

FINAL REPORT and RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE MULTIFAMILY CHAPTER OF THE LAND USE CODE

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Executive Summary	4
Objectives	5
Key Recommendations	6
Process and Public Involvement	7
3. Background.....	9
Current Multifamily Zones	9
Why Amend the Land Use Code?	12
Relationship to Comprehensive and Neighborhood Plans.....	13
4. Updated Multifamily Zones	15
Mix of Multifamily Zones	15
Residential Commercial Designation (RC)	18
Rezone Criteria	19
5. Uses	21
Permitted and Prohibited Uses.....	21
Conditional Uses.....	21
6. Development Standards.....	22
Density and Floor Area Ratios.....	24
Setbacks in Lowrise zones	27
Height Limits	28
Standards for Lots Larger than 9,000 sq. ft.	32
Landscaping and the Seattle Green Factor.....	36
Residential Amenity Requirement.....	38
Design Standards	39
Townhouse Design.....	41
Midrise (MR) and Highrise (HR) Zones.....	45
Parking	47
Green Building.....	56
Institutions and Public Schools.....	59
Definitions and Measurement Techniques.....	60
7. Incentive Program	60
Eligible Areas.....	61
Program Basics	63
Affordable Workforce Housing	66
Landmarks and Open space Incentives.....	67

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Effect on Development Capacity	68
8. Other Benefits of the Multifamily Code Update	69
Restoring Lost Housing Capacity	69
Make the Code Easier to Use.....	71
Encourage the Reuse of Existing Single Family Structures	72
Appendix A	73
Rezone Criteria Comparison.....	73
Appendix B.....	95
Charts Comparing Current Development Standards to the Proposal.....	95
Appendix C	104
Neighborhood Plan Policies Applicable the to MF Code Update	104
Appendix D	113
2007 - Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Multifamily Policies.....	113

I. Introduction

Mayor Nickels is proposing amendments to the multifamily chapter of the City's Land Use Code, to promote smart growth, green housing and good design. The new Multifamily Code proposal advances the City's growth management objectives and better achieves the City's goals and policies for new development, and makes the code easier to use and understand.

Over the next 20 years, Seattle expects to add 100,000 residents and 84,000 jobs. In 2006, as part of the citywide effort to streamline and update development regulations, new zoning was adopted for downtown and neighborhood commercial areas. Multifamily zones are next in line as they also play an important role in the city's ability to accommodate this expected growth. In addition to achieving the objectives outlined below, this code update also presents the opportunity to address the important issues of climate change and the growing need for housing affordable to working people.

Climate disruption is an urgent threat to the environmental and economic health of the Seattle region. Many cities, in this country and abroad, already have strong local policies and programs in place to reduce global warming pollution, but more action is needed, including at the local level, to meet the challenge. To help Seattle do its part, Mayor Nickels convened a Green Ribbon Commission on Climate Protection. Among other measures, the commission identified actions that could be taken, including reducing energy use in homes. This is often referred to as 'reducing the carbon footprint.' The Mayor responded to the climate protection commission's recommendations in September 2006 with a Climate Action Plan. The action plan has informed many of the recommendations in the Multifamily Code Update; in particular, Action #5 of the Climate Action Plan calls for creating compact, green urban neighborhoods -- where multifamily housing is close to transit and commercial areas.

In addition, housing costs have continued upward, to the point that middle-income wage earners have found themselves increasingly priced out of the market. The median price of new condominiums now exceeds \$350,000, requiring an income of more than \$74,000.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Median-priced single family homes exceed \$500,000, requiring an income of more than \$100,000. Seattle has a long history of meeting the housing needs of the poor or low-income earners. During the past 20 years, through the Housing Levy and other programs, nearly 10,000 homes have been created for those earning between zero and \$45,000 a year. A zoning incentive program, as part of the Multifamily Code Update, is proposed as a way to help provide for the middle-income wage earners. This program is consistent with City Council Resolution 30939, adopted by the Mayor and Council in December of 2006. This resolution expresses support for the use of zoning incentives for affordable housing and other public benefits. The incentive resolution was used in the formulation of the proposed incentive provisions developed as part of the Multifamily Code Update, with additional details expected to be included in separate legislation for on citywide incentive zoning programs.

Many of the recommendations for new multifamily zoning are consistent with goals to reduce the city's carbon footprint and provide zoning incentives for affordable housing. Proposed development standards would:

- Encourage growth where it is most appropriate and reduce development pressures on fragile natural environments and low-density, single-family areas;
- Promote housing affordability with zoning incentives;
- Incorporate green building practices;
- Emphasize the water-quality benefits of landscaping;
- Allow for more green roofs and wind and solar power generation on rooftops;
- Reduce automobile dependence by eliminating or reducing parking requirements based on local conditions.

As Mayor Nickels has recently said: "Every decision facing us today has a direct impact on climate change and our planet. As Seattle grows, we need to do it in a way that protects the environment and creates housing that working people can afford."

2. Executive Summary

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The Multifamily Code Update began in mid-2005. Milestones to date include the Multifamily Concept Recommendations, first published in April of 2006, that have guided the development of the proposed multifamily draft code provisions. The concepts for amending the City's multifamily zones were the product of extensive research and many years of experience in administering zoning provisions, meetings with neighborhood groups, development and design professionals, and a careful assessment of newly emergent issues and conditions in Seattle's multifamily neighborhoods.

Additional steps in the process of developing the Mayor's final recommendations for new multifamily zoning included public review and comment on draft code provisions and initial environmental review. These steps occurred at the end of 2007. Input received throughout the process was considered in the preparation of the final legislative documents. The City Council's review process, anticipated to begin in mid-2008, will include additional opportunities for public participation, including a public hearing.

Objectives

The objectives of the proposed Multifamily Code Update are to:

1. Help create high quality multifamily neighborhoods;
2. Support Comprehensive and Neighborhood Plan objectives;
3. Promote sustainable development;
4. Encourage new investment in a variety of housing types, including affordable housing;
5. Recognize special locational characteristics: urban centers and villages and light rail station areas; adjacency to single family zoned areas.
6. Foster creative design through development flexibility; and
7. Make the code easier to use and understand, complementing the adopted amendments to neighborhood commercial zoning.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Key Recommendations

The proposal to amend multifamily zoning is summarized by the following list of key recommendations:

1. Maintain the current overall scale and density of most Lowrise zones.
2. Establish an incentive program for L3 (except portions of lots within 50 feet of single family zoned lots), MR and HR zones in urban centers, urban villages and station areas to encourage affordable housing in exchange for additional height and floor area.
3. Allow alternatives to overly prescriptive development standards - "flexibility with limits," including:
 - use basic standards -- setbacks, floor area ratio and height limits -- on small (infill) lots;
 - apply additional standards -- lot coverage, structure width/depth limits -- on larger lots;
 - recognize local conditions -- to provide appropriate transitions, require greater structure setbacks from property lines on multifamily zoned lots abutting single family zoned lots;
 - replace current open space and landscaping requirements with residential amenity area and green factor requirements similar to provisions recently adopted in commercial zones.
4. Encourage landmark preservation and new open space amenities through floor area bonuses and the transfer of development potential (TDP) in HR.
5. Improve the appearance and function of townhouses with new design standards, and an administrative Design Review requirement.
6. Require green buildings when the incentive program is used in L3, MR and HR zones.
7. Eliminate parking requirements in urban centers and station areas, and reduce parking requirements in other areas (consistent with changes in commercial areas).
8. Update and organize regulations so they are easier to understand and use.

Recommendations to change multifamily code provisions apply only to land that is currently zoned for multifamily development. No remapping is proposed (no single family zoned areas would be rezoned).

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

A limited number of technical amendments, such as space requirements for garbage and recycling, apply to zones other than multifamily. Minor amendments are proposed to the standards for Residential Small Lot (RSL) zones to allow for features such as eaves and architectural features within setbacks areas, consistent with allowances in other residential zones. In addition, amendments are proposed for cottage housing, allowed in RSL and multifamily zones, to clarify standards related to the permitted floor area of a cottage structure and open space requirements.

Process and Public Involvement

After releasing the concept recommendations in May 2006, staff spent the next two years talking with more than 500 people at over 35 meetings of community groups, and design and development professionals about their issues and ideas and the concepts and process for updating the multifamily code. In addition, information and meeting minutes have been posted on the project website. Written comments have been received responding to the issues discussed at the various meetings and to the web-content. The public comments received from these various sources have influenced the proposed code amendments.

After the Mayor submits legislation to amend the Land Use Code to the City Council, additional opportunities for public participation will be available. The chart below outlines the public process:

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Tasks Completed	Dates
Multifamily process and background research underway	Mid '05
Multifamily concept recommendations available	April 2006
Public meeting to discuss the concept recommendations	May 3, 2006
Public comments accepted on the concept recommendations	through August '07
Meetings with community representatives and design and development professionals	May '06 through March '08
Draft multifamily code amendments available for public review	September 26 '07
Public meeting to discuss draft code recommendations	October 15 '07
2 nd Public comment period on DRAFT code	September 26 through October 31 '07
Publication of Environmental Determination	November '07

Next steps	Dates
Mayor submits legislation for new Multifamily Code	July '08

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

provisions to City Council for review and adoption	
Republish Environmental Determination	July '08
City Council consideration begins (to include additional public process)	Anticipated: July '08

3. Background

Current Multifamily Zones

The following chart summarizes the building types and standards in the current Multifamily Zones. For more detailed summaries see Appendix B.

Another source for information about existing multifamily zones are the “Zoning Charts” under the “Publications” menu at DPD’s website:

<http://www.cityofseattle.net/dpd/>

The following chart provides a summary of the building types, key development standards and amount of parcel area zoned for each multifamily zone designation:

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Zone	Primary Building Type	Height Limit	Height Limit w/ Pitched Roof	Density Limit	Parcel Area Zoned MF/ % of Total MF Zoned Parcel Area***
Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT)	Duplex or triplex houses and townhouses	25'	30' to 35'*	One unit per 2,000 sq. ft. of lot area	318 acres/ 8%
Lowrise 1 (L1)	Townhouses	25'	30' to 35'*	One unit per 1,600 sq. ft. of lot area	749 acres/ 18%
Lowrise 2 (L2)	2 to 3 story apartment buildings or townhouses	25'	30' to 35'*	One unit per 1,200 sq. ft. of lot area	882 acres/ 22%
Lowrise 3 (L3)	3 story apartment buildings or townhouses	30'	35'	One unit per 800 sq. ft. of lot area	1,662 acres/ 40%
Lowrise 4 (L4)	4 story apartment buildings or townhouses	37'	42'	One unit per 600 sq. ft. of lot area	168 acres/ 4%
Midrise (MR)	6 or 8 story apartment buildings, limited commercial uses permitted	60' or 85'	65' (NA in the 85' zone)	NA	302 acres/ 7%
Highrise (HR)	Residential towers up to 240' in height, limited commercial	160'/240'***	NA	NA	50 acres/ 1%

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

	uses permitted				
--	----------------	--	--	--	--

**In LDT, L1 and L2 zones, roofs with a 4:12 pitch (slope rises 4' for every 12' in length) may extend to 30' and to 35' with a 6:12 pitch.*

***Height limit in HR zones when affordable housing or open space is provided or landmarks are preserved.*

****Multifamily (MF) zoned land (4,131 acres excluding rights-of way and City-owned open space) applies to 12% of the total parcel area of the city (34,110 acres).*

Why Amend the Land Use Code?

Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 1994 and updated in 2004, establishes how the city will accommodate approximately 47,000 new households by 2024. Under the Comprehensive Plan, Seattle's growth management strategy directs growth to a system of urban centers and urban villages, where much of the city's development capacity exists. Multifamily zones play an important role in accommodating future growth by allowing structures that provide denser housing choices than single family zones. Seattle's Comprehensive Plan recognizes the role of multifamily residential areas as a means to "encourage the development and retention of a diversity of multifamily housing types to meet the diverse needs of Seattle's present and future populations."

Multifamily zones make up approximately 12 percent of the total parcel area of the city (excludes city-owned open space and rights-of-way). When combined with neighborhood commercial zones, which account for another eight percent of the city's parcel area, these zones are expected to accommodate many more households than the more than sixty percent of the city's parcel area zoned for single family development. Multifamily zones can provide many different housing options, such as townhouses, row houses, apartments and condominiums that are often more affordable than single family houses and better address the needs of Seattle's changing households.

Seattle's zoning is complex, and is often relied upon to accomplish many, often conflicting objectives. In order to implement Seattle's Comprehensive Plan and meet the goals established for managing future growth, it has become necessary to re-evaluate the City's zoning regulations. Modifying and improving multifamily zoning is the third major undertaking in updating the City's zoning requirements, following changes begun with the Mayor's Neighborhood Business District Strategy and Downtown zoning changes.

The basis for our current multifamily zoning was originally adopted in 1982. Since that time, the zoning has been incrementally amended over the years such that some objectives

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

may be obscured by added layers of requirements and process. Over time, many of these added layers of regulation have become redundant and unnecessary. They often add to the cost of development and can work against Comprehensive and Neighborhood Plan goals for affordable housing and quality design.

City staff, Planning Commissioners, applicants, neighborhood residents, and Design Review Board members, have identified many issues that impact the effectiveness of multifamily zone requirements. These issues include:

- the code is old and out of date (and was developed before Design Review);
- could better reflect the Comprehensive Plan;
- the code is overly complex, which has been exacerbated by multiple amendments over time;
- the code is not having the desired effect on neighborhood character; and
- the code does not effectively address climate change or the need for affordable housing.

Consequently, four key questions were considered in preparing the final recommendations:

How effective are the multifamily zones in accommodating a growing and changing population?

Do they encourage well-designed buildings that fit in with established neighborhoods?

Does multifamily zoning help accomplish City and neighborhood goals without adding unnecessarily to the cost of building new housing?

How can new multifamily development help protect the environment and provide housing that working people can afford?

Relationship to Comprehensive and Neighborhood Plans

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The goals and strategies laid out in the Comprehensive Plan's Urban Village, Land Use and Neighborhood Planning Elements were the basis for proposed changes to the multifamily zone requirements. The proposed changes will help to implement Land Use and Housing Element Goals and Policies and 67 Goals and Policies from 30 Neighborhood Plans (see Appendix C for a list).

Land Use and Housing Goals and Policies. The overarching goals for Multifamily Zones are to:

LUG11 -- *Encourage...a diversity of multifamily housing types to meet the diverse needs of Seattle's present and future populations.*

LUG12 -- *Promote a residential development pattern consistent with the urban village strategy, with increased availability of housing at densities that promote walking and transit use near employment concentrations, residential services and amenities.*

Not only are these two goals furthered by the proposed amendments to multifamily zones, but more specific policies about providing zoning incentives for affordable housing (adopted by the City Council in 2006) and protecting the environment (including responding to the impacts of climate change) are also advanced by proposed amendments to the multifamily code:

LU-5 (#2) -- *Seek opportunities to incorporate incentive programs for development of housing affordable to lower-income households into legislative rezones or changes in development regulations that increase development potential. Consider development regulations that condition higher-density development on the provision of public benefits when such public benefits will help mitigate impacts of development attributable to increased development potential.*

E1 – Explore ways for City actions and decisions to have positive effects on the natural environment and human health, and to avoid or offset potential negative effects, including those caused by private projects permitted by the City.

The proposed amendments are consistent with land use, housing and environmental policies, including those most directly related to Multifamily Zones. These policies were adopted by the City Council as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update of 2007 and are listed in Appendix D to this report.

4. Updated Multifamily Zones

Multifamily zoning should accommodate a range of housing choices to provide housing for current and future households making Seattle home. New rezone criteria should aid in predictable and rational use of these zones. This section of the report summarizes the proposed changes to development standards and rezone criteria that will enable the existing mix of zones, including a mixed-use zone designation – Residential Commercial (RC), to achieve these objectives.

Mix of Multifamily Zones

Currently there are seven Multifamily zones. Five are intended for low-scale development, while the other two address mid-scale and highrise development. The low-scale zones tend to be located adjacent to single family zoned areas. Together, the multifamily zones are intended to provide for a wide range of housing choices and accommodate gradual transitions between zone designations allowing different intensities of development. Multifamily zones will continue to act as a transition from single family and lower intensity multifamily zones to more intense multifamily and mixed-use commercial zones.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The five existing Lowrise zones -- Lowrise Duplex/Triplex, and Lowrise 1, 2, 3, and 4 -- are proposed to be retained as mapped throughout the city. However, for future use, only the first four of these lowrise zones will be available for mapping and would thus have rezone criteria. The L4 zone would be maintained, but new L4 zones would not be mapped in the future. This preserves current development potential and maintains an appropriate range of lower-intensity zones to accommodate desired housing types, including duplexes, triplexes, townhouse, row houses, and moderate density stacked flats (apartments and condominiums).

Four zones are recommended to replace the current five zones for future use to provide for a diversity of housing types as shown in the chart:

New Zone	Intended Primary Building Type*	
	Current	Proposed
Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT)	2 to 3 story duplexes, triplexes and townhouses	Same
Lowrise 1 (L1)	2 to 3 story townhouses, row houses or apartment buildings	Same
Lowrise 2 (L2)	2 to 3 story townhouses, row houses or apartment buildings	Same
Lowrise 3 (L3)	3 story apartment buildings or townhouses	3 story apartment buildings or townhouses; 4 th story when affordable housing is provided**.
Lowrise 4 (L4)	4 story apartment buildings or townhouses	Same

*The stated building type is primarily what is intended, although other types are allowed.

**4 floors may be accommodated in the L4 zone, where currently mapped, without providing affordable housing.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT) zone continues to be a zone allowing small multifamily structures in areas that generally abut single family zones. LDT zoning is intended to accommodate existing single family structures as well as duplexes and triplexes.

