

Port Townsend Tactical Infill Housing Strategies

PC Review Packet – January 2023

Orientation Conversations and PC Open Mic

The City of Port Townsend invited community members interested in housing attainability to join in conversations on housing. Hour-long conversations, held in a series over December 15 and 16, 2022 in the Cotton Building, focused on topics and issues to inform short-term zoning proposals and longer-term policy initiatives to improve housing availability and affordability in town. The Planning Commission hosted an “open mic” event Thursday evening to hear thoughts from other community members, making time available for individuals to address the Commission with their thoughts and ideas.

Participants

More than 30 individuals participated in the conversations, representing an array of agencies, non-profits, and other organizations concerned about housing in Port Townsend.

Date	Time	Participants	Affiliation	
December 15	9:00	Emma Bolin Judy Surber Steve King Suzanne Wassmer Tyler Johnson	City of Port Townsend	
	1:00	Liz Revord	Housing Solutions Network	
		Fred Kimball		
		Kelsey Caudebec		
		Eric Jones		
		Barbara Morey		
		Lauren Ehnebuske		
		Carol McCreary		
		Diane McDade		
		Jaisiri Lingappa		
		John Effman		
		Karen Bondruant		OlyCap
		Lynn LeMaster		
		Teri Nomura		Olympic Housing Trust
	Debbi Steele	Community Build Project		
	Dunia Faulx	Jefferson Healthcare		
	Amanda Grace	Jefferson Community Foundation/ Goodman Sanitation		
	2:00	Eric Toews	Port of Port Townsend	
	3:00	Lily Queen	Housing designers	
Jesse Thomas				
4:00	Lizanne Coker	Homebuilders Association		
	Fred Kimball			
	LD Richert			
	John Geiser			

Date	Time	Participants	Affiliation
December 15 PC Open Mic	6:00	Liz Berman	
		Viki Sonntag	
		Fred Kimball	Housing Solutions Network
		Jaisri Lingappa	Housing Solutions Network
		Patrick Tompkins	
		Liz Revord	Housing Solutions Network
		Pete Langley	Port Townsend Foundry
		Bill Wise	Former Chair of EDC Team Jefferson
		Judith Alexander	
		Griffin Myeks	
		Buster Ferris	Edensaw
		Jake Beattie	NW Maritime Center
		Sol Riou	
		Morning Stargarden	
		Michael Moore	Bayside Housing
		Jamie Maciejewski	Habitat for Humanity
Kathryn Maly			
Scott Walker			
December 16	8:00	Richard Tucker	Jefferson Land Trust
	9:00	Earll Murman	Local Investor Network
		Terrence Fleischer	1St Security Bank
		Emily Ingram	New American Funding Inc
	10:00	Richard Berg	Terrapin Architecture
		Amy Dahlberg	
		Simon Little	Studio STL
		Shane Harper	
	Monica Mader		
	11:00	Arlene Allen	Chamber of Commerce
	1:00	Jamie Maciewjewski	Habitat for Humanity
		Bob Collins	
		Fred Kimball	
	2:00	Michelle Sandoval	Windermere Realty
Teri Nomura			
Andres Andreiatis			
3:00	Cindy Brooks	Jefferson EDC	
	Heather Dudley Nolette	Bayside Housing Services Board Member	
4:00	Scott Walker	Transportation Lab	
	David Thielk		
	Jeff Randall	Jefferson PUD Commissioner	

Topics

This is a list of the topics raised during the conversations, describing the importance of each topic and the information relevant for this project. It parses out the elements of the conversations for tracking, explaining the contexts of the discussions and how each topic may be relevant to the tactical infill housing project. These topics inform the list of issues, presented later in this document, intended to spawn specific zoning strategies to address those issues of priority concern.

Employee attraction

Interviewees mentioned challenges with attracting employees because of the lack of available housing. Positions, like the 124 open jobs at the hospital, remain unfilled because of the community's inability to house prospective employees.

Employee retention

Some interviewees reported losing valued employees because they were either unable to find appropriate housing or were spending too much for their housing conditions. In some cases, employees – even those earning professional salaries – were relegated to living in their cars or with friends, questioning their decision to relocate to Port Townsend.

