space, and common parking areas at intervals no greater than 15 feet.	If the units within the building are 15' wide, then the articulation intervals are then based on that 15' interval.
96	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.44.100 Grocery store, neighborhood	Grocery store, neighborhood. How does this supplemental use regulation get applied to the MMU or CMI zoning district? If this prohibits this type of use in the MMU or CMI, then increase or delete the size and radius limitations.	In the commercial zones, the subject use falls under retail. We only call it out in the residential zones, due to special use provisions there for neighborhood grocery stores.
97	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.44.165(B)(3) Religious institutions	Should Religious Institutions be prohibited within the 200 foot Shoreline jurisdiction line?	The provision is not included in the second draft (under civic uses). The Shoreline Master Program governs uses and form/intensity of uses in the shoreline jurisdiction.
98	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.44.170(A) Restaurant sidewalk uses	Change sidewalk permit type to Right-of-Way Permit instead of Conditional Use Permits. Add MMU district to the zones allowed for this type of permit. Streamline and simplify process, why use a CUP?	Restaurant sidewalk permits are a public works matter and have been removed from the 2nd draft. Likely to be moved to Title 5.

DIVISION 5 - Community Design						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
1	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.51	Page 133, minimum standards for public streets should not be left to the discretion of the Public Works Director.	Minimum public street standards (such as streetscape elements and widths) are included in the 2nd Draft. Required public improvements may differ based on site specific conditions.
2	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.51	Page 134, sidewalks extension. What is "practical and reasonable"? Page 134, alley improvements should be determined directly by the language of the regulation Page 134, transition to existing improvement. When would an existing improvement "decrease in the future?" Page 135, dedication of right of way. This should be spelled out as opposed to leaving it to the public works director. Page 135, sidewalk "modification."	The "practical and reasonable" language is what's now in the existing code and has been for an extended period of time. The unique context of improvement levels on a block by block vary tremendously and make it challenging to integrate a clear threshold of applicability for such improvements. The current language has allowed the City some flexibility and has proven to be workable. An example of an existing improvement being decreased in the future could be a road width being reduced in size to reduce impervious surface, increase sidewalk or landscaping width, or to accommodate other traffic calming measures. Dedication of right-of-way is based on street classification and ROW width ID'd in Div. 5 and the Transportation Element of the Comp Plan.
3	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	Division 5	How is development on unimproved streets and alley regulated, if at all?	Div. 5 provides public street improvement requirements for new development (including on unimproved streets and alleys).
4	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	Division 5	How is access to emergency medical and fire suppression services addressed? In the past the fire chief has made ad hoc decisions but based upon what?	The content of Div. 5 was coordinated with the Fire Department to ensure consistency with emergency services access requirements.
5	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	Table 19.52.040	New ROW standards including 14 feet water quality planter on both sides will not work, have not seen in other communities. Unclear who maintains the planter area. Concerns about keeping up appearances.	Proposed standards have been updated to provide smaller minimum street dimensions and allow for increased widths to accommodate LID facilities, when proposed and appropriate.
6	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	Table 19.52.040	Why would a single-family dwelling with access off a "Lane" be required to provide sprinklers, is the minimum fire access not 20 feet? Which is your proposed standard?	This section has been removed.
7	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	Table 19.52.040	Driveway cuts, especially on smaller lot developments, will encroach on almost have the swale length. Developments look like the WEST streets, terrible. Imagine 60 feet side lots with a 20-25 foot culvert in front of every garage and an open ditch. Terrible!!	These provisions have been updated in the 2nd draft to allow, but not mandate, the increased landscaped area widths to accommodate LID facilities.
8	4/13/2018	PDF letter	Nels Strandberg	Table 19.52.040	Would like to see the Water Quality Swale as an option, not mandatory.	Staff agree, this has been modified in the 2nd draft.
9	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.51.050(B)(3)	Suggesting adding "and non-motorized" after "pedestrian"	This refers to 19.51.030(C) in the second draft. Change made.
10	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.53	This whole section is kind of confusing as it appears to primarily deal with residential subdivisions. There is one section dealing with commercial and light industrial zones. All of the examples are residential in nature. Should this be clarified and split into two sections, residential and commercial?	Update 19.54.030 to emphasize that the open space/park provisions only apply to new residential subdivisions.
11	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.53.020(A)(2)	Suggest striking "residential"	Change suggested.
12	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.53.020(A)(3)	Suggest replacing "accessways" with "connectivity" in first sentence. Suggest replacing "an accessway" with "path" in the last sentence	Similar edits have been made in the second draft.