Initially, in formulating a concept for new multifamily zoning, consolidating L1 and L2 zones was considered, due in part to only a moderate difference in density and scale of development allowed in both zones. This recommendation was subsequently withdrawn in response to public comments in favor of maintaining both L1 and L2 zones to retain a diversity of scale and density in areas where a lower density neighborhood character or transition to single family areas would best be served.

Existing L1 and L2 zoned areas account for approximately 40% of the multifamily zoned land in the city, almost evenly split between the two zones. In addition, these areas are commonly located outside of urban village areas.

The L3 and L4 zones were intended to accommodate moderate-scaled, wood frame multifamily construction of three to four story apartment and condominium buildings, though townhouses are also common in both zones. The nature, density and scale of development in both zones are similar, with the primary difference being the ability to accommodate an additional floor in L4.

The revised L3 and existing L4 zones, with improved standards addressing the design of structures, will allow a moderate scale of multifamily development of three to four story apartments that are compatible with the scale and density of the surrounding neighborhood.

Under proposed changes for L3 zones, developers would have the choice to develop at standards similar to what is currently allowed in the L3 zone or, in specified locations, to use standards similar to current L4 if affordable housing is provided (for more on the affordable housing incentive program see Section 7).

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Comprehensive Plan, Neighborhood Plan Element Policies: A-P4, EL-P14, MJ-P15, NN-P34, QA-P10, W-P7

The special L3 and L4 locational criteria for the evaluation of rezones to the L3 and L4 designations inside of urban villages, shall not apply in the Admiral, Eastlake, Lake City, Morgan Junction, Upper Queen Anne, or Wallingford Urban Village(s).

When the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1994, the rezone criteria in the Land Use Code only allowed rezoning to L3 and L4 zones when the area to be rezoned already exhibits the scale and intensity of development permitted in these zones. To help implement the Comprehensive Plan, the City proposed a less restrictive approach to allow the use of L3 and L4 zones within urban villages. The City Council supplemented this proposal and adopted the above policy for the six neighborhoods listed.

The policy can be interpreted as a prohibition on additional development potential for the L3 zone, as contemplated in the proposed incentive program. In deference to this existing policy, these areas are proposed to be excluded from the incentive zoning program, until such time as this policy is amended after appropriate community process. For more information, see Section 7 of the report on the incentive program.

Recommendations

Maintain the existing multifamily zone designations (Lowrise Duplex/Triplex, Lowrise 1,2,3 and 4 (L1, L2, L3, and L4), Midrise (MR) and Highrise (HR) and the original intent for establishing these zones. The Lowrise 4 (L4) zone would remain essentially the same as it exists today.

Residential Commercial Designation (RC)

The Residential Commercial (RC) designation is combined as a suffix to a multifamily zone to allow limited non-residential uses in a mixed use structure (residential and commercial uses). The physical appearance and use of structures in RC zones is primarily

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

residential in order to maintain compatibility with surrounding residential zoning. This designation is typically limited to areas adjacent to commercial zones.

Recommendation

No changes are proposed to the RC zone.

Rezone Criteria

Rezone criteria are used to guide decisions regarding the appropriate zone designation for a property proposed to be rezoned. Rezones might be proposed to carry out new City policies adopted as part of a planning process, or requested by a property owner or permit applicant as part of a development process. A rezone must be approved by the City Council.

Rezone criteria address general planning considerations, such as effective transitions between different zones, impacts that might result from different zoning scenarios; and specific criteria that help to decide what zone best fits the desired function and characteristics of an area.

When current multifamily zoning was adopted in 1982, new zones replaced zones first adopted in 1958. Criteria were developed to identify when a new zone designation was appropriate for a particular parcel of land. Generally, these criteria were written to recognize the existing character of an area. For example, the criteria would conclude that an area characterized by highrise development be designated as Highrise.

Over the years, many rezones involving multifamily zones have occurred throughout the city. In some cases, this was necessary to accommodate new housing opportunities, especially for neighborhoods within urban centers and villages. Some rezones were proposed as part of a neighborhood planning process. However, the existing rezone criteria emphasize only allowing rezoning when the existing scale and character of the area already

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

reflects the development that would be permitted under the new zoning designation. This diminishes the value of planning and rezoning as tools for shaping the future development of an area in ways that might further City and community goals.

Recommendations

In order to support City policy and neighborhood plan goals and objectives that favor a range of housing types, compatible with existing neighborhoods, zone locational criteria are proposed to be amended. Proposed changes to zone locational criteria are found in Appendix A**.

Generally, the revised criteria will:

- Allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve the City and neighborhood goals.*
- Strengthen the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy for directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers.

*No changes are proposed to existing rezone criteria used to guide rezones for single family zones.

**While the L4 zone is proposed to be retained, it is not intended for future use, so no rezone criteria are proposed.

5. Uses

Current multifamily zones are primarily residential in nature. In addition to the variety of housing types permitted, accessory uses that support the principal residential purpose of the zones are also permitted. Uses such as institutions (i.e. religious facilities, day cares, schools) that meet development standards are permitted outright. Institutions that do not meet development standards are permitted as conditional uses. A conditional use is a use permitted only after it is determined that it meets specific conditions.

Generally, under the proposal, the regulation of uses in multifamily zones is not proposed to change. As with current zoning, in Midrise and Highrise zones, ground floor non-residential uses would continue to be permitted in limited circumstances.

Permitted and Prohibited Uses

The proposed permitted and prohibited uses are organized on a chart for ease of use and understanding. Though substantively unchanged, organization of the code is changed so that provisions for approval of public facilities are relocated from various sections throughout the existing code to a new use section in the proposed new code, locating all use-related provisions in one place.

Conditional Uses

Administrative conditional uses can be approved by the Director of DPD, subject to appeal to the Hearing Examiner; Council conditional uses must be approved by the City Council. Generally conditional uses must not be detrimental to the public welfare or surrounding properties. Amendments are proposed to organize general criteria applicable to conditional uses in all zones in one location in the Land Use Code. The current uses (institutions, other than public schools, that do not meet Multifamily development standards; uses not otherwise permitted in landmark structures; and park and pool and park and ride lots) would continue to be subject to conditional use approval in multifamily zones:

Recommendations

No substantive changes are proposed to the treatment of uses in Multifamily zones. Use provisions would be consolidated to make them easier to find and understand. Conditional use criteria are simplified and consolidated in one location in the Land Use Code.

6. Development Standards

To meet the objectives laid out in Section 1, the proposed changes to multifamily zoning should help to foster new development that: is cost-effective and sensible; is of quality design; fits into existing neighborhoods; promotes sustainable development and provides incentives for affordable housing. This section of the report presents the recommendations for development standards for multifamily zones.

Current multifamily zones are governed by standards that have been amended several times since their original adoption, and they predate the creation of the design review process, which, without an alternative approach, made it necessary to address design issues with prescriptive standards. Consequently, the standards can be redundant or overly prescriptive, resulting in development that is not responsive to neighborhood context or character, diminishing the quality of design in multifamily neighborhoods. An example is façade modulation, which is required without regard to overall composition of the façade design, articulation or division of the outside of the building to show that there are different units in a building. While the existing standards were intended to address design concerns, the lack of flexibility has made them an obstacle to design that responds to neighborhood or site specific conditions, which is critical to good design.

The concept of increased development flexibility within prescribed limits is based on the belief that simpler, less prescriptive code requirements can help new development better relate to local conditions. Development standards should focus on the objectives to be achieved.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The Design Review Program, initiated in 1994, is intended to improve the design of new structures in Seattle's neighborhoods. Development proposals with nine or more dwelling units in L3 and L4 zones and over 20 units in the Midrise and Highrise zones are subject to design review. In addition, applicants may volunteer for design review, in all multifamily zones.

Design review allows departures from development standards when a design solution is proposed that better meets the intent of the zone or when the strict application of development standards inhibits good design. For projects that are subject to design review, issues of compatibility and siting of development can be effectively addressed. A principal focus of design review is a project's context. Design guidelines direct designers and project reviewers to look closely at local conditions in order to ensure that new buildings fit in and enhance their surroundings.

For more information about the Design Review program, see DPD website:

http://www.cityofseattle.net/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Applicant's_Toolbox/Design_Guidelines/

Flexibility must be guided with clear statements of policy intent – what is to be achieved. Standards would have limits, but allow for development projects to be designed in a way that is more responsive to the unique conditions of sites. Proposed standards are based on situations or characteristics of different development sites. For example, the regulation of bulk and scale on smaller, infill sites of 9,000 square feet or less is accomplished with setback requirements, height limits and a floor area ratio (FAR)¹. On larger sites, where the bulk of buildings is less constrained by the site size, additional requirements apply, including maximum limits on structure width.

¹ FAR, or floor area ratio, is the ratio of gross floor area in a building to the total area of the land on which it is built. If a one story building takes up the entire lot, the floor area ratio is 1:1 or 1.0 FAR. A two story building that occupies half of the lot also has a floor area ratio of 1:1 or 1.0 FAR

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Density and Floor Area Ratios

Density in a multifamily development generally refers to the number of dwelling units per square foot of lot area. Currently in Lowrise zones density is limited based on lot area. For example, in L3 zones, one dwelling unit is allowed for every 800 square feet of lot area. While the number of units in a development is often controlled by limits on bulk and scale, setbacks, open space and parking requirements, density limits provide predictability in terms of maximum number of units allowed. Existing density limits are proposed to be retained for LDT, L1 and L2 zones due to the location of these zones generally outside of urban centers and villages and the proximity of these zones to lower density single family areas. This will retain existing capacity for new residential development in these zones.

Density Limits for LDT, L1 and L2 Zones.

	LDT Zone	L1 Zone	L2 Zone
Density Limit	No change: 1 unit/2,000 sq. ft. of lot area (no more than 3 units per structure)	No change: 1 unit/1,600 sq. ft. of lot area	No change: 1 unit/1,200 sq. ft. of lot area

Density limits regulate the number of units on a lot, not building bulk. Therefore, in addition, a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is proposed to regulate building bulk in these zones. FAR permits additional design flexibility. For example, if the massing of a project results in greater floor area at the lower levels of a building and lesser at higher levels, the result may be reduced shadows and more sunlight on surrounding properties, and less view blockage. Having more flexibility in the form of a structure may also allow for some savings in construction. The use of FAR to control bulk could allow more flexibility for how units are arranged on a site.

Without density limits, FAR is largely a bulk control; but still has a limiting effect on density. Since multifamily zones in urban centers and villages are generally L3, L4, MR and HR zones, the proposal is to use FAR to manage both bulk and density in these zones.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Using FAR without a limit on units may increase housing capacity in areas intended to accommodate the greatest density, consistent with the City's growth management strategy. The following chart shows the amount of multifamily land area in an urban center, village or light rail station area. Unlike Lowrise zones, MR and HR zones are currently not subject to a density limit based on lot area.

Inside/outside – Urban Centers, Urban Villages or Light Rail Station Areas.

New Zone	Parcel area inside an urban center, village or station area	Parcel area outside an urban center, village or station area	Total*
LDT	152	166	318
L1	242	507	749
L2	359	523	882
L3/L4	959	871	1,830
MR	192	110	302
HR	50	0	50
TOTAL	1,955 acres (47%)	2,176 acres (53%)	4,131 acres (100%)*

*Total excludes lots with a Major Institution Overlay (MIO) designation, where no multifamily development is anticipated. Total parcel area of multifamily zones with a major institution overlay is 822 acres, with 289 acres in L1, 60 acres in L2, 166 acres in L3, 280 acres in MR, and 27 acres in HR.

Consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies that support accommodating additional height and density in urban centers, urban villages and light rail station areas, the proposal would allow for an increase in FAR in the L3, MR and HR multifamily zones located within these areas through the incentive program described in Section 7.

How proposed FAR limits were derived. Recent development trends and development prototypes using the current and proposed code were analyzed to establish preliminary recommendations for FAR limits in the new multifamily zones. Both types of analysis are helpful (comparing the FAR resulting from the prototypes to FARs resulting from actual development projects built between 1996 and 2006), due to the broad range of building types that are anticipated in Lowrise zones.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Proposed FAR limits are intended to approximate the development scale and capacity of current multifamily zones; allow for a range of housing types as contemplated for each zone; and allow for the introduction of an incentive zoning program in the L3, MR and HR zones.

Proposed FAR Limits

	LDT	L1	L2	L3	L4	MR	HR
Permitted FAR	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.4	2.0	3.2	7.0
Maximum FAR, when affordable housing is provided (or other benefits in the HR zone)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2.0	N.A.	4.0	13

An important difference between the current approach to lot coverage and width and depth limits, and FAR is that a departure from FAR limits would not be allowed through Design Review. Generally, a departure from limits on width does not result in buildings with substantially greater floor area.

When parking is provided within the structure at least partially underground (protruding not more than 4' above grade), it would not count toward the floor area used to calculate FAR. This encourages parking in below grade structures rather than on the surface.

Recommendations

- Use FAR to regulate building bulk in all zones.
- Maintain dwelling unit density limits tied to lot area in LDT, L1 and L2 zones.
- Rely upon FAR to manage density in L3, L4, MR and HR zones.
- Exempt parking from FAR in structures that do not rise more than 4' above grade.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Setbacks in Lowrise Zones

Landscaped setbacks are important to maintain compatibility with surrounding residential development and add vegetation that is important for the environment. The current approach to setbacks in multifamily zones essentially follows a single family zone model where front and rear setbacks are relatively large (on the order of 15' to 20' from the property lines) and side setbacks are more modest (generally, 5' from the property lines).

Under the proposal multifamily zoned lots that abut other multifamily or commercially zoned lots would be required to provide setbacks that provide for reasonable separation between structures for privacy and access to light and air, but need not mimic single family development. However, multifamily zoned lots that abut single family zoned lots are proposed to continue to provide setbacks similar to what is currently required to provide a transition. The amount of Lowrise zoned parcel area on edges abutting single family zoned lots is shown below.

Setbacks in Lowrise Zones: Parcels on Edges of Single Family Zones

New Zone	Parcel Area of Edge Zones* Maintain current front or rear setback requirements in Lowrise zones for transition.	Parcel Areas of Non-Edge Zones*	Total**
LDT	150	168	318
L1	445	304	749
L2	488	394	882
L3/L4	726	1,104	1,830
TOTAL	1,809 acres (48%)	1,970 acres (52%)	3,779 acres (100%)**

*Edge Zones = Multifamily zoned lots that abut or are across an alley or street from a Single Family zoned lot.

**Total excludes lots with a Major Institution Overlay (MIO) designation, where no multifamily development is anticipated.

Differentiating between these situations allows greater variety of site planning options for new multifamily development in areas abutting neighborhood business zones or surrounded by other multifamily areas. For the Lowrise zones, the following setbacks are proposed:

Recommendations

- To provide transitions to lots zoned Single Family, required front or rear setbacks (up to 15' or 20', depending on the zone) would remain unchanged for Lowrise multifamily zones abutting single family zoned lots. Reduced setbacks would be allowed for multifamily zoned lots separated from single family zoned lots by a wide right-of-way.
- For Lowrise zoned lots that abut lots zoned multifamily or commercial, setbacks from all property lines must average seven feet (7') and in no case be less than five feet (5'). Side setbacks would be five feet (5') when facades facing side lot lines are no longer than forty feet (40').
- Continue to allow rear lot line setbacks to be measured from the center line of alleys.

Height Limits

Height limits are important to providing an appropriate transition between zones of greater and lesser intensity. Currently in LDT, L1 and L2 multifamily zones, structures are limited to a height of 25 feet. In L3 and L4 zones height limits are 30 and 37 feet, respectively. In all Lowrise zones an additional 5' is allowed for a roof with a pitch of 4:12 (the roof slope must rise 4' for every 12' of horizontal distance or run). In LDT, L1 and L2 zones, 10' is allowed above the height limit for a pitched roof with a minimum pitch of 6:12.

A height of 30' to 35' is generally needed to accommodate structures with at least three floors, which is common for townhouse and other multifamily structures, especially with structured parking at ground level. In addition, assessment of recently built projects in L3 zones where there is currently a 35' height limit, when a pitched roof is used, shows that there is more variety in roof designs, both contemporary and traditional. This also happens to be the height limit allowed in single family zones.

The existing 25' height limit would remain unchanged in LDT, L1 and L2 zones, except that additional height for pitched roofs would be limited to 10' for roofs with a minimum pitch of 6:12.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

An additional 5' in height would continue to be allowed in L3 and L4 zones for pitched roofs, but the minimum pitch required would be 6:12, rather than the current minimum of 4:12.

Dormers and clerestories are traditional architectural features located on roofs that can allow for more usable floor space within a roof-structure without visually increasing the appearance of building bulk, as would occur if an additional floor with vertical walls were allowed. Dormers and clerestories can also add to the visual interest of a roof. The proposal would allow limited dormers and clerestories within the height limit allowed for a pitched roof

In Highrise zones, in order to promote more interesting architectural treatment of the tops of residential towers, towers that comply with specific design conditions are permitted a 15% height increase. The added height is for architectural features and screening, and does not allow additional residential floor area.

Pitched Roof Allowances. At community meetings dissatisfaction was expressed over the appearance of structures with a shallow pitched roof, encouraged by the minimum requirements of 4:12 under the current code. It was widely believed that these roof pitches result in structures that do not fit in and can even detract from the neighborhood. In response, the proposal is to allow an additional 10' in height in LDT, L1 and L2 zones and an additional 5' in height in L3 and L4 zones as an incentive for pitched roofs, but in all cases to require a minimum roof pitch of 6:12.