Employers as housing partners

Some interviewees suggested the area's larger employers, like the hospital, mill, and shipyard, construct housing units to support their employees' housing needs. Some may be better positioned than others to help, but some interviewees noted the hospital has a handful of units available for staff, but the intention is for those units to serve temporary shelter needs until their employees find a permanent residence.

Insufficient inventory

One interviewee noted that there are now fewer than 100 houses for sale in Port Townsend, with likely 500 potential home-buying households in the market. The rental inventory is similarly constrained, with exceptionally low vacancy rates.

Consumptive development pattern

Interviewees claim some of the lots within the city's limits are being underdeveloped, with owners of multiple adjacent properties developing only one home on an area which might otherwise accommodate several units. In some cases, houses are positioned on the properties in ways which might prohibit subsequent owners from further developing the adjoining lots, with homes crowding or straddling property lines and with utility service lines developed through private property rather than within rights of way.

Infrastructure condition

Many interviewees pointed to the condition of the City's water, wastewater, and storm water infrastructure, noting the "spaghetti" lines routed in easements or rights of way are poorly equipped to accommodate additional development. The lines are small and were installed as needed to serve individual homes, sometimes extending for hundreds of feet from City water and sewer mains.

Infrastructure extension

Some interviewees see land otherwise suitable for missing middle housing development not yet served by streets, water and sewer. Making infrastructure available earlier may help phase in development in places where higher-intensity housing is envisioned.

Land value increases

Property values in Port Townsend have skyrocketed in the past five years, according to interviewees. Many remarked they could not now afford to live in the place they own or rent if they were in the market today.

Construction and labor cost increases

Several interviewees cited increasing construction and labor costs as a major impediment to affordability. New single-family residential construction costs have increased rapidly from \$250-350 just two years ago up to \$500 per square foot today, depending on size and finish. Multi-family could cost more than \$250 per square foot.

Permit process

Some interviewees question the value of some of the City's permit processes, particularly the requirement for a planned unit development (PUD) permit to achieve higher residential density or earn credit for providing affordable housing units.

Zone change and property values

Some interviewees cautioned the City to be aware of the potential land value increase consequences of upzones. Increasing development potential by right might result in land values being based on the potential of rental income or subsequent lot subdivision and sale. They shared cautionary tales from City of Langley and Seattle.

Takings v "givings"

Interviewees noted the concept of somehow monetizing increased development opportunity, similar in concept but opposite to the idea of takings, where more restrictive zoning regulations diminish land value. This would parallel the strategy of volunteer bonus density, offering increased development opportunity in exchange for a guarantee of long-term affordability for housing units.

Land conservation and transfer of development rights

One interviewee discussed opportunity for collaborative land management strategy, conserving the forestland within Port Townsend while increasing development options in town. A transfer of development rights (TDR) program would create a market to sell development rights in open space "sending" areas and purchase additional development intensity in the urban, "receiving" areas.

Land trust model

Interviewees pointed to current efforts to offer housing through the community land trust model, where land ownership remains in the name of the trust and housing units are purchased by owner-occupants.

Permanent affordability

Many interviewees consider permanent affordability to be critical, both for households earning less than 80 percent of median income and for those households earning between 80 and 150 percent of median

income. They believe the area's housing crunch pushes purchase and rental prices beyond the means of households who, in other areas, may normally be able to participate in the housing market.

City's efforts to date

Interviewees were interested in learning about the City's recent efforts to streamline permit processes and reduce barriers to constructing housing in Port Townsend.

Public education and involvement

Interviewees confirmed the Port Townsend community will appreciate a process that's both informative and inclusive, welcoming of differing opinions and open to creative ideas.

Volunteerism

Interviewees frequently referenced the spirit of volunteering in Port Townsend, pointing to Habitat for Humanity and other organizations where residents and businesses actively help in the name of community.

Substandard housing

According to these conversations, many Port Townsend households reside in substandard housing or in housing where the rents are high for the product offered. This is mostly because of restricted choice related to limited housing inventory.