DIVISION 6 - Project Design

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
1	11/15/2017	PDF scan	Tom Allen	19.62 Open space	Do sidewalks around buildings, front and rear porches, interior lounge areas, workrooms, count as open space?	Sidewalks in the ROW wouldn't, but internal paths and porches would if within space that meets the criteria for shared open space design in 19.62.040.B.2
2	11/15/2017	PDF scan	Tom Allen	19.62 Open space	Does open space requirement reduce parking area and therefore number of units that can be built?	If and when most or all of the open space is built on the ground level, it would reduce the amount of land available for surface level parking (though parking could be provided below grade). However, the provisions have been designed to allow a variety of ways to meet the standards, including balconies, courtyards/decks built over in-structure parking, rooftop decks, and for mixed-use buildings, indoor recreational areas.
3	11/16/2017	Email	Lynne Jordan	19.66.090 Performance assurance bonding	Clarification needed on right-of-way landscaping fee-in-lieu and maintenance	Delete old code text that is confusing and difficult to enforce
4	12/8/2017	MS Word	Tom Decker	19.63 Building design	New design standards for existing buildings: At the November meeting, the question of when you would have to bring a building up to new standards and codes was not clearly answered. I believe current regulations require that a remodel or repair valued at more the 50 percent of the total building value trigger the new standards. In the absence of clarity, the worry is that a project to remodel an apartment interior, paint an exterior or repairs simply storm damage could trigger the new design standards. I recommend leaving the threshold for triggering new design standards at the 50 percent level.	The updated draft includes the threshold of gross floor area increase rather than \$value since it's more easily measured. For any remodel/addition that adds new floor area (gross) up to 50% of existing floor area (gross), only that the proposed improvements to the building need to meet the standards and do not lead to further nonconformance with the standards.
5	12/8/2017	MS Word	Tom Decker	19.61.060 Storefronts	Storefront block frontage standards, sidewalk protection: First, how was the 6-foot minimum for sidewalk weather protection determine as opposed to, say, 5 feet? In a quick review of other regulations and standards, I noticed other communities use a 5-foot minimum which would provide protection at lower cost with less support structure. I would recommend using a 5-foot minimum. On a related point, looking at the table in your current draft of regulations, the example shows what appears to be a curved awning extension. Would curved awnings be allowed provided they meet the minimum on average? I can see instances when the curved structure will look for natural. On this same topic, would the city have the ability to reduce the establish weather protection extension standard where the city finds that that existing right-of-way dimensions, easements, or building code requirements preclude the planned 6-foot standard extension. I would recommend such flexibility when warranted. In addition, I would suggest the above standards do not apply where a building has a ground floor dwelling, as in a mixed-use development or live-work building, and the dwelling has a covered entrance. This change would promote more variety in appearance.	A 6' minimum width was chosen after examining examples in downtown and factoring in that a 6' canopy more easily allows a couple to walk out by side out of the rain along a façade. There's a note that says: "Weather protection must not interfere with street trees, street lights, street signs, or extend beyond the edge of the sidewalk." Also - note that aside from Live-work units that meet Storefront block frontage standards, buildings with ground floor residential would be subject to a 10' minimum setback (Landscaped block frontage) - and would just need to have a covered entry (3' deep).
6	12/8/2017	MS Word	Tom Decker	19.61.060 Storefronts	Application of storefront block frontage standards: How the storefront block frontages standards apply to existing buildings was not clearly stated at the November meeting. The concern, obviously, is that if you set the trigger point too low, the new regulations would become a strong disincentive to building owners who want to undertake remodeling and upgrades to their properties, the reverse of the situation we want to encourage. I would suggest that the threshold for applying the new standards be set at the 50 percent level for the value of the building. Once again, my general concern is that the city reach the right balance in providing more affordable options in housing so that the private sector can more fully meet local family, workforce and senior housing needs. Providing new housing options and reining in the cost to build affordable housing carries new urgency in light of our community's increasing needs.	The provisions here are written to NOT discourage investment in existing buildings. For example - take an old storefront that may not meet the transparency percentage requirements. If the owner simply wants to replace those existing windows, they can as long as they don't make them smaller. But if they have only 3' wide awnings and they want to take them down and put a new awning up, the new awning would need to meet the 6' requirement.