Height Incentive. Consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies that support accommodating additional height and density in urban centers, urban villages and light rail station areas, the proposal would allow for an increase in height limits in the L3, MR and HR multifamily zones located within these specified areas. The height increase would only be allowed if public benefits—mainly affordable housing—were provided through the incentive program described in Section 7. In L3 and MR zones outside of these areas, and in all L4 zones, no change in maximum height is proposed

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Additional Height in HR Zone. To promote thinner tower design, the proposal in the HR zone would allow maximum structure height to be increased from 240' up to 300' when the project includes affordable housing or other public benefits as outlined above, and the following additional conditions are met:

- The average residential gross floor area per story above a height of 45' is limited to a footprint of 9,500 square feet;
- No parking may be located above the ground floor, unless it is separated from all street frontages by another use; and
- A minimum of 25% of the lot area at ground level must be provided as a landscaped area with a minimum dimension of 10'; or a minimum of 20% if a landscaped, common recreation area at ground level is provided.

Allowances for Green Building Features. For zones with height limits under 40', it is difficult to accommodate a green roof (roofs with soil and plants that help off-set heat gain and reduce climate impacts associated with buildings, as well as help filter impurities, improving the quality of storm water run-off). Green roofs require that the roof structure be engineered to support soil and plant materials. Often, the floor to ceiling height of floors must be reduced or floors potentially lost if a green roof is provided. This acts as a disincentive for green roofs. Therefore, the proposed multifamily code would allow up to 2 additional feet to accommodate a green roof that occupies at least 50% of the area of a roof.

New technology has produced new elevators that use up to 25% less energy than conventional elevators. The mechanical equipment of these elevators is such that the current elevator penthouse allowance of 10' above the height limit is not sufficient to accommodate these elevators. Therefore, an additional 6' to 16' of height is proposed to be allowed in Lowrise and MR zones and up to 25' in HR zones when new, energy efficient elevators are proposed. The additional height needed to accommodate these elevators must be approved pursuant to administrative Design Review. Mechanical penthouses are allowed to cover up to 20% of the roof area when screened. No changes are proposed to the coverage allowance related to elevator equipment.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Wind-driven power generators placed on the rooftops of buildings are gaining in popularity. These generators can meet some or all of the power needs of a new building, without consuming fossil fuels and thereby reducing the carbon footprint of a building. In some cases, excess power generated can be sold to a public utility. A low profile type of wind generator can be placed on the rooftop of a building and extend no more than 10' above the surface of the roof. These horizontal wind generators look like coils that allow views through them, even when rotating. Therefore the proposal would allow rooftop wind generators to extend up to 10' above the height limit and exempts them from the rooftop coverage limits.

Solar collectors are allowed to extend above the height limit currently, but they are not allowed on top of penthouse structures on the roof. This is often an optimal location for solar collectors. Therefore, the proposal is to allow solar collectors not taller than 4' to be located on the roof of a penthouse in Lowrise zones and no taller than 7' in MR and HR zones.

In addition, the current allowance for sloping sites that allows an additional 5' of height, measured from the downhill side of a slope, on lots with a slope of 6% or greater, is retained.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Recommendations

- No change to 25' height limit in LDT, L1, L2, and L4 zones;
- Allow additional height in L3 (7' additional, for a total of 37'), MR (15' additional, for a total of 75') and HR (60' additional, for a total of 300*) in specified locations when the incentive program for affordable housing is used;
- Allow 10' of additional height in LDT, L1 and L2 zones for pitched roofs, but only for roofs with a minimum pitch of 6:12, eliminate allowance for additional 5' for pitched roof with a minimum slope of 4:12;
- Continue to allow additional 5' of height in L3 and L4 zones, but only for roofs with a minimum pitch of 6:12, rather than the current minimum of 4:12;
- Allow up to 2' of additional height to accommodate a green roof that occupies at least 50% of the area of a roof.
- Subject to administrative Design Review, allow elevator penthouses to extend 16' above the height limit in L3, L4 and MR zones and 25' in HR zones to accommodate green (energy efficient) elevators.
- Allow solar collectors no more than 4' high to be located on a mechanical penthouse in LDT and L zones and no more than 7' in MR and HR zones.
- Allow horizontal wind generators to extend 10' above the height limit in all multifamily zones and exempt them from rooftop coverage limits.
- Retain existing provision for height of structure on sloping sites.
- Allow additional height of up to 15% above the 300' height limit in the HR zone to accommodate special treatment of the building top.

*currently, in the HR zone, incentives are required for increases in height above 160' up to the maximum height of 240'. An additional 60' increase to 300' is proposed for projects participating in the bonus program and meeting specific design criteria.

Standards for Lots Larger than 9,000 sq. ft.

In some neighborhoods, new structures are built on relatively small sites and add to the existing pattern of development at relatively similar bulk and scale. These developments are characteristic of more urban neighborhoods where lot aggregation may be difficult. In such

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

circumstances it is recommended to distinguish these proposed developments from those that would occupy much larger sites and are more likely to alter or introduce a new character in an area.

Over time, historically platted lots have been combined, divided and reconfigured. This makes it difficult to predict the lot area and configuration of all future development projects. However, using increments of sample platted lots in the city's multifamily neighborhoods, a 9,000 square foot lot is proposed as an appropriate threshold for apply regulations that distinguish infill lots form larger lots.

On larger sites, height and FAR limits and setbacks are supplemented by other measures to further protect existing neighborhoods by helping new development to fit in with the surroundings. Consequently, on sites that are greater than 9,000 square feet, revised standards for lot coverage and structure width and depth limits are proposed to apply.

Lot coverage. Lot coverage describes the maximum percentage of the lot that may be occupied by structures. Current code requirements allow greater coverage for townhouse structures. At the time the Code was written, there was only limited townhouse development, and it was believed desirable to encourage this type of development. Not only is this no longer necessary, it also adds unneeded complexity to the code. With the added benefit of a floor area ratio (FAR) limit, the proposal is to apply the greater lot coverage afforded townhouses to all structures to increase flexibility for the siting and design of structures.

Comparison of current and proposed lot coverage limits

Zones	Current lot coverage limits		Proposed lot coverage limits*
	Townhouses	All other structures	All structures
LDT	45%	35%	45%

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

L1	50%	40%	50%
L2	50%	40%	50%
L3 & L4	50%	45% & 50%	50%

*Applies to lots over 9,000 sq. ft. in area.

Width and Depth Limits. Width and depth limits are used to regulate the bulk of structures. The maximum width of structures applies to the facades extending between side lot lines, generally facing street and alley rights-of-way or front and rear setbacks. Maximum depth applies to facades that generally span the distance from the front to the rear of the lot.

Under current code requirements, width and depth limits differ depending on whether or not the structure includes a modulated facade and whether or not an entrance to the structure faces the street. As with lot coverage, current standards allow greater widths and depths for townhouse structures, and these are proposed to apply to all new development on sites greater than 9,000 sq. ft. In addition, depth limits are proposed to better match the setback requirements in that 75% of lot depth tends to be left over, once a front or rear property line setback is provided (for the transition setbacks for multifamily lots that abut single family zoned lots).

Development on larger lots will likely require design review. The existing variable width and depth limits that can be increased to the maximum limits allowed through modulation are standards pre-dating design review. The design review process now provides a better approach than the prescribed modulation standards for addressing the design issues associated with projects reaching the maximum bulk limits allowed. The chart below compares current width and depth limits with proposed limits.

Current Width/Depth Requirements for Lowrise Zones

Current Zones	Maximum Building Width w/o Modulation	Maximum Building Width w/ Modulation	Maximum Building Depth
----------------------	--	---	-------------------------------

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

LDT	30', 40' w/ an entrance facing a street	45'	60% of lot depth, not to exceed 65'
L1	SAME	60'	60% of lot depth
L2	SAME	Apartments and ground related housing (except townhouses): 50' Townhouses: 90'	Apartments and ground related housing (except townhouses): 60% of lot depth Townhouses: 65% of lot depth
L3	SAME	Apartments and ground related housing (except townhouses): 75' Townhouses: 120'	Apartments and ground related housing, including townhouses: 65% of lot depth
L4	SAME	Apartments and ground related housing (except townhouses): 90' Townhouses: 150'	65% of lot depth

Proposed Width/Depth Requirements for Lowrise Zones

Proposed Zones	Maximum Building Width	Maximum Building Depth
LDT	45'	65% of lot depth
L1	60'	65% of lot depth
L2	90'	75% of lot depth
L3 & L4	120'	75% of lot depth

Recommendation

- The proposal distinguishes between applicable development standards development standards based on lot size to increase flexibility for small, in-fill lot development.
- Setbacks, height limits and FAR limits are proposed to regulate bulk and scale on smaller infill lots up to 9,000 sq. ft. in area, and would be further supplemented by new design standards (discussed on page 32) for projects below the threshold for design review.
- In addition to setbacks, height and FAR limits, lot coverage and structure width and depth limits would apply to development on larger sites, over 9,000 sq. ft. in area.

Landscaping and the Seattle Green Factor

Current multifamily code requirements include a landscaped area equivalent to three times the perimeter of lot, street trees as per SDOT standards, and screening of surface parking lots. The total amount of required landscaping depends on the size of the lot and the configuration of development on the lot. Under the proposal, new development will have to meet the Seattle Green Factor, a menu of landscaping strategies and corresponding scoring system.

The Green Factor is designed to increase the amount and quality of urban landscaping, while allowing increased flexibility for property owners to develop their property. Green Factor landscaping can add value and interest to new development and maximizes the functional benefits of landscaping on the environment, such as natural cooling and insulation, air quality, reduced runoff, and habitat.

Under the Green Factor requirement, and in addition to residential amenities, developers will be required to landscape an area that has the equivalent positive effect on water quality to landscaping on 60% of a lot (minimum Green Factor score = 0.6).

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Under the Green Factor scoring system, this landscaping may be provided through a variety of landscaping options, including trees and shrubs, pervious paving, green roofs, vegetated walls and approved water features. Each of these options is weighted differently, with high values or bonuses assigned to the following:

- Vegetation that is visible to pedestrians and passers-by;
- Preservation of existing trees;
- Trees that have larger canopies;
- Landscaping that combines layers of plantings, increasing the environmental benefits of the landscaped area; and
- Use of native or drought-tolerant plants.
- Rainwater harvesting.

As is the case in neighborhood business districts, the proposal for multifamily zones would allow landscaping provided in the right-of-way to count towards the Green Factor requirement. The Green Factor increases the ecological and aesthetic function of landscaped areas.

This ordinance uses the revised Green Factor scoring system that will be proposed in summer 2008 for commercial zones. Revisions are based on experience from the first year of implementation as well as a preliminary audit of projects permitted under the Green Factor. To add greater design flexibility, the revised scoring system includes several new categories, including shallower pervious paving and green roofs, native plants, structural soils, and food cultivation areas.

Recommendations

- Require that all setbacks be landscaped;
- The amount and type of plantings required for new development will be governed by the Seattle Green Factor;
- A Green Factor requirement of 0.6 is proposed by zone (equivalent in function to vegetation covering 60% of the lot).
- Continue to require street trees and screening of surface parking.

Residential Amenity Requirement

Current multifamily code requirements for open space, setbacks and screening and landscaping are complex. Standards stipulate minimum required areas, dimensions and percentages of allowed overlap (for example, a portion of required open space can, in some cases, count toward required landscaping). These standards vary by zone and by building type. “Open space” provided to meet these standards is intended to serve the needs of residents and is not public. In some cases, requirements can be met above ground, on balconies and rooftop decks.

Proposed amendments to open space requirements are intended to address amenities that provide for the recreational needs of residents. Residential amenity requirements in multifamily zones are proposed to replace all of the current open space requirements. The amount of residential amenity area required in a project is equivalent to five percent of the total gross floor area of residential use. Eligible amenities will include individual and shared spaces such as rooftop decks, balconies and ground level, landscaped spaces.

Current open space requirements in the multifamily zones do not effectively address the needs of residents in either amount or type of space provided and open space, as currently defined, is often cited as adding unnecessarily to the cost of housing development. As of January 20, 2007, multifamily development in commercial areas must meet residential amenity requirements rather than “open space” requirements. The residential amenity requirements were adopted by the City Council as part of comprehensive amendments to

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

the City's commercial areas zoning. The amount of required residential amenity area proposed for multifamily zones would be the same as the amount now required for multifamily development in commercial areas.

The proposed residential amenity requirement:

- Will meet the needs of residents;
- Allows more flexibility for amenities, including ground level open space, decks and balconies, and rooftop decks, which can be provided for individual or shared use; and
- Is equal to or exceeds what is required in other cities around the state.

Recommendations

- Amenity areas are proposed to be required in an amount equal to 5% of the total gross floor area of a structure in residential use
- All of the required amenity area must be outside, except in the Highrise zone where common amenity space located on a roof may be enclosed.
- Eligible residential amenity areas would include: shared and private ground level open spaces, decks and balconies, and rooftop decks.

Design Standards

Strict adherence to standards that do not take into account site variability and local characteristics often produces a development that does not respond well to an established neighborhood character. In order to raise the level of design quality and architectural interest of new development that is not subject to the Design Review Program, simple design standards are proposed. Required architectural features are a relatively low cost way to provide visual interest without prescribing specific architectural styles. Other U.S. cities,

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

such as Portland, Oregon, successfully include these types of requirements in their multifamily zoning.

Proposed design standards would apply to all multifamily development below the thresholds for design review. Applicants may volunteer for administrative Design Review to address the intent of each standard in a different manner.

Recommendations

Key design issues are addressed by these proposed standards:

1). Façades:

a. Windows and/or doors must account for a minimum of 20% of the area of street-facing facades to avoid the appearance of blank walls and help ensure “eyes on the street” (a public safety principle).

b. Facades over 750 sq. ft. in area must be divided into smaller areas by projections or recesses. This standard is proposed to provide visually interesting facades and prevent blank, monotonous walls, working in tandem with façade openings.

To allow more flexibility in meeting this design standard, the Director would be allowed to permit variations, such as changes in building materials, architectural features, or special landscaping elements to achieve the intent of the façade requirements and limit the impact of blank walls.

2). Building Entries. Ground-level townhouse units abutting a street must have a pedestrian entrance facing the street; or if apartments, there must be a primary entrance facing the street or a courtyard with access to the street. This design standard is proposed to foster a sense of community and create pedestrian connections between multifamily buildings and streets. It also helps to ensure “eyes on the streets” and promotes a sense of openness/access to light and air.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

- 3). Appearance of Garage Entrances. Garages may not be closer to street lot lines than the remainder of the structures and street facing garage doors are limited to 75 sq. ft. in area. These standards are intended to help reinforce the pedestrian nature of multifamily neighborhoods.
- 4). Limit on Surface Parking Areas. Except when parking access is from an alley, and where permitted on the lot, surface parking areas would not be allowed to exceed six spaces unless separated by landscaping or screening from other surface parking areas (allowing a reasonable amount of surface parking, without overwhelming the development site).
- 5) Reduction in Height of Fences. The current 6' limit on fence height is proposed to be reduced to 4' in front setback areas to promote more pedestrian friendly street frontages.

Townhouse Design²

Townhouses have been popular with homebuyers and townhouse construction can be observed in most multifamily neighborhoods. Almost all townhouse development takes place in the Lowrise zones, which are meant to accommodate a variety of housing types and densities. Lowrise zones often serve as a transition between single family zoned areas and commercial and mixed-use areas of greater density.

The townhouses that are being built, while generally of a much higher design quality than the apartments of the 80s and early 90s, are both homogeneous and ubiquitous. The following characteristics are typical:

- Units sizes of 1,000 to 1,400 square feet
- 3 stories

² Also applies to other small scale structures.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

- 4 to 8 units in duplex, triplex or quad structures with garage doors and main entrances oriented around a common auto courtyard
- One garage underneath each unit
- Small yards surrounded by 6' to 8' tall fencing

DPD held a series of workshops to examine the characteristics of townhouse design and develop recommendations for how to improve this important housing type. The workshop was attended by community representatives, designers, and developers. Based on these workshops and independent study of recent townhouse development, as well as feedback from the community, DPD is proposing new flexible standards intended to improve the design quality of townhouses.

The proposed design standards, discussed earlier in this report, and outlined below, would apply to townhouses and are intended to encourage creative design solutions to help ensure a better contextual fit in existing neighborhoods.

In addition, standards are proposed to:

- Limit the height of fences in a street facing setback to four feet (4') in height;
- Limit building overhangs over driveways and aisles to 3';
- Require wider (2' additional width) drives/aisles to facilitate maneuvering in the auto-courtyards;
- Require larger parking spaces for townhouses (8½ feet wide by 19 feet deep); and
- Allow for more flexibility in how the driveway slope is configured to aid in accommodating shared, underground parking structures.

Recommendations

Increased flexibility. The concept of increased development flexibility, within prescribed limits, is integral to the Multifamily Code Update overall and is based on the belief that simpler, less prescriptive code requirements can help new development better relate to

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

local conditions. Increased flexibility would be achieved by modifying existing standards and introducing new standards to improve townhouse design. These changes are summarized below and discussed in more detail in other sections of the report.

The following modifications to existing standards are proposed to address issues observed in recent townhouse developments:

- **Setbacks.** When multifamily zoned lots only abut multifamily or commercially zoned lots, new setbacks would allow more flexibility in site planning (as structures will no longer be pushed into the center of the lot).

Bay windows and eaves would be allowed to project into a required setback. In Lowrise zones, stoops and porches may come out to the property lines for street and alley facing facades. Front and rear yards would only be required to transition to abutting single family zoned lots.

Required separation between structures on the same lot would be modified to limit the depth of portions of structures projecting above autocourts to improve the quality of these spaces.

- **Parking Requirements.** Parking quantity requirements would be eliminated in urban centers and station areas, reducing site and floor area used by cars.
- **Curb-cut location.** More flexibility is proposed so that curbcuts from streets may be acceptable, even when an alley is present. This will expand site plan options beyond the too-common auto-courtyard.
- **Improved on site parking conditions.** To improve vehicle access and maneuverability on site, the minimum size of garages for individual units and access parking aisle widths would be increased.

The following new standards are proposed to improve the quality of townhouse design:

- **Residential amenity area.** Residential amenity requirements are proposed to replace the current private open space requirement. Residential amenity space would be required in an amount equal to 5% of the total gross floor area of residential use.

This would replace current private open space requirements and allow options to provide individual and shared spaces such as rooftop decks, balconies and ground level, landscaped spaces.

- **Seattle Green Factor.** Existing landscaping requirements would be replaced with a Green Factor requirement, improving environmental benefits.

- **Fewer standards on small (in-fill) lots.** For the Multifamily code, fewer standards are needed to accommodate new development and help it fit into neighborhoods.

For example, on an infill lot, 9,000 sq. ft. or less, once basic standards like setbacks, height and density are applied, the building area is defined, making lot coverage and width and depth limits redundant. Additional standards would apply to larger sites.

- **Height and FAR measurements.** Rules for measuring height and FAR would provide incentives for common parking areas located at least partially below grade, allowing for additional open space and landscaping at grade.

Midrise (MR) and Highrise (HR) Zones

MR and HR zones allow substantially denser and taller/bigger development than Lowrise zones. These zones are generally only mapped in urban centers, mostly where high density, walkable urban environments are already established. The Northgate, University District and First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Centers contain the majority of MR zoning. The HR zone is mapped only within the First Hill Urban Center Village.

Existing conditions. Development in MR and HR zones is currently not subject to a density limit or a lot coverage limit, and in certain circumstances, nonresidential uses are allowed at street level. MR zones generally allow structures up to 60 feet in height, although there are limited areas of MR in Northgate with an 85 foot height limit. In the HR zone, buildings may achieve a height of 160 feet. However, when affordable housing, open space or historic structures are provided or preserved, additional height up to a maximum of 240 feet is possible. Development standards in MR and HR zones are proposed to be generally maintained, allowing current bulk and density of development. However, in addition to general consolidation of standards related to bulk and scale, rules governing height increases and an incentive program for affordable housing (and other amenities in HR) are also proposed to apply to MR and HR zones. The incentive program allowing increased height and density would be limited to MR and HR zones located within Urban Centers, Urban Villages, or light rail station areas.

Recommendations

- Generally, maintain MR and HR zone standards and requirements.
- For both MR and HR zones, the height and FAR limits will serve as the principal controls on bulk and scale. The transition to FAR as a bulk control will allow more flexibility in the massing and design of large structures to better adapt them to specific site conditions.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

- Base FAR limits are proposed for the MR and HR zones that generally reflect the amount of development currently achievable under existing height and bulk standards.
- Current height limits are retained as base height limits, which can only be exceeded where participation in incentive programs is allowed (see Section 7).
- Update development incentives in Highrise zones. Landmark preservation and public open space improvements are maintained as amenities eligible for a bonus.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

- Consolidate bulk and scale regulations. Setback requirements are relaxed and simplified. The required depth of setbacks distinguishes between setbacks from shared property lines and setbacks from streets and alleys, where the public rights-of-way serve to separate developments. Additional provisions also encourage courtyards on street frontages in MR zones and townhouses and ground level retail at the base of structures in HR zones. In MR zones, maximum width and depth limits only apply on large lots of over 9,000 square feet. A maximum tower width is retained for HR zones, but is slightly increased.
- Residential amenity area is required at an amount equivalent to 5% of the total residential floor area in a building.
- Combined lot provisions are established for the HR zone to allow the transfer of density between lots on the same block.
- A Green Factor requirement of 0.6 is proposed for MR and HR zones (equivalent in function to vegetation covering 60% of the lot)

Parking

In adopting revisions to development standards in commercial zones in 2006, the City Council concluded that it was reasonable to eliminate parking requirements for multifamily structures in commercial zones within urban centers and villages, and to align parking requirements with parking demand and automobile ownership elsewhere.

Seattle's parking requirements for residential use are intended, in part, to anticipate the amount of parking needed and to reflect automobile ownership patterns. As was true in commercial zones, current requirements for parking in multifamily zones are based on estimates of parking demand and automobile ownership established in the 1980's.

Comprehensive Plan goals and policies for parking support Seattle's public transportation investments, encourage transit use and discourage an over-supply of off-street parking. Appropriate off-street parking requirements, combined with more effective on-street parking space management, shared parking opportunities, improved bicycle and pedestrian

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

ways and transit availability can help to make more efficient use of parking and further long-term goals for a more pedestrian-oriented city.

Recent studies of parking demand have shown that the Land Use Code often requires more parking than is needed in new development. This undermines the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and adds significantly to the cost of housing. Parking provided in a garage can cost upwards of \$30,000 per space to build.

To be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with recent Council actions, local data were examined to determine where parking requirements may exceed demand. Areas with similar characteristics, such as urban centers or high capacity transit areas, exhibit similar parking demand and behavior. Parking requirements are proposed to be differentiated according to these characteristics to better manage parking supply, without creating an oversupply of parking that could run counter to transportation and environmental policies. The City of Seattle, over the past few years, has been able to gather several data sets to use for analysis for parking code changes. This parking data helps to match real-life parking and traffic experiences to off-street parking regulations. This data were the basis for the Council-approved multifamily parking changes in 2007 as part of the Neighborhood Business District Strategy.

The following four data sources were used to perform this analysis:

- Comprehensive Neighborhood Parking Study (CNPS, City of Seattle Strategic Planning Office, 2000),
- Review of new residential development in Belltown where parking is not currently required,
- An urban village off-street parking study (City of Seattle, SDOT, 2004), and
- U.S. Census data regarding car ownership.

Examining local conditions. The current state of neighborhood parking conditions in Seattle — the supply and demand for off-street parking and the relationship between what

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

is built and what is used– forms the basis of the recommended changes to the parking regulations.

The CNPS provides an understanding of actual parking demand in Seattle’s multifamily zones. In 2000, this study collected on and off-street parking data in over 35 areas of Seattle neighborhoods outside of the downtown retail core. The results of the parking data highlighted the difficulty of establishing a single minimum requirement across the entire city that could minimize parking spillover on the one hand and discourage under used parking on the other. A single minimum requirement is not flexible enough to address the varied parking demands for different transportation and land use patterns across Seattle.

Another data source is found in downtown residential buildings where Seattle has no minimum parking requirements. In these areas, developers still provide parking. The amount of parking provided is more closely tailored to the anticipated building occupancy. Downtown condos with multiple bedrooms typically come with two parking spaces (although trends show a demand for fewer spaces), while small apartment buildings attractive to low-income singles may provide one parking space for every four units.

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) also collected additional off-street parking data in eight Seattle neighborhood business districts (*Greenwood; Eastlake; Lake City; Columbia City; Madison-Miller; Admiral; Alaska Junction; and Ballard*) in the fall of 2004. The following table compares current parking requirements to the average parking demand for residential developments in these areas:

Parking Demand from 8 Seattle Neighborhoods

Multifamily Development	# of sites	Average # of units	Average # of parking spaces	Parking spaces/unit	Weekday parking demand per unit	Parking spaces currently required	Requirement > Demand?
Buildings with 2 – 10 units	16	7	7	1.0	0.85	0.93	Yes
Buildings with 11 – 30 units	6	18	19	1.1	0.60	0.84	Yes

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Total/Average	22	10	10	1.0	0.78	0.91	Yes
---------------	----	----	----	-----	------	------	-----

Two key points emerge from the demand data, consistent with the findings of the 2000 Comprehensive Neighborhood Parking Study:

- Seattle is currently requiring more parking spaces than are needed for most residential buildings.
- Buildings generally provide more parking spaces than are required. The result is parking lots that cost money to provide, but are not efficiently used much of the year.

The parking data illustrates another very important point, and addresses a concern expressed by neighborhood residents. No requirement or a lower minimum parking requirement does not mean that no on-site parking will be provided. The data show that most development will provide parking to meet anticipated demand. In fact, the amount of parking provided can even exceed the average and peak demand.

In addition to the parking demand analysis, the 2000 Census data on “vehicles available per household” offers another reliable way to measure residential parking demand. Citywide, on average, households have 1.34 vehicles. However, looking at the buildings that are most likely to be built in multifamily neighborhoods, one can see that Seattle’s requirements of 1.1 to 1.5 generally provides more spaces than households in these areas typically need, see the table:

Cars Available per Seattle Household Compared to Building Size

# of units in the structure	Households	Cars available	Cars per household	Current requirement
Single Family Houses	138, 701	243,754	1.8	1.0
Duplex/Triplex/Fourplex	22,448	27,480	1.2	1.1
5 to 19 units	42, 454	40,302	0.9	1.1 to 1.5
20 to 49 units	33,686	28,050	0.8	1.15 to 1.2
50 or more units	31,661	18,335	0.6	1.2 to 1.25

Source: 2000 US Census, 5-percent sample PUMS data, City of Seattle, SDOT Analysis, 2004

In buildings with 5 or more units, the average number of cars per household is 0.8, with a decreasing number of cars per household as the number of units goes up. Residents of larger buildings are more likely to have fewer cars than other residents of Seattle. While the figures vary slightly from neighborhood to neighborhood, in no area does the average number of cars available per household in multifamily structures exceed one space.

Transportation Alternatives in Urban Centers and Light Rail Station Areas. These areas are all mixed-use neighborhoods with significant concentrations of both housing and jobs and improving transit service. With construction of light rail underway, “station areas” have been mapped around the future light rail stations. These station areas are the areas where residents are most likely to walk or bike to use the light rail system. It is Seattle’s goal to encourage the continued development and redevelopment of urban centers and station areas into denser, mixed-use communities, with strong pedestrian, bike and transit facilities.

Seattle’s six urban centers are:

- Downtown Seattle (no Lowrise, MR or HR multifamily zoning)**;
- First Hill/Capitol Hill;
- South Lake Union (no Lowrise, MR or HR multifamily zoning)**;
- Uptown (Lower Queen Anne);
- University District; and
- Northgate.

Station areas* with multifamily zoning are:

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

- Henderson;
- Othello;
- Edmunds;
- McClellan; and
- Beacon Hill.

**Multifamily and Commercially zoned land within the Station Area Overlay District.*

***These areas having zoning specific to these locations that encourage high density, mixed use development.*

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Seattle's urban centers attract residents who enjoy excellent transit service and walking access to neighborhood shopping. They have high numbers of residents who do not use cars to get to work as shown in this table:

Transportation Choices of Urban Center Residents

Urban Center	Workers	Drove alone to work	% who drove alone	Average # of cars per household
1 st Hill/Capitol Hill	22,009	6,778	31%	0.73
Downtown	8,929	2,480	28%	0.51
Northgate	2,475	1,229	50%	0.98
South Lake Union	697	275	39%	0.70
University Community	10,468	3,104	30%	0.91
Uptown	3,285	1,350	41%	0.90
All Urban Centers	47,863	15,216	32%	0.62
City total	316,493	191,326	60%	1.35

Source: 2000 US Census, City of Seattle, DPD Analysis, 2004

These residents are also likely to not use their cars to access local businesses. In each of the centers, the ratio of cars per household (including single-family households) is lower than the citywide average.

In addition, on-street parking in these areas is already or will be controlled using parking pay stations, parking meters and/or residential parking zones (RPZs), which limit non-resident, long-term, free parking. The South Lake Union, U-District, Capitol Hill, Pike/Pine, 12th Avenue, Lower Queen Anne and First Hill neighborhoods are, or will soon be, regulated with paid on-street parking and RPZs. In 2008, SDOT will be working with station area communities to establish RPZs around light rail stations to discourage so-called hide-and-ride parking. RPZs will be established before the stations open.

Impacts of parking on neighborhoods, health and the environment. As noted, the City's parking demand analyses show that development in Seattle tends to supply more parking than is needed. These findings illustrate observations made by national parking

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

experts about the negative traffic, environmental and land use effects of too much free on- and off-street parking. While most people have become accustomed to free parking in front of their homes, and elsewhere, such ease of access to parking impacts the natural environment, increases traffic, and decreases neighborhood quality of life.

Seattle Public Utilities and SDOT are currently working together on natural drainage systems that reduce impervious surfaces, provide green space in residential areas, and help Seattle meet new state Department of Ecology stormwater management regulations. Limiting surface parking can help to support that work as well. Runoff from surface parking lots contribute to polluted lakes and streams.

The environmental implications described above are exactly what the Seattle Comprehensive Plan is trying to address with policies that discourage automobile use and encourage transit, bicycling and walking. The proposed multifamily zone parking changes support other City and other government agency efforts to protect and enhance the environment. The City of Seattle is leading an effort for U.S. cities pledging to meet or exceed the Kyoto Protocol's emissions reduction goals to reduce climate change. The Seattle Climate Action Plan is the way Seattle will meet those goals and reduce greenhouse gas emissions as a city to 7 percent below 1990 levels by 2012.

Many agencies and other groups in the Puget Sound region are making significant investments in rail transit with Sound Transit Light Rail and improved bus service. In addition, SDOT is now implementing the Seattle Transit Plan through the City's Bridging the Gap transportation funds and through King County Metro's Transit Now --- transit service improvements and bus rapid transit projects that better connect Seattle's urban centers and villages. All of these efforts will create additional ways to provide access to multifamily neighborhoods.

In recognition of these efforts, the proposal also would allow reductions in the amount of parking required for multifamily residential uses when transit and other alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles are available. This approach is currently allowed for

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

nonresidential uses in commercial zones. The proposal is to extend this exception for multifamily use in both multifamily and commercial zones.

Promoting shared parking, for example making parking spaces available to residents in nearby buildings that may not have parking, can make more efficient use of the overall parking supply available in and around a multifamily neighborhood. This is proposed to be limited to parking for uses that are permitted in the multifamily zone and only parking spaces that are not needed to meet the parking requirement, if any, would be eligible to be used by neighboring uses.

Coordinating Environmental Review Parking Policies. Currently, the City's State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) policies state that in Urban Centers, no additional parking may be required for impact mitigation. Consistent with the City's transportation goals, the proposal is to add light rail station areas, defined as commercially and residentially zoned land within the Light Rail Station Overlay District, to the list of areas where additional parking may not be required, beyond that required by the Land Use Code.

Recommendations

- Require one parking space per dwelling unit in all multifamily zones outside of urban centers and Light Rail Station Areas.
- Eliminate minimum parking requirements in multifamily zones in urban centers and Light Rail Station Areas (to match the requirements for multifamily uses in commercial zones).
- Eliminate the ability to require more parking in Light Rail Station Areas pursuant to SEPA.
- Maintain the requirement for one bicycle parking space for every four dwelling units (adopted as part of the commercial code changes).
- Allow reductions in required parking when transit and alternative transportation is available (would apply to multifamily use whether in multifamily or commercial zones).

Green Building

Green, or sustainable building, is an approach that applies principles of resource and energy efficiency, healthy buildings and materials, and ecologically and socially sensitive land-use to new development. Green building requires an integrated design process that considers the building's entire life-cycle (from planning, design and construction to operations and maintenance, renovation, and demolition and reuse). This process allows for the optimizing of building cost and performance.

Buildings and development affect water quality, air quality, and ecosystems, impacting human health and our quality of life. Investment in buildings represents more than 50% of the nation's wealth, and the U.S. construction market comprises 13% of Gross Domestic Product. The construction industry employs over 10 million people (2003 U.S. DOE Buildings Energy Databook). Green building is a way to address the environmental impacts of the nation's largest manufacturing sector, which is responsible for:

- o 39% of total energy use
- o 39% of municipal solid waste
- o 40-45% of greenhouse gas emissions
- o 40% of all raw materials use, including:
- o 25% timber harvests
- o 12% of potable water withdrawal

Green building addresses these impacts and contributes toward the Mayor's environmental goals: Climate Protection, Restore our Waters, Sustainable Urban Forests, and Healthy People and Communities.

For single family, multifamily, and mixed-use residential projects, the City encourages the use of LEED™ or Built Green™. LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Green Building Rating System™) is a nationally recognized green building standard developed by the US Green Building Council. Built Green™ is a green building program

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

developed by the Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties, in partnership with King County, Snohomish County and the City of Seattle.

Adoption of LEED™ and Built Green™ in the marketplace will also support many of the City's housing and environmental goals, including: infill development, alternative transportation choices, on-site stormwater management, water conservation, energy efficiency and use of renewable energy systems, construction waste recycling, use of local and resource efficient materials, and healthy indoor environments. The programs accomplish these goals by offering a menu of options that result in durable, high quality homes and multifamily projects that are more cost-effective to own and operate, healthier, safer, and more protective of the environment.

Recommendation

Require a green building certification when floor area is added above either base height or FAR limits through incentives for affordable housing for new construction projects in L3, MR and HR zones in eligible areas. The proposal will allow applicants to select the most appropriate green building rating system for their project. Acceptable rating systems are:

- Built Green™ Single Family New Construction (4 Star rating or better)
- Built Green™ Multi-family (4 Star rating or better)
- LEED™ for Homes (Silver rating or better)
- LEED™ for New Construction (Silver rating or better)

In Seattle, builders and developers have rapidly adopted green building, helping to make Seattle one of the strongest green building markets in the nation. These builders and developers cite a number of reasons for adopting green building, from differentiating their projects in the marketplace and offering high quality homes to earning a higher return on their investment and protecting the value of the asset over time.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

In 2006, nearly 25% of new residential units were Built Green™ certified. And as of July 2007, there were a total of 1,547 Built Green™ certified housing units in Seattle: 641 single family / duplex / townhouse and 11 other multifamily projects with 906 housing units. As of May, 2007, there were 28 LEED™ certified projects including residential mid-rise buildings. In addition, there were 98 LEED™ registered projects in development, including nearly 30 LEED™ residential mid-rise and high-rise buildings.