DIVISION 6 - Project Design

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
7	12/27/2017	Email	Cynthia Richardson	19.68 Signs	<p>For example: "Using a CMYK color chart, sign background that employs color numbers that add up to at least 20 (collectively) are considered as "shaded"."</p> <p>Followed by a chart with illustrations of dark and light backgrounds and lettering that add up to a numerical score.</p> <p>ARE YOU KIDDING? Talk about over-regulation!!!</p> <p>Comparing it to our existing sign code, which is 10 pages (as a Word docx), the new one is 36 pages. Why? The old code covers the bases pretty well. A few photo examples and a little word tweaking is all that's needed – not a complete re-write. Is someone trying to make a career out of regulating signs?</p> <p>We should specify the size, number, and placement allowed, and then let folks decide what kind of signs they want to represent their business. It's really none of the City's business whether there is a dark or light background, or whether the base is stone or steel, etc.</p> <p>In some senses, regulating these minute details is a type of censorship, because you're telling folks that their taste in signage is unacceptable and they must conform to someone else's notions of what looks good.</p> <p>I'll work my way through the editing, but I hope you will sincerely consider scrapping most of the new draft and seriously simplifying it to just the basic requirements. Forget the detailed design requirements. They're a hornet's nest for the businesses, the designers, and the regulators.</p> <p>And you can tell Bob B. that I said so.</p>	The updated draft eliminates this provision (allowing extra sign area for signs with dark background).
8	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	Division 6 Project Design	<p>There is an over emphasis on "design standards" and developing cosmetics. The whole garage door section is a good example. And mandating a 3' covered porch is an example of a regulation designed to fix a problem that does not exist. Focusing on how things are going to look is just a way to subvert an inquiry into how things will function when streets, sewers, the electrical grid, etc are overloaded. Makers must be compelled to produce "design standards" that are relevant to Anacortes.</p>	The garage provisions only apply to small lot developments (less than 5,000sf) and were added to promote compatibility with existing neighborhoods, enhance character of the street, and promote eyes on the street for safety. Likewise, the covered entry provisions is a basic livability element (providing an ability to unlock the door out of the rain or wait for doorbell answer out of the rain) and it contributes to the character of buildings by adding human scaled design elements.
9	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.61 Block Frontages	<p>Page 152, on what basis should the Director "waive or relax."</p>	The provision states that the director may waive the provisions of the I, LM, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones depending on the type of use, number of anticipated employees and customers, and the site's physical context. The greater number of employees and/or customers and the higher visibility levels warrant a greater application of block frontage standards. This was a compromise of sorts between completely exempting those districts from the standards and applying the standards to all new development in those zones.
10	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.61 Block Frontages	<p>Page 176, on what basis should the Director resolve a "conflict" between frontage standards?</p>	This refers to corner lot situations where there are different block frontage designations on opposite frontages. Subsections 19.61.150.B-E explain how the conflicts are resolved.
11	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.61 Block Frontages	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Page 177, reduction in transparency, based upon what?</p>	In this case - the applicant would need to successfully demonstrate how the façade treatment with reduced transparency provides visual interest to the pedestrian and mitigates any impact of blank wall areas. The director, in approving any departure design, would then need to document the proposed treatment, and reason for approval or denial so there's a track record. The issue was further discussed at the May 9 Joint CC/PC meeting and there will likely be follow up discussion on the subject.

DIVISION 6 - Project Design

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
12	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.61 Block Frontages	<input type="checkbox"/> Page 178, high visibility corners, based upon what?	? Unclear on the question. These corners are delineated on the block frontage maps and new development on these sites must comply with the standards in 19.61.070.C. These provisions provide for "other" decorative elements that meet the intent (to accentuate street corners with high visibility to the public). In this case, the Director could use the options in C.2.a-e along with the photo examples to help set up the general design expectations for the types of treatments desired to accentuate the corner.
13	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.63 Building Design	Page 205, wave or relax building design standards based upon what?	See recommendation for comment #9 regarding provisions to allow the Director to waive or relax standards in the I, LM, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones.
14	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.66 Landscaping	Page 225, wave or relax landscaping standards based upon what?	See recommendation for comment #9 regarding provisions to allow the Director to waive or relax standards in the I, LM, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones.
15	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.66 Landscaping	Page 234, on what basis would the Director require greater buffers to preserve existing mature trees?	Where mature trees and vegetation exists. We suggest updating the draft to condition that where wider buffer widths are required (for mature tree preservation), other parts of the buffer may be reduced to (so that they = no more than meeting the minimum width on average).
16	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.66 Landscaping	Page 235, on what basis would the Director decide "other effective visual transitions"?	This allows for reduced planting strip width as long as it provides a physical transition between the building and the pathway that includes plantings and can also be maintained. If it's determined that this language is too challenging to administer in these limited situations, then we'll update the language.
17	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.66 Landscaping	Page 235, "the director may adjust requirements to emphasize buffer types that enhance visibility between the developing use or focus more on visual screening depending on the context of the park or trail and type of developing use." Based upon what?	This applies to very limited and special cases where a development is directly adjacent to a park or trail and the design is important to public safety - thus the language "depending on the context of the park or trail and type of developing use"
18	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.66 Landscaping	Page 236, on what basis is the Director to determine "variations in the planting of trees"?	This language has been removed.
19	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.66 Landscaping	Page 241, on what basis would the director decide "Limbing" up trees and "topping" or shearing off trees"?	Public safety, such as below power poles.
20	1/29/2018	PDF	Vernon Lauridsen	19.66 Landscaping	Page 242, on what basis would the Director reduce the requirement for a performance bond?	This language has been removed.