Proposed green building ratings systems

Zone	Green Building System and Rating*
Lowrise Duplex Triplex (LDT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Built Green Single Family• LEED-Homes
Lowrise 1 (L1), Lowrise 2 (L2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Built Green Single Family• Built Green Multi-family• LEED-Homes
Lowrise 3 (L3) and Lowrise 4 (L4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Built Green Multi-family• LEED-New Construction
Midrise (MR), Highrise (HR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• LEED-New Construction

**LEED: minimum Silver rating*

Built Green: minimum 4 Star rating

To administer the green building condition, DPD recommends that the applicant meeting the following requirements:

- 1. Submit a letter of intent that communicates a commitment to meet the green building performance requirement prior to issuance of the Master Use Permit.*
- 2. Demonstrate green building performance requirements have been met within 90 days of receiving final Certificate of Occupancy. Performance is demonstrated through an independent report from a third party. For projects using one of the Built Green programs the report will be produced by the Master Builders Association Built Green Program and submitted by the applicant to DPD. For projects using a LEED rating system, the report*

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

will be produced by the US Green Building Council and submitted by the applicant to DPD.

3.If performance requirements are not met, DPD will work with permit applicants to reach the performance level. If not successful, DPD would require the applicant to pay a penalty for non-performance. The penalty will be assessed based on construction value and the number of points the project falls below the minimum number of points needed to achieve the performance requirements. See table below.

Green Building Program	Performance Requirement	Points
Built Green™ Single Family New Construction	4-Star Rating	250 Points V2007
Built Green™ Multi-family	4-Star Rating	TBD
LEED™ for Homes	Silver Rating	60 Points V1.11a
LEED™ for New Construction	Silver Rating	33 Points V2.2

Institutions and Public Schools

In addition to residential uses, institutions such as churches, day cares and private schools are permitted in multifamily zones as are public schools. Institutions are permitted outright when meeting the standards for institutions including: height, width and depth limits, setbacks, parking, access to parking and requirements for transportation plans. The proposal maintains these requirements while simplifying and reorganizing them. In addition, these provisions are relocated to a new Chapter devoted to institutions for all zones (provisions for other zones are to be relocated at a later date).

Standards for public schools are also interspersed through out the different chapters of the Land Use Code. The proposal simplifies these provisions and relocates them to one new Chapter (other zones to be added at a later date).

Definitions and Measurement Techniques

To aid understanding of the code, definitions are provided for words that are not commonly used or that are intended to be used in a specific way. Measurement techniques help DPD and permit applicants apply consistent approaches in how development standards are applied. Amendments are proposed to various definitions and measurement techniques to clarify meaning and to be consistent with new development standards.

Changes to three definitions are intended to help promote better townhouse development and are discussed further below:

- “Ground-related dwelling unit.” This definition called out a type of housing, as distinct from others, when there is direct access to private ground related open-space. This definition was created in the late 1990s to help promote townhouse development, which was allowed to cover more of the lot and other more generous development standards than is allowed for stacked flats. As incentives for townhouse development are no longer desirable, this definition is no longer needed.
- “Townhouse.” This overly restrictive definition only allows parking garages to be shared when they are underground. Making this definition more broad will allow developments that mix townhouse and stacked flat units and allow for shared garage structures separate from the townhouse units, which could result in housing development that is more like rowhouses seen in eastern U.S. cities.
- “Private usable open space.” This definition is tied to the ‘ground related’ development discussed above. It is no longer needed, although private open space would still be permitted by the proposed new multifamily code.

7. Incentive Program

Washington State law (RCW 36.70A.540) provides an opportunity to broaden the application of incentive programs throughout the city, both to stimulate additional housing development and to ensure that a portion of it is affordable. In addition, the Mayor and Council adopted, as part of the 2007 amendments, a Comprehensive Plan policy to direct

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

the use of incentive zoning when contemplating changes in zoning, such as the Multifamily Code Update. Density and height bonuses used in Seattle's downtown were updated in 2006. At that time, the Mayor and City Council directed that this type of program be expanded to more of the city. To that end, the Council adopted and the Mayor signed Resolution 30939 in December of 2006.

Incentive zoning programs for affordable housing operate by allowing a density bonus or other modification to regular zoning requirements that create increased development potential in exchange for the production of or payment for a certain number of housing units affordable to moderate wage workers. Incentive zoning can also be used to provide for other public benefits in addition to housing, if it can be clearly demonstrated that those benefits are directly related to mitigating any impacts that might be anticipated as a result of the additional density allowed.

Generally, all public benefits that are part of an incentive program relate to the additional development that would result from the bonus development potential. Under an incentive program, the public benefit would generally be accomplished by providing a specific feature in a project (performance option) or by making a payment (payment option) based on the economics of the development (e.g. greater value of added density at a higher elevation), taking into consideration limits on the actual cost of compliance with bonus conditions so that there will be enough of an economic benefit to encourage use of the bonus incentive.

Eligible Areas

Comprehensive Plan and Neighborhood Plan policies support accommodating additional height and density in urban centers, urban villages and light rail station areas, provided development will fit into the surrounding neighborhoods. Consistent with these policies, the proposal would focus on the L3, MR and HR multifamily zones within these areas as zones eligible for the incentive program. In order to transition to single family zoned areas, portions of L3 zoned lots that are within 50' of single family zoned lots would not be eligible for more height and density.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Eligible lots:

- L3, MR and HR zoned lots in urban centers, urban villages or light rail station areas.
- Except that portions of L3 zoned lots that are within 50' of single family zoned lots may not accommodate additional height and density;

(NOTE: the HR zone currently is only located on First Hill, an urban center, and includes a bonus program that would be maintained and updated)

LDT, L1 and L2 zones are not considered appropriate for application of incentive programs due to general location outside of urban centers, villages or station areas. In addition, these zones tend to be located so as to help transition between more intensively zoned areas and zones of lesser intensity. The L4 zone already allows for a fourth floor and no changes are proposed for this zone, which is mapped in limited areas (for more on L4, see 'Mix of Zones' earlier in this report).

The following chart shows by percentage where the various multifamily zones are located:

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Eligible for the Incentive Bonus

New Zone	Non-Edge Zones* - Inside of urban center, village, or station area** Bonus for FAR and height increases	Edge Zones* - Inside an urban center, village or station area** No bonus for FAR and height increases	Edge and non-edge zones outside of urban center, village, or station area No bonus for FAR and height increases	Total ***
L3 (includes limited area zoned L4)	580	312	871	1,763
MR	187	0	110	302**
HR	50	0	0	50
TOTAL	822 acres (39%)	312 acres (15%)	981 acres (46%)	2,115 acres (100%***)

*Edge Zones = L3 zoned lots that may have portions of the lot within 50' of a Single Family zoned lot are assumed ineligible.

**Excludes L3 zoned lot area in urban villages w/ restrictive L3/L4 policy.

***Excludes L3, MR and HR zones in Major Institution Overlay areas.

Program Basics

The proposal is to apply an incentive zoning program to areas outside of downtown. Similar to the recently adopted downtown program, the incentive program for multifamily zones would be composed of the following elements:

- A portion of bonus floor area must be provided as housing affordable to moderate wage workers;
- The program would only apply where floor area and/or height above the base is used;
- Housing is the priority public benefit;
- Creation of housing units affordable to moderate wage workers is the goal of the housing program, payment to a fund in-lieu of providing the affordable units would also be allowed;
- In the HR zone, incentives also include open space, green street improvements, and preservation of designated landmark structures.

The public benefit incentive program would apply in Multifamily zones as follows:

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

- LDT, L1 and L2: not eligible;
- Eligible L3 and MR zones: affordable housing only;
- HR: affordable housing, historic preservation, open space, and green street improvements.

Given the scale of development anticipated in each zone, the amount of bonus floor area and height is not believed to be sufficient to generate enough resources in the L3 and MR zones to support other public benefits in addition to the priority housing benefit. The HR zone, mapped only in the First Hill Urban Center Village, allows for enough bonus development capacity to accommodate housing, open space, and historic preservation, which were confirmed at community meetings on First Hill to be important to that neighborhood.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The following chart shows the proposed base and bonus floor area and height allowances:

Zone	Base Height	Height with incentive	Base FAR	Additional FAR with incentive	Incentive
L3	30' (35')*	37' (42')*	1.4 FAR	0.6 FAR (2.0 max. FAR) 43% increase in floor area	11% of total GFA*** bonus floor area provided as housing affordable to moderate wage workers or cash contribution based on total bonus GFA
MR	60'	75'	3.2 FAR	0.8 FAR (4.0 max. FAR) 25% increase in floor area	Same as L3
HR	160'	240' or 300***	7.0 FAR	6.0 FAR (13 max. FAR) 86% increase in floor area	For a minimum of 60% of total GFA*** of bonus floor area, 11% provided as housing affordable to moderate wage workers in the project or cash contribution based on total bonus GFA. Up to 40% of total GSF bonus floor area may be gained by providing open space or preserving landmarks using a bonus or transfer of development potential (TDP). If other bonuses or TDP not used, up to 100% of the total GSF of bonus floor area may be earned by providing 11% as affordable housing.

*5' additional height allowed for pitched roof

** when participating in the incentive program, developers may choose to build to 240' or 300' when additional standards are met that promote a thinner tower

***Gross Floor Area (GFA)

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

To provide additional flexibility for accommodating bonus projects and public amenities in the HR zone, a combined lot provision is proposed that would allow lots located on the same block to transfer permitted density to other lots located on the same block. Under this provision, a project could add bonus floor area, and the ability to transfer density could increase opportunities for improving the massing of structures or accommodating such amenities as open space. While some lots on the block could, under this provision, gain more floor area than otherwise allowed, the increase would only occur through a reduction in the floor area allowed on other lots, thereby maintaining the same amount of permitted floor area for the block as a whole.

Affordable Workforce Housing

In the spring of 2006, the State legislature passed House Bill 2984 (now codified as Washington State law, RCW 36.70A.540), which authorizes local jurisdictions to enact or expand incentive programs that encourage the development of housing units affordable to households with incomes at or below certain limits. The proposed multifamily code incentive program gives developers the option of exceeding base height and density limits in L3, MR and HR zones if they include housing units that are affordable to moderate-wage workers in their developments. At the developers discretion, a financial contribution may be made to a housing fund established for this purpose, in lieu of providing the housing.

The affordable housing obligation under the performance option totals 11% of a minimum of 60% of the gross bonus floor area. If a developer chooses to make a cash contribution in lieu of performance, it must equal an average minimum of \$15.00 per square foot and a maximum of \$18.94 per square foot of gross bonus floor area. Affordability requirements for units produced as part of the incentive program are as follows: less than 80% of area median income for rental apartments and less than 100% of area median income for condominiums or townhomes. The minimum term of affordability is 50 years.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The developer may choose to provide the required affordable units either on- or off-site. Land donations may also be considered. Fee-in-lieu funds must be spent within five years of the date the payment is made. Affordable units produced with developer contributions would be built in the following areas, in order of priority:

- Same neighborhood where the market-rate development is located;
- Within ½ mile of a major bus transit stop or light rail station; or
- In the same quadrant of the city where the market-rate development is located.

Landmarks and Open Space Incentives

As one of Seattle's first neighborhoods, First Hill, where the HR zone is located, has a number of designated landmarks and structures that may be eligible for designation as a landmark. Under the existing HR zone provisions, developers may build additional floors above the base height limit of 160', up to 240', when a landmark structure is preserved, among other options. This was intended to encourage the preservation of landmark structures either on the development site or nearby. The proposed changes to the HR zone would continue to allow a developer to gain additional development potential, but instead of simply preserving a landmark structure on site, or nearby, the developer would be required to transfer development rights from a designated landmark, thereby, more clearly tying the additional floor area to be gained to the landmark structure preserved.

In addition to protecting landmark structures, the current HR zone also allows up to 40' of additional structure height to be gained when open space, accessible to the public, is provided on the development site or in the immediate vicinity. The proposed multifamily code would continue to allow a floor area bonus for the provision of neighborhood open space, as well as allow floor area gains by acquiring development rights transferred from open space locations within the community, similar to the program for protecting landmark structures. Additional floor area could also be gained by improving a designated green

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

street according to an adopted green street plan and by providing a publicly accessible landscaped setback abutting a designated green street.

Effect on Development Capacity

Chapter 6 contains analysis of the overall effect on development capacity that is anticipated to result from adoption of all of the proposals in the Multifamily Code Update. This section focuses on the number of affordable housing units that may be produced, assuming projects use the incentive program on all potential development sites in eligible areas:

Estimated Bonus Units

Zone	Bonus units
L3	324
MR	134
HR	387
TOTAL	845 units

As mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan section of this report, certain neighborhoods would be excluded from eligibility in the incentive program due to existing neighborhood plan policies.

Recommendations

- Allow additional height and FAR as development incentives in return for the production of affordable housing in HR and eligible L3 and MR zones.
- Increase height from 30' to 37' in L3 and from 60' to 75' in MR - when affordable housing is provided.
- Maintain the current heights in the HR zone from 160' to 240' and allow increase in height to 300' when additional standards are followed to promote thinner towers.

8. Other Benefits of the Multifamily Code Update

Restoring Lost Housing Capacity

Though improved design and simplification of the Code are the main impetus behind the amendments now under consideration, the changes also provide an opportunity to restore the capacity for additional multifamily development originally anticipated to be available in the MF zones when the last major amendments were adopted in 1989.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The chart below presents the estimated capacity for new units in the various multifamily zones under:

- A) Current conditions, with available land in the various zones developed at the densities observed in recent development in those zones;
- B) The capacity that would have been expected on available land in the various zones under the assumptions that were used to estimate capacity in the 1989 EIS when the current zoning was adopted, and
- C) The capacity expected on available land in the various zones developed at densities adjusted to reflect the proposed changes (for example, higher densities in some zones because of the increases in height and/or bulk proposed through incentives).

Current zoning capacity (under current observed/actual densities and assumed densities in 1989) compared to proposed zoning

A. Current Zoning and capacity based on densities of observed development			B. Zoning adopted in 1989 and capacity based on assumed densities in 1989 EIS			C. Proposed Zoning and capacity based on adjusted densities reflecting changes		
Zone	Assumed Density*	Capacity	Zone	Assumed Density*	Capacity	Zone	Assumed Density*	Capacity
LDT	1/2000	2,298	LDT	1/2000	2,298	LDT	1/2000	2,298
L1	1/1800	5,881	L1	1/1600	6,697	L1	1/1700	6,180
L2	1/1400	5,600	L2	1/1200	6,616	L2	1/1300	5,987
L3	1/1100	12,449	L3	1/800	17,573	L3/L4	1/800	15,575
L4	1/800	540	L4	1/500	880		1/1000**	
MR	1/350	6,416	MR	1/350	6,416	MR	1/300 1/350**	7,286
HR	1/150	3,884	HR	1/150	3,884	HR	1/150	3,884
TOTAL		37,068			44,364			41,210

* Density expressed as the amount of lot area in square feet for each unit. The assumed densities for Lowrise zones current conditions and the proposal are less than the actual density limits in the Code, since refinements in the methodology for capacity analysis have resulted in adjustments that reflect average densities achieved in real projects.

**Assumed density without bonus

In the LDT and HR zone, the available capacity remains the same for all three scenarios.

However, in the other lowrise zones, there is less capacity under current observed conditions than was expected to be available using the 1989 Environmental Impact

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Statement (EIS) assumptions. This discrepancy is most significant in the L3 zone, where under observed densities, the capacity is almost 30% less than what was anticipated.

Overall, the capacity under observed conditions is about 16% less (7,296 units) than what would have been expected under the assumptions used to estimate available capacity in the 1989.

Under the proposed changes, capacity in the L3, which for analysis purposes combines current L3 and L4 zones, would still fall short of what was estimated in the 1989 EIS for both of these zones, but the amount of the reduction would drop to 16% instead of the 30% shortfall under current conditions. The total estimated capacity under the proposal is about seven percent less than the estimated capacity in the 1989 EIS.

The MR zone is the only zone where capacity is increased appreciably under the proposed changes relative to what was anticipated in the 1989 EIS or observed since then. There were no interim changes to the original MR zone in 1989, and density assumptions have remained the same under current zoning. The increase in capacity under the proposal is due to the higher densities anticipated in MR projects in areas eligible for height and density increases through the incentive program. Similarly, the capacity in the L3 zone would also exceed the estimated combined capacity of the L3 and L4 zones under current conditions. The increase in L1 and L2 zone capacity is minimal.

The capacity regained under the proposal is largely due to the extra density that could be achieved through the height and FAR bonuses in the L3 and MR zones, which currently do not exist. However, even though the actual density limits in the Code do not change in the L2 zone, the assumed densities for the proposed L2 and L3 zones are higher than under current conditions because the increased flexibility is expected to allow more projects to achieve the allowed densities.

Make the Code Easier to Use

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

The current code is overly reliant on text including complex requirements and layers of exceptions. New multifamily zoning will make better use of illustrations (e.g. drawings, maps and charts) and diagrams. Simple, straight forward sentence structure and language will help make the code easier to use. Fewer exceptions will be needed if regulations are less prescriptive.

Encourage the Reuse of Existing Single Family Structures

In some cases, though property has been zoned for multifamily development for some time, single family structures remain. Some of these structures may be able to be incorporated into new development rather than being demolished and replaced with new development. Allowing existing structures to be incorporated into new development can have a positive effect on neighborhood character as well as environmental benefits (reuse of existing structures and less demolition material going to landfills). The proposal is to allow existing single family structures to be exempt from certain development standards including FAR, setbacks and, where applicable, width and depth limits and lot coverage, to allow more flexibility to accommodate additional development on the same site.

Appendix A

Rezone Criteria Comparison

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
23.34.013 Designation of multifamily zones.		
<p>An area zoned single family that meets the criteria of Section 23.34.011 for single-family designation, may not be rezoned to a multifamily zone except as otherwise provided in Section 23.34.010B.</p>	<p>A. An area zoned single family that meets the criteria of Section 23.34.011 for single family designation, may not be rezoned to a multifamily zone except as otherwise provided in Section 23.34.010 B.</p> <p>B. Established multifamily zoned areas are appropriately designated, especially when properties in the area are developed predominantly to the permitted scale, and if applicable, density, of that multifamily zone.</p> <p>C. Generally, reclassification of areas to L3 and MR zones are only appropriate in urban villages and urban centers. Reclassification to an HR zone may only be considered in urban centers.</p> <p>D. Multifamily zoning is appropriate for areas that are generally within one half (1/2) mile of existing or projected facilities and services used by residents, including retail sales and services, schools, parks and community centers.</p> <p>E. Land that is designated environmentally critical or a required buffer area due to the</p>	<p>New Subsections B through G are relocated from the criteria specific to individual multifamily zones. F clarifies that while the L4 zone is proposed to be maintained, it is not intended for future remapping.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
	<p>presence of a wetland, wildlife habitat or corridor or riparian corridor is generally considered inappropriate locations for reclassification from a less intensive zone to a L3, MR or HR zones.</p> <p>F. The arrangement of multifamily zones in relation to other zones is generally intended to provide for a gradual transition in the scale and intensity of development.</p> <p>G. No land may be redesignated to Lowrise 4 (L4).</p>	

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
23.34.014 Lowrise Duplex Triplex (LDT) zone		
<p>A. Function. An area that provides opportunities for limited infill housing development, both through new construction and the conversion of existing single-family structures to duplexes and triplexes, where, in order to preserve the character of the neighborhood, the recycling of existing structures to a slightly higher density and small-scale infill development is preferable to single-family zoning or to the development of townhouses or higher density apartments.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT) zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:</p> <p>1. Development Characteristics of the Area.</p> <p>a. Areas where structures of small bulk and low heights, generally less than thirty (30) feet, establish the pattern of development; and</p> <p>b. Areas with a mix of single-family structures, small multifamily structures, and single-family structures legally converted into multiple units where, because of the type and quality of the existing housing stock, it is desirable to limit new development opportunities to infill projects and conversions</p>	<p>A. Function. To provide opportunities for duplex and triplex multifamily housing, primarily through new infill development that is similar to the scale of single family structures permitted in single family zones, or through the conversion of existing single family structures to duplexes and triplexes.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The LDT zone is most appropriate on land that is generally characterized by the following conditions:</p> <p>1. A mix of single family structures, or similarly scaled multifamily structures thirty-five feet (35') or less in height and single family structures legally converted to multiple units or well-suited to conversion;</p> <p>2. Local access and circulation conditions that can accommodate this low density multifamily designation;</p> <p>3. Local access and circulation conditions that are conducive to multiple residential units, especially in structures oriented to the ground level and the street, preferably in locations separated from arterials;</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent in maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve the City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflecting existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>that preserve the existing character.</p> <p>2. Relationship to the Surrounding Area.</p> <p>a. Areas that do not meet single-family criteria, but are otherwise similar in character and adjoin areas zoned single-family or Lowrise 1 without necessarily the presence of a significant topographical break or open space to provide a transition to increased density;</p> <p>b. Areas where narrow streets, on-street parking congestion, local traffic congestion, lack of alleys, or irregular street patterns restrict local access and circulation;</p> <p>c. Areas close to existing or projected facilities and services used by households with children, including schools, parks and community centers.</p> <p>C. Areas zoned single family meeting the locational criteria for a single-family designation may be rezoned to LDT only when the provisions of Section 23.34.010 B are met.</p>	<p>4. Areas where a gradual transition is appropriate between single family zoned areas and multifamily or neighborhood commercial zoned areas;</p> <p>5. Areas that are zoned single family may be rezoned to LDT only when the provisions of 23.34.010 are met.</p>	

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
23.34.016 Lowrise 1 (L1) zone, function and locational criteria.		
<p>A. Function. An area that provides low density, primarily ground-related multifamily housing opportunities.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. Lowrise 1 zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:</p> <p>1. Development Characteristics of the Area.</p> <p>a. Areas where structures of low heights, generally less than thirty (30) feet, and small bulk establish the pattern of development;</p> <p>b. Areas with:</p> <p>(1) A mix of single-family structures, small multifamily structures and single-family structures legally converted into multiple units where, because of the type and quality of the existing housing stock, it is desirable to encourage new development opportunities, or</p> <p>(2) Numerous or large vacant parcels suitable for family housing where densities greater than single-family are desired; and</p>	<p>A. Function. To provide opportunities for low density multifamily housing, such as townhouses, or to provide a transition from SF or LDT zoned areas to other higher density multifamily or neighborhood commercial zones.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The L1 zone is most appropriate on land that is generally characterized by the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Low-scale structures with structure heights of thirty-five feet (35') or less, compatible with SF and LDT zones;</p> <p>2. Local access and circulation conditions that are conducive to multiple residential units, especially in structures oriented to the ground level and the street, preferably in locations separated from arterials;</p> <p>3. Areas where a gradual transition is appropriate between SF or LDT zones and higher density multifamily or neighborhood commercial zones;</p> <p>4. Areas that are zoned single family may be rezoned to L1 only when the provisions of 23.34.010 are met.</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent in maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve the City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflecting existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>c. Areas where internal vehicular circulation is conducive to residential units that are oriented to the ground level and the street. Preferred locations are generally separated from principal arterials, as defined by the Seattle Comprehensive Transportation Program, which conflict with the desired character of L1 areas.</p> <p>2. Relationship to the Surrounding Areas.</p> <p>a. Properties that are definable pockets within a larger, higher density multifamily area, where it is desirable to preserve a small-scale character;</p> <p>b. Properties generally surrounded by a larger single-family area where variation and replacement in housing type could be accommodated without significant disruption of the pattern, character or livability of the surrounding development;</p> <p>c. Properties where a gradual transition is appropriate between single-family areas and more intensive multifamily or neighborhood commercial zones;</p> <p>d. Properties in areas where narrow streets, on-street parking congestion, local traffic congestion, or irregular street patterns restrict local access and circulation;</p>		

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>e. Properties in areas close to facilities and services used by households with children, including schools, parks and community centers.</p> <p>C. Areas zoned single family meeting the locational criteria for single-family designation may be rezoned to L1 only when the provisions of Section 23.34.010B are met.</p>		
<p>23.34.018 Lowrise 2 (L2) zone, function and locational criteria.</p>		
<p>A. Function. The intent of the Lowrise 2 zone is to encourage a variety of multifamily housing types with less emphasis than the Lowrise 1 zone on ground-related units, while remaining at a scale compatible with single-family structures.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. Lowrise 2 zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:</p> <p>1. Development Characteristics of the Areas.</p> <p>a. Areas that feature a mix of single-family structures and small to medium multifamily structures generally occupying one (1) or two (2) lots, with heights generally less than thirty (30) feet;</p> <p>b. Areas suitable for multifamily development where topographic</p>	<p>A. Function. To provide opportunities for moderate density multifamily housing, such as townhouse and stacked flat developments, at a scale and character compatible with other lower density single family and multifamily zones, which may serve to provide a transition between zones of different scales and intensities.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The L2 zone is most appropriate on land that is generally characterized by the following conditions:</p> <p>1. A mix of small to medium scale multifamily structures generally occupying not more than one (1) or two (2) lots;</p> <p>2. Local access and circulation conditions that can accommodate a modest increase in density to that permitted in L2;</p> <p>3. Areas where a transition is</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent in maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflect existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>conditions and the presence of views make it desirable to limit height and building bulk to retain views from within the zone;</p> <p>c. Areas occupied by a substantial amount of multifamily development where factors such as narrow streets, on-street parking congestion, local traffic congestion, lack of alleys and irregular street patterns restrict local access and circulation and make an intermediate intensity of development desirable.</p> <p>2. Relationship to the Surrounding Areas.</p> <p>a. Properties that are well-suited to multifamily development, but where adjacent single-family areas make a transitional scale of development desirable. It is desirable that there be a well-defined edge such as an arterial, open space, change in block pattern, topographic change or other significant feature providing physical separation from the single-family area. However, this is not a necessary condition where existing moderate scale multifamily structures have already established the scale relationship with abutting single-family areas;</p> <p>b. Properties that are definable pockets within a more intensive area, where it is desirable to preserve a smaller scale character and mix of densities;</p>	<p>appropriate between lower density multifamily zones and higher density multifamily or neighborhood commercial zones;</p> <p>4. Areas with a well-defined edge such as an arterial, open space, change in block pattern, topographic change or other significant feature providing separation from abutting single family zoned areas;</p> <p>5. Areas where narrow streets, on-street parking congestion, local traffic congestion, lack of alleys and irregular street patterns restrict local access and circulation and make designations more intensive than L2 less desirable.</p>	<p>intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>c. Properties in areas otherwise suitable for higher density multifamily development but where it is desirable to limit building height and bulk to protect views from uphill areas or from public open spaces and scenic routes;</p> <p>d. Properties where vehicular access to the area does not require travel on "residential access streets" in less intensive residential zones.</p>		
<p>23.34.020 Lowrise 3 (L3) zones, function and locational criteria.</p>		
<p>A. Function. An area that provides moderate scale multifamily housing opportunities in multifamily neighborhoods where it is desirable to limit development to infill projects and conversions compatible with the existing mix of houses and small to moderate scale apartment structures.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria.</p> <p>1. Threshold Conditions. Subject to subsection B2 of this section, properties that may be considered for an L3 designation are limited to the following:</p> <p>a. Properties already zoned L3;</p> <p>b. Properties in areas already developed predominantly to the permitted L3 density and where</p>	<p>A. Function. To provide opportunities for a range of multifamily housing types in existing multifamily neighborhoods with a mix of small to moderate scale residential structures or to accommodate redevelopment in areas within urban centers and urban villages where it is desirable to establish multifamily neighborhoods of moderate scale and density.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The L3 zone is most appropriate on land not subject to subsection C, and that is generally characterized by the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Adjacency to neighborhood commercial areas with comparable height and scale, or where a transition in scale between areas of larger multifamily and/or commercial structures and smaller</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent in maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflect existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>L3 scale is well established;</p> <p>c. Properties within an urban center or village, except in the Wallingford Residential Urban Village, in the Eastlake Residential Urban Village, in the Upper Queen Anne Residential Urban Village, in the Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village, in the Lake City Hub Urban Village, in the Bitter Lake Village Hub Urban Village, or in the Admiral Residential Urban Village; or</p> <p>d. Properties located in the Delridge Neighborhood Revitalization Area, as shown in Exhibit 23.34.020 A provided that the L3 zone designation would facilitate a mixed-income housing development initiated by a public agency or the Seattle Housing Authority; a property use and development agreement is executed subject to the provisions of SMC Chapter 23.76 as a condition to any rezone; and the development would serve a broad public purpose.</p> <p>2. Properties designated as environmentally critical may not be rezoned to an L3 designation, and may remain L3 only in areas predominantly developed to the intensity of the L3 zone.</p> <p>3. Other Criteria. The Lowrise 3 zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:</p>	<p>multifamily structures is desirable;</p> <p>2. Alley access to sites is preferred, and street widths should be sufficient for two (2) way traffic and parking along at least one (1) curb;</p> <p>3. Well served by public transit with direct access to arterial streets that can accommodate anticipated vehicular circulation so that traffic is not required to use streets that pass through lower density residential zones;</p> <p>4. In close proximity, generally one half (1/2) mile, and with pedestrian connections to neighborhood services.</p> <p>C. Land zoned a less intensive designation within the following designated areas may not be rezoned to L3:</p> <p>1. The following urban villages: Admiral, Eastlake, Lake City, Morgan Junction, Upper Queen Anne, or Wallingford;</p> <p>2. The Delridge Neighborhood Revitalization Area, as shown in Exhibit 23.34.020 A, unless the L3 zone would facilitate a mixed-income housing development initiated by a public agency and a property use and a development agreement is executed subject to the provisions of SMC Chapter 23.76.</p>	<p>management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>a. Development Characteristics of the Area.</p> <p>(1) Either:</p> <p>(a) Areas that are already developed predominantly to the permitted L3 density and where L3 scale is well established,</p> <p>(b) Areas that are within an urban center or urban village, except in the Wallingford Residential Urban Village, in the Eastlake Residential Urban Village, in the Upper Queen Anne Residential Urban Village, in the Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village, in the Lake City Hub Urban Village, in the Bitter Lake Village Hub Urban Village, or in the Admiral Residential Urban Village; or</p> <p>(c) Areas that are located within the Delridge Neighborhood Revitalization Area, as shown in Exhibit 23.34.020 A provided that the L3 zone designation would facilitate a mixed-income housing development initiated by a public agency or the Seattle Housing Authority; a property use and development agreement is executed subject to the provisions of SMC Chapter 23.76 as a condition to any rezone; and the development would serve a broad public purpose.</p> <p>(2) Areas where the street pattern provides for adequate vehicular circulation and access to sites. Locations with alleys are preferred. Street widths should</p>		

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>be sufficient for two (2) way traffic and parking along at least one (1) curbside.</p> <p>b. Relationship to the Surrounding Areas.</p> <p>(1) Properties in areas that are well served by public transit and have direct access to arterials, so that vehicular traffic is not required to use streets that pass through less intensive residential zones;</p> <p>(2) Properties in areas with significant topographic breaks, major arterials or open space that provide sufficient transition to LDT or L1 multifamily development;</p> <p>(3) Properties in areas with existing multifamily zoning with close proximity and pedestrian connections to neighborhood services, public open spaces, schools and other residential amenities;</p> <p>(4) Properties that are adjacent to business and commercial areas with comparable height and bulk, or where a transition in scale between areas of larger multifamily and/or commercial structures and smaller multifamily development is desirable.</p>		

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
23.34.024 Midrise (MR) zone, function and locational criteria.		
<p>A. Function. An area that provides concentrations of housing in desirable, pedestrian-oriented urban neighborhoods having convenient access to regional transit stations, where the mix of activity provides convenient access to a full range of residential services and amenities, and opportunities for people to live within walking distance of employment.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria.</p> <p>1. Threshold Conditions. Subject to subsection B2 of this section, properties that may be considered for a Midrise designation are limited to the following:</p> <p>a. Properties already zoned Midrise;</p> <p>b. Properties in areas already developed predominantly to the intensity permitted by the Midrise zone; or</p> <p>c. Properties within an urban center, the village core of a hub urban village, or a residential urban village, where a neighborhood plan adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995 indicates that the area is appropriate for a Midrise zone designation.</p> <p>2. Environmentally Critical Areas. Properties designated as</p>	<p>A. Function. To concentrate higher-density housing in pedestrian-oriented urban neighborhoods having convenient pedestrian access to regional transit, a wide range of services and amenities, and employment centers.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The MR zone is most appropriate on land within urban centers or hub urban villages, that is generally characterized by the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Adjacency to business and commercial areas where comparable height and scale is allowed;</p> <p>2. Access to regional transit service is good to excellent and street capacity is able to accommodate vehicular circulation that may result from higher density multifamily development;</p> <p>3. Convenient pedestrian connections to major employment centers and open space and recreational facilities.</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent in maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflect existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>environmentally critical may not be rezoned to a Midrise designation, and may remain Midrise only in areas predominantly developed to the intensity of the Midrise zone.</p> <p>3. Other Criteria. The Midrise zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:</p> <p>a. Either:</p> <p>(1) Areas that are developed predominantly to the intensity permitted by the Midrise zone, or</p> <p>(2) Areas that are within an urban center, the village core of a hub urban village, or a residential urban village, where a neighborhood plan adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995 indicates that the area is appropriate for a Midrise zone designation;</p> <p>b. Properties that are adjacent to business and commercial areas with comparable height and bulk;</p> <p>c. Properties in areas that are served by major arterials and where transit service is good to excellent and street capacity could absorb the traffic generated by midrise development;</p> <p>d. Properties in areas that are in close proximity to major employment centers;</p>		

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>e. Properties in areas that are in close proximity to open space and recreational facilities;</p> <p>f. Properties in areas along arterials where topographic changes either provide an edge or permit a transition in scale with surroundings;</p> <p>g. Properties in flat areas where the prevailing structure height is greater than thirty-seven (37) feet or where due to a mix of heights, there is no established height pattern;</p> <p>h. Properties in areas with moderate slopes and views oblique or parallel to the slope where the height and bulk of existing structures have already limited or blocked views from within the multifamily area and upland areas;</p> <p>i. Properties in areas with steep slopes and views perpendicular to the slope where upland developments are of sufficient distance or height to retain their views over the area designated for the sixty (60) foot height limit;</p> <p>j. Properties in areas where topographic conditions allow the bulk of the structure to be obscured. Generally, these are steep slopes, sixteen (16) percent or more, with views perpendicular to the slope.</p>		