DIVISION 6 - Project Design

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
21	2/4/2018	Email	Cynthia Richardson	Division 6 Project Design	<p>ACHIEVING A BALANCE IN DESIGN REGULATIONS</p> <p>Any code or regulation, whether for zoning, traffic, criminal activities, or other topics, must try to achieve a balance between restricting individual rights for the benefit of the community and allowing individual expression to the extent that it does not harm others. Just because some people don't care for something doesn't mean we necessarily need to regulate it.</p> <p>With regard to the current draft of the Anacortes zoning regulations, my sense is that they are unduly restrictive, particularly with regard to design standards. The intent of improving the appearance of our city is admirable. But too many rules can increase costs and reduce options for responding to individual needs without a clear benefit to the community.</p> <p>Design standards which promote conformity and familiar characteristics can create a cityscape that is comforting. But it can also be boring. Lack of standards can allow diversity, but that can become chaotic and disorienting. What is the right balance?</p> <p>Unlike a shopping mall, office park or residential neighborhood that is built by a single developer and controlled by very strict design guidelines enforced by a committee, Anacortes was built over a century during which design preferences evolved through many phases. Victorian style homes and cannery worker cottages gave way to Craftsman bungalows, then post-war ramblers, mid-century modern, suburban, post modern, brutalism, Northwest contemporary, and other styles – interspersed with the occasional quirky castle or log home.</p> <p>Some of those styles were popular for a while, then faded away. The best loved have survived and become mainstream. We have no way of knowing what styles will appear and become loved or despised in the future. But by limiting design guidelines to what we find appealing now, we preclude even better new styles from being tried. If only historic materials and details are allowed, there will be nothing to represent the 21st century aesthetic 200 years from now.</p> <p>There is no consistent historic Anacortes style in either the residential or commercial areas. To many of us, that is part of the charm of our town. When someone buys or builds a home or business, they have the freedom to express their own design preferences, whether traditional or contemporary. Just because a person prefers certain styles doesn't mean they should control what their neighbor builds, if the neighbor has different preferences.</p>	<p>Generally, the provisions herein have been developed as a collection of tools working together to meet the collective goals and policies of the comprehensive plan. Many provisions are based on concepts that we've found workable in other communities and fit the context/goals/policies here in Anacortes. They've also been crafted to allow strategic flexibility in how they can be complied with, whether via toolbox approach (choose from options) or via departures. Furthermore, the building design provisions don't force a singular architectural style for the reasons mentioned here, and they allow for a great range of commonly used exterior materials provided a limited number of conditions are met.</p>
22	2/4/2018	Email	Cynthia Richardson	Division 6 Project Design	<p>[MAKERS NOTE: See email for embedded images] Sometimes conformity with design standards can stand in the way of creating a memorable and iconic symbol for a city, or for an individual business.</p> <p>Recently I read that the Guggenheim Museum in New York (above) is “the most photographed building in the US”.</p> <p>These buildings are also recognizable icons. None of them could be built under the proposed design standards:</p> <p>My point is not that we need a monumental iconic building in Anacortes. But if our standards are too strict, we risk blandness and rule out opportunities for creative expression.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the smallest list of minimum standards needed to promote a sense of harmony, while still allowing diversity? • Can someone build a design that may seem radical (and unpopular) now but might be the start of something that will eventually become acceptable, then mainstream, and then historic? 	<p>Consider adding a provision for landmark buildings that allows flexibility in design for public buildings and perhaps high visibility street corners and full block sites</p>

DIVISION 6 - Project Design						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
23	2/4/2018	Email	Cynthia Richardson	Division 6	<p>For each code requirement (whether keeping an existing one or proposing a new one), it is essential to ask,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "What is the objective that this requirement is trying to achieve?" 2. "Is that objective important enough to require regulation via the code?" 3. "Will it achieve that objective?" 4. "Will it create other problems?" 5. "On balance, is achieving that objective more important than the problems?" 6. "Are there other ways of achieving the objective that are more flexible, less costly, or have other benefits?" <p>As an example, one suggested code change is to require the front doors of houses to face the street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The objective is to make the home seem more friendly and welcoming to people passing by. 2. Just because it's desirable does not mean it is important enough to require a code regulation. 3. Yes, to some extent a door facing the street will be welcoming. 4. It will limit the functional arrangement of rooms within the home, may be very difficult on a lot that slopes steeply up or down from the street, could result in an entry that doesn't access the main living level, could interfere with enjoyment of a view from the street side of the house, could limit the use of the front yard for private outdoor space, and could be more costly to construct than a side or rear entry on some lots. 5. Which is more important – the appearance of the house to the general public, or the ability of the homeowner to maximize the potential of the house to meet their personal needs and lifestyle? 6. How about allowing the entry to be on any side, but requiring that a sidewalk with a clear route to the entry be provided for ease of access by visitors, delivery 	<p>Good comment and this approach is used to make updates that we feel will help implement the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan. In many cases, we are trying out a range of tools that work together to help meet those goals and policies. We are first presenting these tools and techniques first to staff for their review and edits and then to the public as a part of the process of testing these tools. As far as the house example mentioned - we assume it refers to the small lot single family standards in 19.43.010(B) - which provides clear and obvious pedestrian connection between the sidewalk and the entry and minimum 3'x3' weather protection over the entry, but it doesn't specifically require the entry to face the street.</p>
24	2/4/2018	Email	Cynthia Richardson	Division 6 Project Design	<p>Some of the requirements in the proposed code address things that aren't really very significant in the overall scheme of things, and create a layer of complexity for owners and city staff far out of proportion to their importance. Two examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chain link fences prohibited within 10 ft. of a street right-of-way in all zones. <p>Why should industrial types of uses within their appropriate zones have this restriction? Chain link fences offer inexpensive, sturdy security while allowing surveillance from passing police. Setting the fence back 10 ft. takes away considerable useable square footage, and the fence still looks the same. It's not necessary to regulate fence types in these zones. Let the industrial types of uses be practical and work-oriented. It's not necessary to prettify them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Darker colored signs can be larger than lighter colored signs. <p>This is really getting into picky details. We should just regulate the size of the sign, and let the owner choose colors, text, symbols, etc. As long as the size is limited, even if a few signs end up being garish or not very readable, the impact on the community is very minimal, and the cost for staff to monitor sign details is way out of proportion to its importance.</p> <p>Go back to the questions above – what are these fence and sign restrictions intending to achieve? Is that important enough to regulate them via the code? Let's only regulate the really important things.</p> <p>We should try to achieve a balance between restricting individual rights for the benefit of the community and allowing individual expression to the extent that it does not harm others or isn't that important in the overall scheme of things. What is the right balance? Keep it simple.</p>	<p>19.66.080 requires a 10' setback and landscaping buffer for chain link fences along streets, but offers departures based on the design of fence and landscaping. Other chapters/sections in Division 6 allow the director an ability to relax or waive certain requirements in Industrial Zones based on the context of the site. Similar flexibility for the industrial zones will be considered with staff and Planning Commission review. The sign provision mentioned here has been removed.</p>
25	2/15/2018	Email	Jeff Mount	19.67 Fences	<p>This is one question that may come up. I have a very steep slope behind my house, with a fire service road running behind it. I would assume there are hundreds of people in that situation. I am not considering a fence, but if I had a dog I probably would and a 42 inch fence would look terrible. I don't know how your standards would apply to a fire access road, but the same concern would certainly pertain if there was a street down there.</p>	<p>The subject provision applies to through lots with a public street at the rear of the property. The concept will be discussed with staff and clarifications suggested if needed. (largely it is not the intent for this shorter fence provision to apply to your situation)</p>
26	2/21/2018	Email	Jeff Mount	19.69.030 Signs	<p>1) In the section which says trucks cannot be displayed on private property with signs not pertaining to the activity therein, does that allow or prohibit for sale signs? You could bust a dozen people every day if it prohibits them.</p>	<p>One of the provisions (subsection 16), which includes items exempt from sign ordinance: Any sign on a vehicle, unless such vehicle is regularly parked in any prominently visible location from public right-of-way or other public space for the primary purpose of attracting public attention to the sign, which is prohibited pursuant to AMC 19.67.040(A)(8). Subject provision will be discussed with staff and Planning Commission.</p>
27	2/21/2018	Email	Jeff Mount	19.69.030 Signs	<p>2) In Section 8, does the 25% restriction apply to each sign or to the cumulative space taken up by all signs? If it's cumulative, every store on Commercial probably is in violation. If it's not, we should probably reword it.</p>	<p>This applies to any wall, canopy, or awning signs on an individual storefront - collectively for an individual business - for new signs.</p>