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
23.34.026 Midrise/85' (MR/85') zone, function and locational criteria.		
<p>A. The Midrise/85' (MR/85') is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the criteria described for a rezone to Midrise in Section 23.34.024.</p> <p>B. In addition, the following shall apply to designate an MR zone as Midrise/85':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A neighborhood plan adopted by the City Council shall have designated the area as suitable for Midrise zoning with an eighty-five (85) foot height limit; and 2. A height of eighty-five (85) feet could be accommodated without significantly blocking views; and 3. The development permitted by the zone would not exceed the service capacities which exist in the area, including transit service, parking, and sewers; and 4. A gradual transition in height and scale and level of activity between zones is provided unless major physical edges are present. These edges may be the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Natural features such as topographic breaks, water bodies and ravines, b. Freeways, expressways, and other major traffic arterials, and railroad tracks, c. Street grid and block 	<p>A. Function. To further encourage the concentration of high density residential development at locations within easy walking distance of a high capacity transit station and to more easily accommodate street level uses by providing flexibility for taller multifamily structures up to eighty five feet (85') in height.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. In addition to areas generally characterized by the conditions applicable to MR zones as provided in Section 23.34.024, the MR/85' zone is most appropriate for land in urban centers that is within eight hundred (800) feet of a high capacity transit station.</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent is maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflect existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>orientation, or</p> <p>d. Significant open space and greenspaces.</p>		
<p>23.34.028 Highrise (HR) zone, function and locational criteria.</p>		
<p>A. Function. An area that provides a concentration of high density multifamily housing in a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood with convenient access to regional transit stations, and where the mix of activity provides convenient access to a full range of residential services and amenities and employment centers.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria.</p> <p>1. Threshold Conditions. Subject to subsection B2 of this section, properties that may be considered for a Highrise designation are limited to the following:</p> <p>a. Properties already zoned Highrise;</p> <p>b. Properties in areas already developed predominantly to the intensity permitted by the Highrise zone; or</p> <p>c. Properties within an urban center, the village core of a hub urban village, or a residential urban village, where a neighborhood plan adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995 indicates</p>	<p>A. Function. To accommodate residential towers that concentrate the highest density multifamily development in pedestrian-oriented residential neighborhoods well-served by regional transit, within walking distance to employment centers and a full range of residential services and amenities.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The HR zone is most appropriate in urban centers generally characterized by the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Adjacent to the Downtown Urban Center or centrally located in other urban centers in close proximity to major employment generators and regional transit.</p> <p>2. The presence of intervening MR or NC zones allowing a moderating scale of development that would provide an appropriate transition from Highrise residential tower development to any lower density and scale of development.</p> <p>3. The development pattern</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent in maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflect existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>that the area is appropriate for a Highrise zone designation.</p> <p>2. Environmentally Critical Areas. Properties designated as environmentally critical may not be rezoned to a Highrise designation, and may remain Highrise only in areas predominantly developed to the intensity of the Highrise zone.</p> <p>3. Other Criteria. The Highrise zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:</p> <p>a. Either:</p> <p>(1) Areas that are developed predominantly to the intensity permitted by the Highrise zone, or</p> <p>(2) Areas that are within an urban center, the village core of a hub urban village, or a residential urban village, where a neighborhood plan adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995 indicates that the area is appropriate for a Highrise zone designation;</p> <p>b. Properties in areas that are served by arterials where transit service is good to excellent and street capacity is sufficient to accommodate traffic generated by highrise development;</p> <p>c. Properties in areas that are adjacent to a concentration of residential services or a major employment center;</p>	<p>lacks uniform scale and character, allowing highrise tower development to help define a high density residential character;</p> <p>4. Where possible, flat areas on the tops of hills or in lowland areas away from hills, where view blockage from highrise tower development would be minimized.</p>	

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>d. Properties in areas that have excellent pedestrian or transit access to downtown;</p> <p>e. Properties in areas that have close proximity to open space, parks and recreational facilities;</p> <p>f. Properties in areas where no uniform scale of structures establishes the character and where highrise development would create a point and help define the character;</p> <p>g. Properties in flat areas on the tops of hills or in lowland areas away from hills, where views would not be blocked by highrise structures;</p> <p>h. Properties in sloping areas with views oblique or parallel to the slope where the height and bulk of existing buildings have already limited or blocked views from within the multifamily area and upland areas where the hill form has already been obscured by development.</p>		

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
23.34.070 Residential-Commercial (RC) zone, function and locational criteria.		
<p>A. Function.</p> <p>1. Purposes. Areas that serve as the following:</p> <p>a. As a means to downzone strip commercial areas which have not been extensively developed with commercial uses;</p> <p>b. As a means to downzone small commercial areas which have not been extensively developed with commercial uses and where commercial services are available nearby;</p> <p>c. To provide opportunities for needed parking in areas where spillover parking is a major problem;</p> <p>d. As a means of supporting an existing commercial node.</p> <p>2. Desired Characteristics. Areas that provide the following:</p> <p>a. Physical appearance resembling the appearance of adjacent residential areas;</p> <p>b. Mixed use with small commercial uses at street level.</p> <p>B. Location Criteria.</p> <p>1. Requirement. A residential-commercial designation shall be combined only with a multifamily designation.</p>	<p>A. Function. To provide access to a limited range of commercial goods and services in residential structures and to support activity in abutting commercial areas.</p> <p>B. Locational Criteria. The RC zone must be accompanied by a multifamily zone classification and is most appropriate on land generally characterized by the following conditions:</p>	<p>Function statements are updated to be consistent with those for other zones. Multifamily zone functions are more succinctly described and the overall intent is maintained.</p> <p>Locational criteria are updated to allow flexibility to rezone property to better achieve City and neighborhood goals, as opposed to simply reflect</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Existing Criteria	Proposed Criteria	Notes
<p>2. Other Criteria. Residential-Commercial zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:</p> <p>a. Existing Character.</p> <p>(1) Areas which are primarily residential in character (which may have either a residential or commercial zone designation), but where a pattern of mixed residential/commercial development is present; or</p> <p>(2) Areas adjacent to commercial areas, where accessory parking is present, where limited commercial activity and accessory parking would help reinforce or improve the functioning of the commercial areas, and/or where accessory parking would help relieve spillover parking in residential areas.</p> <p>b. Physical Factors Favoring RC Designation.</p> <p>(1) Lack of edges or buffer between residential and commercial uses;</p> <p>(2) Lack of buffer between major arterial and residential uses;</p> <p>(3) Streets with adequate access and circulation;</p> <p>(4) Insufficient parking in adjacent commercial zone results in parking spillover on residential streets.</p>	<p>1. A primarily residential character, but where a pattern of mixed residential/commercial development is present or desirable;</p> <p>2. Adjacent to neighborhood commercial areas, where limited commercial activity and accessory parking would help reinforce or improve the function of the commercial area, and/or where accessory parking would help relieve spillover parking into surrounding residential areas;</p> <p>3. Adequate street capacity to accommodate anticipated vehicular access and circulation supporting mixed residential and commercial development.</p>	<p>existing development. New text also strengthens the relationship between multifamily zones and the City's growth management strategy directing future growth to urban centers and villages by linking the intensity of the multifamily zone to the intended development in urban villages and centers and other characteristics where appropriate.</p>

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

Appendix B

Charts Comparing Current Development Standards to the Proposal

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review
EXISTING: Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT)	FAR: N.A. Density limit: 1 unit 2,000 sq. ft. of lot area Structures may not contain more than 3 units	25' + 10' w/ 6:12 pitched roof	Front: avg. of neighboring properties up to 20', min. 5' Side: min. 5' Rear: 20% of lot depth up to 20', min. 15' In addition, modulation of facades is required: Generally modulation must be 5' wide with a depth of 4'. Projections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eaves, gutters, etc. may extend 18" into setbacks Bays may extend w/in five (5) feet of any lot line & individually may make up no more than 30% of façade 	Applies to all lots Maximum width: 45' Maximum depth: 60% of lot up to max. 65'	Applies to all lots Apartments: 35% Townhouses: 45%	400 sf/unit, private space; or 600 sf shared space accessible to one unit	Equivalent to 3 times the perimeter of the property line. May or may not count towards open space requirement.	Apartments: up to 1.5 space/unit (depends on number of units, bedrooms and size of units) Townhouses: 1 space/unit Alki and portions of the U. District: 1.5 spaces per unit. Required on side, rear or under; access from alley, if present; must be screened	Voluntary: Administrative DR All development standards are eligible for departure except height, FAR, parking quantity and Seattle Green Factor.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review
PROPOSED: Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT)	FAR: 1.0	25' + 5' with 6:12 pitched roof	Abutting a SF zone*:		Applies to lots > 9,000 sf Maximum width: 45' Maximum depth: 65% of lot depth	Residential amenities required @ 5% of gfa in residential use. May be provided in setback areas, on the roof or as balconies. Shared space must be accessible to all residents, w/ a min area of 250 sf. and a min. dimension of 10'. Balconies must be 60 sf. or greater w/ a min dimension of 6'.	Must be landscaped to satisfy a Green Factor score of .6 Green roofs, planters, green walls, landscaping and plantings in the adjacent ROW are eligible.	None required in urban centers and station areas. All others: 1 space per unit. Alki and portions of the U. District: 1.5 spaces per unit. Required on side, rear or under; access from alley, if present; must be screened	Same as above
	Density limit: 1 unit /2,000 sq. ft. of lot area		Front	The average** of the first principal structure on either side. A required front setback will not be less than five (5) feet & an avg. of seven (7) feet or more than fifteen (15) feet.					
	Structures may not contain more than 3 units		Rear	Twenty five (25) feet or fifteen (15) percent of lot depth, whichever is less, but not less than fifteen (15) feet.					
	Below grade floor area and parking up to 4' above grade is exempt from FAR		Side	An average of seven (7) feet and a minimum of five (5) feet (facades no longer than 40' must setback five (5) feet); ten (10) feet on a reversed corner lot from the street facing property line.					
			*For the corresponding lot line that abuts or is across the street from a lot zoned SF ** For averaging, structures may be in any zone.						
			All other: Avg. seven feet (7'), min. five feet (5') from all lot lines (side setbacks are five feet (5') for facades no longer than 40')						
			Projections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eaves, gutters, etc. may extend w/in three (3) feet of any lot line; Bays may extend w/in five (5) feet of any lot line & individually may make up no more than 30% of façade; The first steps (30" in height) of a stoop may extend to front or rear property lines. 						

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review
EXISTING: Lowrise 1 (L1)	FAR: N.A. Density limit: 1 unit 1,600 sq. ft. of lot area Only ground related housing permitted (townhouses and cottages)	25' + 10' w/ 6:12 pitched roof	Front: avg. of neighboring properties up to 15', min. 5' Side: min. 5', increasing w/ height & depth Rear: 20% of lot depth up to 20', min. 15' In addition, modulation of facades is required: Generally modulation must be 5' wide with a depth of 4'.	Applies to all lots Maximum width: 60' Maximum depth: 60% of lot depth	Applies to all lots Apartments: 40% Townhouses: 50%	Apts: 25% of lot area or 30% if 1/3 is above ground Townhouses: avg. 300sf/unit, ground level & directly accessible; min. 200sf/unit.	Equivalent to 3 times the perimeter of the property line. May or may not count towards open space requirement.	Same as EXISTING LDT	Voluntary: Administrative DR All development standards are eligible for departure except height, FAR, parking quantity and Seattle Green Factor.
PROPOSED: Lowrise 1 (L1)	FAR: 1.1 max. Density limit: 1 unit /1,600 sq. ft. of lot area Below grade floor area and parking up to 4' above grade is exempt from FAR	25' + 5' with 6:12 pitched roof	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Applies to lots > 9,000 sf Maximum width: 60' Maximum depth: 65% of lot depth	Applies to lots > 9,000 sf 50%	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as above

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review
EXISTING: Lowrise 2 (L2)	FAR: N.A. Density limit: 1 unit 1,200 sq. ft. of lot area	25' + 10' w/ 6:12 pitched roof	Front: avg. of neighboring properties up to 15', min. 5' Side: min. 5', increasing w/ height & depth Rear: 15% of lot depth up to 25', min. 15' In addition, modulation of facades is required: Generally modulation must be 5' wide with a depth of 4'.	Applies to all lots Maximum width: Apartments 50' Townhouses 90' Maximum depth: Apartments: 60% of lot depth Townhouses: 50% of lot depth	Applies to all lots Apartments: 40% Townhouses 50%	Apts: 30% of lot area Townhouses: 300 sf/unit at ground level	Equivalent to 3 times the perimeter of the property line. May count towards open space requirement.	Same as EXISTING LDT	Voluntary: Administrative DR All development standards are eligible for departure except height, FAR, parking quantity and Seattle Green Factor.
PROPOSED: Lowrise 2 (L2)	FAR: 1.2 max. Density limit: 1 unit 1,200 sq. ft. of lot area Below grade floor area and parking up to 4' above grade is exempt from FAR	25' + 5' with 6:12 pitched roof	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Applies to lots > 9,000 sf Maximum width: 90' Maximum depth: 75% of lot depth	Applies to lots > 9,000 sf 50%	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as above
EXISTING:	FAR: N.A.	30' + 5'	Front: avg. of neighboring properties up	Applies to all	Applies to all	Apts: 25% of	Same as	Same as	9 units or more:

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review
Lowrise 3 (L3)	Density limit: 1 unit 800 sq. ft. of lot area	w/ 4:12 pitched roof	to 15', min. 5' Side: min. 6', increasing w/ height and depth Rear: 15% of lot depth up to 25', min. 15' In addition, modulation of facades is required: Generally modulation must be 5' wide with a depth of 4'.	lots Maximum width: Apartments 75' Townhouses 120' Maximum depth: 65% of lot depth	lots Apartments: 45% Townhouses 50%	lot area or 30% if 1/3 is above ground Townhouses: avg. 300 sf/unit, ground level & directly accessible; min. 200sf/unit.	EXISTING LDT	EXISTING LDT	Design Review Board Voluntary: Administrative DR All development standards are eligible for departure except height, FAR, parking quantity and Seattle Green Factor.
EXISTING: Lowrise 4 (L4)	FAR: N.A. Density limit: 1 unit 600 sq. ft. of lot area	37' + 5' w/ 4:12 pitched roof	Front: avg. of neighboring properties up to 20', min. 5' Side: min. 7', increasing w/ height and depth Rear: 15% of lot depth, min. 5' up to 25' max. In addition, modulation of facades is required: Generally modulation must be 5' wide with a depth of 4'.	Applies to all lots Maximum width: Apartments 90' Townhouses 150' Maximum depth: 65% of lot depth	Applies to all lots Apartments: 50%	Apts: 25% of lot area or 30% if 1/3 is above ground Townhouses: min. 200 sf/unit plus 15% of lot area, ground level & directly accessible	Same as EXISTING LDT	Same as EXISTING LDT	Same as above
PROPOSED: Lowrise 3 (L3)	Base: 1.4 Bonus: 2.0* (max.) Density limit: N.A.	Base: 30 +5' with 6:12 pitched roof Bonus:	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Applies to lots > 9,000 sf Maximum width: 120'	Applies to lots > 9,000 sf 50%	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as above

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review
	Below grade floor area and parking up to 4' above grade is exempt from FAR	37' + 5' with 6:12 pitched roof*		Maximum depth: 75% of lot depth					
PROPOSED: Lowrise 4 (L4)	Same as PROPOSED L3, except Base FAR in L4 is 2.0	Base height in L4 is 37' + 5' with 6:12 pitched roof.	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED L3	Same as PROPOSED L3	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as above
EXISTING: Midrise (MR)	FAR: N.A. Density limit: N.A.	60' + 5' w/ 3:12 pitched roof 85' max. where mapped (Northgate)	Front: avg. of neighboring properties up to 15', min. 5' Side: min. 8', increasing w/ height and depth Rear: average of 15', min. 10' In addition, modulation of facades is required: Generally modulation must be 5' wide with a depth of 4'.	Applies to all lots Maximum width: 150' Maximum depth: 65% of lot depth	Applies to all lots Apartments: 45% Townhouses 50%	Apts: 25% of lot area or 30% if 1/3 is above ground Townhouses: avg. 300sf/unit, ground level & directly accessible; min. 200sf/unit.	Same as EXISTING LDT	Same as EXISTING LDT	21 units or more: Design Review Board Voluntary: Administrative DR All development standards are eligible for departure except height, FAR, parking quantity and Seattle Green

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review						
									Factor.						
PROPOSED DRAFT: Midrise (MR)	Base: 3.2 Bonus: 4.0 (max.) Density limit: N.A. Below grade floor area and parking up to 4' above grade is exempt from FAR	60' base, 75' max. with bonus 85' max. where mapped (Northgate)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Front & side with street frontage</td> <td>An average of 7 feet and a minimum of 5'. May reduce to 0' when a courtyard is provided with: a) a minimum width equal to 30% of the width of the street frontage or 20' whichever is greater, and b) a minimum depth of 20'</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rear</td> <td>15 feet, 10 feet for lots with an alley</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Side-interior lot line</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 37' in height: average of 7' and minimum of 5' Above 37': average of 10' and minimum of 7' </td> </tr> </table>	Front & side with street frontage	An average of 7 feet and a minimum of 5'. May reduce to 0' when a courtyard is provided with: a) a minimum width equal to 30% of the width of the street frontage or 20' whichever is greater, and b) a minimum depth of 20'	Rear	15 feet, 10 feet for lots with an alley	Side-interior lot line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 37' in height: average of 7' and minimum of 5' Above 37': average of 10' and minimum of 7' 	<p>Applies to lots > 9,000 sf</p> <p>Maximum width: 150'</p> <p>Maximum depth: 75% of lot depth</p>	<p>Applies to lots > 9,000 sf</p> <p>65%</p>	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as above
Front & side with street frontage	An average of 7 feet and a minimum of 5'. May reduce to 0' when a courtyard is provided with: a) a minimum width equal to 30% of the width of the street frontage or 20' whichever is greater, and b) a minimum depth of 20'														
Rear	15 feet, 10 feet for lots with an alley														
Side-interior lot line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 37' in height: average of 7' and minimum of 5' Above 37': average of 10' and minimum of 7' 														
EXISTING: Highrise (HR)	FAR: N.A. Density limit: N.A.	160' base, 240' max. with bonus	<p>Front: 0-37' in height: avg. of neighboring properties up to 10' 37'-240' in height: 20', may be averaged</p> <p>Side: 0-37' in height: Max. combined total of both side setbacks 10'; 5' min. for either side setback. 37' to 240' in height: increase w/ height up to a maximum total combined setbacks of 40'; 16' minimum for either side setback.</p> <p>Rear:</p>	<p>Maximum width & depth: 0-37' in height: no limits 37' to 240' in height: 100'</p>	N.A.	50% of lot area at ground level, may be reduced to 25% ground level open space if more than 25% provided as decks and balconies located at or below 37' in height.	Same as EXISTING LDT	Same as EXISTING LDT	<p>21 units or more: Design Review Board</p> <p>Voluntary: Administrative DR</p> <p>All development standards are eligible for departure except height, FAR, parking quantity and</p>						