DIVISION 6 - Project Design

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
28	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.020.C Applicability (of Block frontage standards)	This paragraph is highly discretionary. The criteria should be more objective.	The provision states that the director may waive the provisions of the I, LM, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones depending on the type of use, number of anticipated employees and customers, and the site's physical context. The greater number of employees and/or customers and the higher visibility levels warrant a greater application of block frontage standards. This was a compromise of sorts between completely exempting those districts from the standards and applying the standards to all new development in those zones. Nevertheless the issue will be brought up in discussions with the Planning Commission and adjustments are clarifications will be considered.
29	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	Table 19.61.030 Summary of block frontage types	Why can't some residential uses such as fitness rooms, community rooms or other active amenity spaces be allowed on the ground floor? I think you have to be really careful here, given the state of the retail market these days and what retail will be in the future. MMU can choose between Storefront or Landscape Block Frontage. However, the Storefront limits uses and the Landscape requires a ten (10) foot setback. It seems that the City should encourage flexibility so that buildings with active uses can go to the sidewalk edge. Some residential amenity uses are active uses and contribute to the pedestrian environment. Maybe a solution is to allow residential uses on the ground floor in the MMU zone only. Please clarify if the MMU zone can choose to mix storefront or landscape frontages within the same street block or if you have to choose one or the other along the whole block.	The use limitation only applies to ground level uses on a storefront building (zero setback). We suggest that this be a discussion topic with Planning Commission.
30	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.040(C) Block frontage designations map for central Commercial Avenue and Central Waterfront	Remove the extension of 21st Street east of Q Avenue.	This is a conceptual street location (meaning that some adjustment will be allowed if the street network is largely consistent with the map herein). City Engineer may have an interest in limiting vehicular access between 17th and 22nd due to Q/R designation as a truck route, so further internal discussion on access will take place along with discussion with the Planning Commission. Also see the new Framework Development Plan provisions in 19.61.180 in the second draft - which will allow some flexibility in the location of the internal roads.
31	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.040(C)	Should High Visibility Street Corners be located on the roundabout?	The map now only includes the NW corner, but we'll raise the topic of adding the designation to the NE corner with Planning Commission.
32	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.040(C)	What is the purpose of the Landscaped Block Frontage designation along just a portion of R / Q Avenue?	This is the most visible block of the site, due to the vantage point from northbound R Avenue - thus the Landscaped designation seemed appropriate to create a more attractive frontage here. Again, alternatives could be considered through the Framework Development Plan process.
33	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.050 About the transparency standards	Strongly support structured parking facility openings simulating windows counting to satisfy transparency requirements.	Concept will be considered

DIVISION 6 - Project Design						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
34	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.060(B) Storefront block frontage standards	Previous page states weather protection should be over 60% of the façade, this states 75%. Vehicular access from a storefront street should be prohibited if there is access available from another street or alley.	Corrected to 75% in the 2nd draft. Access suggestion has been made in master draft.
35	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.140 Where properties front onto multiple streets	Suggest adding "public" before the first instance of "street". Suggest adding "the public street" after "which it fronts". Change the preference if a conflict occurs, suggest it is dependent on the use proposed.	The intent of the provision is that it applies to streets (public or private) that are documented with block frontage designations. The Example provided in the figure illustrates how the concept applies.
36	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.140.B – E	Add public in front of any "street".	See recommendation above.
37	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.140.B – E	Correct Figure 19.61.140, change "streetfront" to "storefront".	Graphic corrected in 2nd draft.
38	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.160(B)	Why can the director choose other areas, shouldn't all the High Visibility Street Corners be identified on the maps in Section 19.61.040 (pages 156 – 161)?	Provision intended to provide criteria upon how maps could be updated in the future. However, the provision might be more confusing than useful and may be updated.
39	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.61.170(C)	Develop a Master Development Plan process. Develop a Development Agreement process.	A "framework development plan" for block frontages is updated in the 2nd draft 19.61.180 and the procedures details are in the works and will be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
40	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.020 Relationship to adjacent properties	This section is duplicated in numbering on page 181.	Numbering corrected in 2nd draft.
41	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.020	We believe setbacks should provide the necessary privacy and compatibility between developments. We believe this section should be deleted.	Since zero setbacks are allowed in the MMU zone for side/rear, the subject provisions are important to ensure some light/air to units in all cases.
42	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.030(B) Internal open space	Change minimum usable open space to 100 SF per dwelling unit with a maximum cap of 20% of the site area.	Due to the flexibility in how these standards can be met, a cap is not suggested.
43	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.030(B)(3)	Private balconies and decks. Suggest changing 36 to 32 and changing 6 to 4.	Changes made in second draft
44	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.030(C)	"Development Envelope" should be defined. Amount of open space should be related to the size of the building instead of the property or "development envelope". Allow public amenities provided at the master plan level (waterfront esplanade) in all zones to satisfy this requirement.	Suggest changing the term to "development site" which is defined and meets the intent of the provision
45	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.030(D)(3)(a)	Allow asphalt pavement under certain conditions, maybe with a departure. Bike paths and multi-purpose trails are two features that asphalt should be an acceptable use.	Edit to be considered
46	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.040(C)(4) Internal pedestrian access and design	Delete C.4, these types of pathways through parking lots are not used.	Parking lot pathways are a key element for enhancing pedestrian safety and the appearance of large parking lots. Note they are only required every four rows or every 200 feet, and are not required in small parking lots.
47	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.040(C)(6)	Gates that limit access to residents should also be considered. What about security issues?	Issue to be discussed
48	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.040(D)(1)	Internal pedestrian walkways should have a minimum dimension of four feet.	Five feet was suggested as the minimum necessary for two people to comfortably walk past each other. Edits, however, will be considered.
49	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.040(D)(3)	Reduce landscaping requirement from three feet to two feet.	Edits will be considered
50	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.040(D)(4)	Reduce pathway dimensions to six feet minimum unobstructed width and minimum nine feet in overall width with landscaping.	This provisions is intended for pathways outside multi-tenant commercial and mixed-use buildings on large sites, which have similar characteristics of storefront streets. 12-foot sidewalks are consistent with the storefront block frontage standard. However, an adjustment to this standard may be an option via the framework development plan process.
51	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.050(C) Vehicular circulation and parking	Reduce the requirement for all internal access roadways to have street trees and sidewalks. These should be prioritized for only the main internal access roadways.	The provision allows exception for service/loading access type roads.