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks	Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review						
			0-60' in height: 10' minimum above 60' in height: 20' minimum In addition, modulation of facades is required: Generally modulation must be 5' wide with a depth of 4'.						Seattle Green Factor.						
PROPOSED DRAFT: Highrise (HR)	Base: 7.0 Bonus: 10 w/ affordable housing; 13 (max.) w/ affordable housing, or affordable housing and incentives for open space and/or landmark preservation Density limit: N.A. Below grade floor area and parking up to 4' above grade is exempt from FAR	160' base, 240' or 300' max. with bonus	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Front & side- street frontage</td> <td>Portions of a structure between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 45' in height: 7' average landscaped setback; 5' minimum setback, except that the setback may be reduced to 0' for frontages occupied by street level uses or townhouse units accessible form the street; 46' – 85' in height: 10' average; minimum 7' Above 85' in height: 10' </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Side- Interior lot line</td> <td>Portions of a structure between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 45' in height: 7' average landscaped setback, 5' minimum, except that setback may be reduced to 0' for portions abutting an existing structure built to the abutting property line); 46' – 85' in height: average 15'; 10' minimum Above 85' in height: 20' </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rear</td> <td>With alley For portions of structure</td> </tr> </table>	Front & side- street frontage	Portions of a structure between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 45' in height: 7' average landscaped setback; 5' minimum setback, except that the setback may be reduced to 0' for frontages occupied by street level uses or townhouse units accessible form the street; 46' – 85' in height: 10' average; minimum 7' Above 85' in height: 10' 	Side- Interior lot line	Portions of a structure between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 45' in height: 7' average landscaped setback, 5' minimum, except that setback may be reduced to 0' for portions abutting an existing structure built to the abutting property line); 46' – 85' in height: average 15'; 10' minimum Above 85' in height: 20' 	Rear	With alley For portions of structure	110' maximum width and depth of tower facades above 85' in height	N.A.	Same as PROPOSED LDT, except that common space may be enclosed.	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as PROPOSED LDT	Same as above
Front & side- street frontage	Portions of a structure between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 45' in height: 7' average landscaped setback; 5' minimum setback, except that the setback may be reduced to 0' for frontages occupied by street level uses or townhouse units accessible form the street; 46' – 85' in height: 10' average; minimum 7' Above 85' in height: 10' 														
Side- Interior lot line	Portions of a structure between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – 45' in height: 7' average landscaped setback, 5' minimum, except that setback may be reduced to 0' for portions abutting an existing structure built to the abutting property line); 46' – 85' in height: average 15'; 10' minimum Above 85' in height: 20' 														
Rear	With alley For portions of structure														

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

ZONES	FAR/ Density Limit (if applicable)	Building Height	Building Setbacks		Building Width & Depth Limits	Lot Coverage	Residential Amenities	Green Factor/ Landscaping	Parking	Design Review
				between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – 45’ in height: 0’ • 46’ – 85’ in height: 10’ • Above 85’ in height: 15’ average, 10’ min. No alley For portions of structure between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – 45’ in height: 5’ • 46’ – 85’ in height: 15’ • Above 85’ in height: 20’ 						

Appendix C

Neighborhood Plan Policies Applicable the to MF Code Update

Citations indicate Comprehensive Plan page numbers where policies cited are located.

Admiral

-p. 8.9 “A high quality, diverse neighborhood where developers and businesses benefit from sustaining excellence and from filling local needs.”

Bitter Lake

-p. 8.21 “A community where new development is environmentally friendly and supports pedestrians, containing a range of housing types and accommodating a diverse set of businesses providing a range of products and services.”

-p. 8.21 “Seek to minimize the impacts of commercial and higher density residential uses on single family residential areas.”

Capitol Hill

-p. 8.23 “A neighborhood, with distinct residential areas, active business districts, accessible transportation services, and strong institutions, which is diverse and densely populated.”

-p. 8.23 “An enhanced neighborhood with diverse land uses, a mixture of housing types including single-family and dense multifamily, and vibrant commercial districts.”

“Enhance and protect the character of the diverse residential districts.”

“A community with a full range of housing types from single family homes to multifamily contributing to a diverse, densely populated neighborhood.”

“Seek tools to retain and increase housing affordable to households with incomes at and below the median income.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Central Area

-p. 8.31 “Encourage increased housing density in and around the 23rd Avenue and Jackson Street commercial area.”

“Encourage increased housing density where appropriate, such as on 12th Avenue and on Yesler Way, and in mid-rise zoned areas.”

Columbia City

-p. 8.34 “Strive to provide the required infrastructure to support increases in housing density.”

Crown Hill/Ballard

-p. 8.37 “A community with housing types that range from single family to moderate density multifamily.”

“Accommodate the majority of new housing units and increases in density in the central areas of the Ballard and Crown Hill urban villages.”

Delridge

-p. 8.43 “A community that preserves and enhances the residential character of single family neighborhoods within the Delridge community while providing a range of housing types to fit the diversity of Delridge households.”

Eastlake

-p. 8.85 “A residential lakefront community primarily defined by low to moderate residential density, pedestrian-scale mixed-use development, neighborhood services, Lake Union maritime uses and compatible architectural styles.”

-p. 8.85 “Buildings are an important part of Eastlake’s views and residential and commercial streetscapes, and their designs should reflect the neighborhood’s lowrise, finely textured scale, comparatively small development sites, and the individuality of its architectural expressions.”

First Hill

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

-p. 8.89 “A community with a culturally and economically diverse residential population, that is also a major employment center, home to many of the region’s state-of-the-art medical centers and related facilities.”

Fremont

-p. 8.93 “Encourage high density housing to locate in mixed-use areas and in close proximity to transit corridors.”

Georgetown

-p. 8.97 “Seek to retain Georgetown’s residentially zoned lands as a means of providing affordable homeownership opportunities.”

Green Lake

-p. 8.106 “An urban village with affordable housing opportunities.”

“A neighborhood with housing for a range of income levels that is compatible with the existing single-family character of the neighborhood.”

“To support the vision of the Green Lake residential urban village and its housing goals and to accommodate growth targets, Midrise 60 zoning is appropriate in the area bounded by Interstate 5, 5th and 6th Avenues NE, NE Maple Leaf Place, and NE 70th Street.”

Greenwood/ Phinney Ridge

-p. 8.110 “A neighborhood with a varied housing stock and a wide range of affordability that serves a diverse population.”

MLK @ Holly

-p. 8.114 “A neighborhood that has a broad range of land uses to respond to the diverse needs of the community and to encourage neighborhood sustainability, including residential, commercial, retail, service, cultural, and open space uses.”

“A balance of both single family and multifamily housing that is both for rent and owner-occupied.”

“Encourage well designed multifamily development to contribute to the development of a mixed use town center development.”

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

“Encourage the preservation of affordable housing resources through rehabilitation of existing single family residences.”

Morgan Junction

-p. 8.119 “Explore methods to discourage increasing height limits in the commercial and multifamily zones above the currently existing levels and encourage developers of new multifamily and commercial buildings to locate mechanical, heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment within the envelope of the building structure.”

“Maintain the character and integrity of the existing single-family zoned areas by maintaining current single family zoning both inside and outside the urban village on properties meeting the locational criteria for single-family zones.”

“Promote home ownership for people of diverse backgrounds and income levels, and encourage a wide range of building styles.”

North Beacon Hill

-p. 8.122 “Establish methods to focus future growth to areas within the urban village best served by existing and future transit and community services. As part of this effort, consider NC2/R-40 as well as less intensive commercial and multifamily zoning in areas abutting existing NC2 zones, including consideration of upzoning single-family zoned areas approximately as shown on attached Map P-1.”

-p. 8.122 “Provide for a more diverse mix of housing types and densities, especially in the northern portion of the North Beacon Hill neighborhood.”

“Seek to maintain the character of low density multifamily areas in the northern portion of the urban village while providing opportunities for additional mixed-use residential development in the retail core in the southern portion of the urban village.”

North Neighborhoods

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

-p. 130 “Encourage development of non-single family parcels adjacent to single family zoning to provide transitions or buffers adequate to protect the single-family area from adverse impacts.”

“Encourage innovative and affordable housing types responsive to market demand and neighborhood desires, including live/work, studio, and in-home business.”

“This policy is to be considered in the review of future rezones in the area defined by 15th Ave NE on the west, NE 95th Street on the south, NE 145th Street on the north, and Lake Washington on the east. Rezones are not favored by this neighborhood plan if they would:

increase the permitted density of residential or commercial use (except for rezones from C to NC zones).”

North Rainier

-p. 8.131 “Housing in the neighborhood which meets community needs and makes a compatible transition from higher-intensity mixed-use and multifamily residential to single family areas.”

-p. 8.132 “Seek to promote the highest intensity residential development in the proposed “Town Center.” Encourage the “Town Center” to be the focal point of mixed-use commercial and residential development. Encourage additional multifamily or mixed-use development in the following areas: south of the Rainier/ MLK intersection within the urban village, and continue south toward Rainier Valley Square Shopping Center; and in vacant parcels located east to 23rd Avenue S and west to 17th Avenue S around the intersection of Massachusetts Street and Rainier Avenue South.”

“Seek to maintain single-family zoned areas within the urban village, but allow rezones to Residential Small Lot to encourage cluster housing developments and bungalow courts. Any single-family zoned area within the urban village is appropriate for any of the Residential Small Lot (RSL) designations, provided that the area meets other requirements of the land use code rezone evaluation criteria for rezones of single-family land. Allow for the rezone of property north of S. Holgate Street that is adjacent to both multifamily and commercially zoned areas to lowrise multifamily zones which permit residential densities that are no higher than permitted in the RSL zone.”

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

“Seek to use design guidelines within the North Rainier Hub Urban Village to promote mixed-use, townhomes, and higher-density development which accommodates the anticipated growth, while promoting the development of well-designed structures that respond to the physical character and environment of the neighborhood. Seek to avoid suburban “tract home style” developments that detract from the character of some North Rainier’s single-family neighborhoods.”

Northgate

-p. 8.135 “Encourage development of the core as a major regional activity center for retail, commercial, office, multifamily residential, and educational uses with densities sufficient to support transit.”

“Promote additional multifamily housing opportunities for households of all income levels to the extent that a compatible scale and intensity of development can be maintained with adjacent single-family areas.”

“Medium to high density residential and employment uses are concentrated within a 10-minute walk of the transit center, reducing the number and length of vehicle trips and making travel by foot and bicycle more attractive.”

Pike/Pine

p. 8.138 “A community with its own distinct identity comprised of a mix of uses including multifamily residential, small scale retail businesses, light manufacturing, auto row and local institutions.”

“Encourage diversity of housing while seeking to maintain existing low income housing.”

“Seek additional resources for the preservation of existing, affordable rental housing.”

“Promote opportunities for owners of existing affordable rental housing to obtain financing to make property improvements without impacting rent levels.”

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

“Promote the additional development of new or rehabilitated housing units, through tools such as code modifications, incentives, and providing flexibility during development review.”

Queen Anne

-p. 8.142 “Queen Anne has many single-family, multifamily, and mixed-use neighborhoods which preserve cultural and historic resources and which include affordable, subsidized, and special needs housing.”

“Encourage an attractive range of housing types and housing strategies to retain Queen Anne’s eclectic residential character and to assure that housing is available to a diverse population.”

-p. 8.143 “Create a unique urban identity in Queen Anne’s Urban Center which includes an attractive multifamily residential neighborhood identified by its distinctive park-like character and surrounding mixed use areas.”

Rainier Beach

-p. 8.147 “A diverse and vibrant neighborhood composed of pedestrian-friendly, transit-connected business districts and affordable and attractive residential areas.”

“Seek to preserve all single family zoned areas’ character. Encourage residential small lot opportunities within single-family areas within the designated residential urban village, and in the area within the residential urban village west of Martin Luther King Boulevard S., permit consideration of rezones of single-family zoned land to the Lowrise Duplex Triplex (LDT), Lowrise 1 (L1), or Lowrise 2 (L2) designations.

“A community that meets the housing needs of its economically diverse and multicultural population and provides opportunities at all economic levels.”

“Encourage affordable and attractive multifamily development, particularly along Rainier Avenue South from South Holly Street to South Cloverdale Street, and as part of South Henderson Street revitalization efforts.”

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

“Seek to preserve Rainier Beach’s diversity and multicultural population by providing affordable housing home-ownership opportunities through programs and land use and zoning tools, including, where appropriate, rezoning.”

Roosevelt

-p. 8.150 “An attractive and diverse community that features the neighborhood’s special small scale building character and a strong, vibrant business district.”

“A neighborhood with a wide range of housing and family types that support an eclectic and diverse community.”

“Encourage future housing development in multifamily structures designed to accommodate a range of incomes.”

South Park

-p. 8.157 “A neighborhood where residents of all cultures, incomes and ages are welcome.”

“Maintain and enhance South Park’s residential character.”

University Community

-p. 8.161 “Encourage the development of retail businesses that serve local needs on 25th Avenue NE, and encourage the redevelopment of a diverse mix of housing and compatible retail, where appropriate, in adjacent areas.”

-p. 8.163 “Employ a variety of housing types and development strategies to effectively provide for identified needs, including existing housing preservation, code enforcement, accessory units, new ground related housing, and mixed-use mid-rise residential development.”

-p. 8.164 “Seek to preserve and enhance the following design characteristics within the community: Pedestrian orientation and visual interest to the pedestrian, high quality, human-scaled design details in larger buildings, streetscape continuity on commercial corridors, integration between the UW campus and the surrounding community, buildings with attractive open space and low rise multi-family development that fits with the design character of adjacent single family houses.”

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

Wallingford

-p. 8.168 “A community with housing and amenities that support a population of diverse incomes, ages and other social characteristics.”

-p. 8.168 “Seek to make a wide variety of housing types available to meet the needs of diverse populations and families and explore options to provide affordable homes.”

West Seattle Junction

-p. 8.172 “A community with housing and amenities that support a population of diverse incomes, ages and other social characteristics.”

Westwood/ Highland Park

-p. 8.174 “A diverse community with two distinct areas, Westwood and Highland Park, comprised of a mix of single and multi-family residential areas, significant public facilities, regional and local commercial businesses, and natural resource opportunities that together offer a variety of choices for its residents.”

-p. 8.177 “A community with both single-family and multi-family residential areas and the amenities to support the diverse population.”

“Promote the attractiveness of higher density residential areas through the enhancement of basic infrastructure and amenities.”

Appendix D

Comprehensive Plan Multifamily Policies

Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan multifamily zone policies were adopted by the City Council as part of the 2007 amendment cycle. The proposed code amendments are intended to be consistent with all Comprehensive Plan policies. The recently amended policies are listed here:

Land Use Policy 80:

Provide for predictability about the allowed intensity of development with appropriate development standards and density limits for each zone to accommodate a range of housing types and achieve development that meets the policy intent for each zone.

Land Use Policy 81:

Limit building heights to establish predictable maximum heights, maintain scale relationships with adjacent buildings, and limit view blockage. Allow for a variety of roof forms, and allow additional height to encourage pitched roofs, where appropriate.

Land Use Policy 83:

Limit bulk to ensure that buildings contribute to the desired pattern of development for the applicable multifamily zone, to maintain compatibility with the surrounding areas, and to encourage infill and single lot development where appropriate.

Land Use Policy 85:

Establish building setback requirements from property lines, as appropriate for the type of multifamily development allowed in the zone. This is to help ensure access to light and air, to provide a sense of privacy, and to provide adequate transition between zones of different intensities.

Land Use Policy 86:

Provide for the recreational needs of residents with standards for amenity areas that may include private or shared open space, whether in the form of rooftop decks, balconies or ground level spaces.

Land Use Policy 92:

Establish a range of low-density multifamily zones to accommodate a range of housing choices that:

- Provide opportunities for multifamily infill development compatible with surrounding zones;
- Allow for densities and building types that encourage both new construction and the conversion of existing structures; and

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

July 2008

- Provide for multifamily development where units have direct access to residential amenities, which may include ground-level open space, to increase opportunities for families with children.

Land Use Policy 94:

In order to maintain a consistent and appealing character in low-density multifamily areas, adopt development standards that help ensure new development and converted structures contribute positively to the character of multifamily neighborhoods and are compatible with abutting single-family zoned areas in terms of scale, open space and setbacks, siting, and unit orientation.

Land Use Policy 102:

Use zoning incentives and other development-related tools to provide for, or preserve, public benefits. Public benefits or other features may include housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, preservation of historic resources or provision of new public open space.