DIVISION 6 - Project Design						
#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
52	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.060(B)(3) Service areas and mechanical equipment	Suggest replacing "must" with "should". Suggest adding "adjacent to public streets" after "visible from the sidewalks". Suggest adding "to the maximum extent feasible" after "properties".	Comment refers to provisions for service area and mechanical equipment location. Provision will be discussed - to determine approach for private internal streets that aren't alleys.
53	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.060.C.1.c.	Suggesting adding "public" in front of streets and pathways.	Comment refers to provisions for service area and mechanical equipment screening. Provision will be discussed - to determine approach for private internal streets that aren't alleys.
54	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.060.C.2	Suggest replacing 5 with 2.5, adding "public" in front of street and pathways, and striking "parking lots".	Comment refers to provisions for service area and mechanical equipment screening. Provision will be discussed - to determine approach for private internal streets that aren't alleys.
55	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.060(E)(1)	Suggest striking "both" and "and from higher buildings".	Comment refers to provisions for roof mounted mechanical equipment. The intent of this provision is to reduce the visual and sound impacts of roof mounted mechanical equipment on nearby residents, including those residents who may have windows facing the roofs of adjacent buildings. The comment will be discussed.
56	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.060(E)(2)	Suggest striking the second sentence starting with "Wood".	Comment refers to screening provisions for roof mounted mechanical equipment. Edit will be considered.
57	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.62.060(E)(3)	Suggest adding "to prevent views from the public street or sidewalk" at the end of the sentence.	Suggestion has been noted in the master draft and will be discussed with the Planning Commission
58	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.020(A)(2) Applicability (Building Design)	The director may waive or relax these provisions: This is arbitrary, what are the standards and/or criteria used by the director in making this decision? What can the director waive or relax?	The provision states that the director may waive the provisions of the I, LM, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones depending on the type of use, number of anticipated employees and customers, and the site's physical context. The greater number of employees and/or customers and the higher visibility levels warrant a greater application of block frontage standards. This was a compromise of sorts between completely exempting those districts from the standards and applying the standards to all new development in those zones. Nevertheless the issue will be brought up in discussions with the Planning Commission and adjustments are clarifications will be considered.
59	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.040.B Building massing and articulation 19.63.040.C	Why every 30 feet? Why not every 50 or 60 feet? This is also required for all non-residential uses, so offices would have to conform. I don't believe this restriction at this microscale is necessary. These standards should only be applied to public street facades, other facades along private streets or alleys should have less restrictions. Ketchum townsite lots are 55 feet in width, this seems more of an acceptable dimension.	30 feet is consistent with the scale of traditional storefront configurations in Anacortes and is appropriate to mitigate the scale of large buildings at the pedestrian level. Adjustments will be discussed on whether the articulation intervals should be increased in areas outside of downtown. Also note the departure criteria in subsection D. In the second draft, it's clarified that the provisions apply to all building elevations facing the street or containing building entrances (alley facades exempt).
60	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.040(E)(1)	Suggest adding "private streets" after "alleys". Suggest changing vertical building modulation from 10 feet to 4 feet deep, and from 30 feet wide to 20 feet wide. Suggesting revising last sentence to "extend through at least one-half of the building floors".	We've reduced to 6 feet deep and 15 feet wide in the second draft. Text edits made.
61	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.050(B) Building details	Suggest adding "public" in front of "street" and adding "or public open space" after "frontage".	Provision will be discussed - to determine approach for private internal streets that aren't alleys.
62	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.050.C	Suggest revising to be only windows "on the ground floor".	The intent of this provision is to apply to upper floors
63	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.050.C	Prohibited windows: Mirrored glass is prohibited. What is the definition of mirrored glass? Should relate to the degree of transparency. This is a very undefined standard.	Provision will be discussed
64	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.060(B) Building materials	Add public street facades and public open spaces to when this requirement is necessary. Are cast materials or simulations of brick, stone or masonry acceptable?	We'll discuss clarifications such as identifying what districts provision applies to (maybe just CBD, C, and MMU for example). CMU units would meet the requirement.
65	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.060.C.3	Increase limitation on EIFS from 20 percent to 60% depending on visual impact.	EIFS is proposed to be limited to 20% of the street-facing façade area but may be increased via a departure.

DIVISION 6 - Project Design

#	Date	Form	Name	Section or Topic in 1st Draft	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
66	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.060.C.3	Allow EIFS to be used on ground floor when facing private streets or pathways.	Consider flexibility for EIFS ground level use for buildings outside of CBD and storefront buildings in other districts. Also consider application of private streets.
67	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.060.C.4	Allow the use of cement board paneling/siding on the ground floor if it meets criteria "4.b."	The departure provision allows some flexibility depending on the nature of proposal. No changes suggested.
68	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.63.070.C Blank wall treatment	Suggest revising to say "Untreated blank walls adjacent to a public street or pedestrian sidewalk are prohibited".	To consider edit and clarity applicability.
69	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.66.020.A.2 Applicability and compliance (Landscaping)	The current wording is arbitrary. Provide more definitive criteria when this would be applicable.	This is referring to the Landscaping chapter in the older draft. The referenced applicability provision is removed in the 2nd draft. Landscaping for additions must comply with the provisions of 19.60.020(C) .
70	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.66.030.A	Need to clarify "entire site" as it relates to phasing and master planned projects.	This refers to 19.65.040(A) in the second draft. The language has been updated to apply to all new non-residential and multifamily development containing landscaping.
71	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.66.xxx	Minimum sizing conflicts with other sections of the proposed code.	This refers to 19.65.050 in the second draft. Plant installation standards have been updated and are being further revised to best ensure the survival of newly installed trees and vegetation.
72	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.66.040.D	Remove minimum width and length.	Unclear what this is referring to.
73	4/26/2018	PDF letter	MJB	19.66.040.D	Reduce ten foot requirement to five feet	Unclear what this is referring to.