Median age

Interviewees mentioned Jefferson County as the "oldest" county in the State of Washington and one of the oldest counties in the country. This can translate to fewer people per household, meaning the relatively constant 10,000 city population resides in more houses now than they may have in years past. The 2016 comp plan update estimated a population of 9,454. With a 1.127% annualized growth rate over the 20-year planning period, Port Townsend would have a population of 12,165 by 2036.

Families

Some interviewees discussed the need to ensure Port Townsend is welcoming to families, stating that the community's educational, institutional, and social infrastructure's collective health depends on what families bring to town.

Supply increase and pent-up demand

When asked if simply adding housing units would help alleviate the current dearth of housing and lack of attainable housing, interviewees generally agreed the pent-up demand is sufficient to absorb whatever units are added without creating an appreciable decline in home prices or rents.

Community character

Some interviewees believe the need to provide housing is both critical and immediate, potentially eclipsing the desire to retain the single-family character of Port Townsend's neighborhoods. Interviewees also mentioned that the community's housing stock is diverse and different from one lot to the next, making it difficult to define what "community character" might be and even more difficult to establish design-based guidance to regulate it.

ADU cost

ADUs are expensive, according to interviewees, and should not be relied upon to provide housing affordable to low- to moderate-income households.

ADU design

Current zoning requires ADU entrances to not face the street front. Some interviewees see this as an unnecessary limitation. Interviewees also noted that an “aging in place” philosophy and ground-floor ADUs make constructing ADUs on 5,000 square foot lots challenging.

ADU popularity

Port Townsend was an early adopter of accessory dwelling units, and the City has issued hundreds of ADU permits since they’ve become legal. The community has accepted these units, and their popularity continues.

Short-term rentals

Most interviewees directed comments at short-term rentals, mentioning their potential both to reduce the supply of housing units available on the long-term rental market and to push rents higher. The City adopted rules to limit short-term rentals, virtually prohibiting the type of rental found online through VRBO and AirBNB. Some interviewees claimed short-term rentals still occur, despite the City’s active enforcement program. Some interviewees suggested additional hotel availability could reduce pressure to provide short-term rentals.

Zero lot line/duplex/single-family attached/semi-detached/townhome

Many interviewees believe it is more difficult than it should be to construct attached housing in Port Townsend. They identified code provisions limiting “single-family attached” housing to two connected structures, making it challenging to develop townhome housing types in some zones. Interviewees also pointed to a need for clarification of definitions to more specifically describe different housing types to ensure terminology is consistent throughout the code and more closely conforms to standard use. They suggested zero-lot-line types be permitted in all residential zones.

PUD process difficulty

The current zoning code provides for housing type flexibility, reduced lot sizes, increased density, and affordability through the planned unit development process. But interviewees tend to believe this step adds unnecessary time and risk to the process with limited benefit. The PUD process also requires a minimum site area of 40,000 square feet, preventing its flexibility options from applying to smaller projects. In terms of submittal requirements, some commented the level of detail required is cost burdensome and questioned whether it was necessary prior to PUD approval.

Lot size v density v housing type

Some interviewees pointed to potential inconsistencies between the zoning ordinance’s provisions related to maximum development density, minimum lot size, and housing type, claiming the minimum lot size and housing type restrictions sometimes make it impossible to attain maximum density. While this might be expected when properties are influenced by environmental constraint, it also occurs in places where the land is otherwise developable.

Corner lots

Some interviewees believe corner lots offer opportunities for constructing duplexes, triplexes, or fourplexes, blending higher intensity housing types into neighborhoods with little impact to existing character.

Housing types in R-IV

Some interviewees believe the City should permit detached and semi-detached housing types in the R-III and R-IV zones, provided the projects attain minimum densities.

Condominium applicability

Interviewees spoke of “condominium” opportunities, but there is a lack of clarity among them of what it actually means. Some attach a more general view, consistent with state law, where condominium is an ownership type, with some degree of property ownership in common. Others see condominiums as a housing type, representing an attached housing product, as in townhomes or stacked units. The zoning and land division codes’ definitions section can help clarify this.

Availability of capital

Not all homebuilders have ready cash to fund their projects, relying on loans for capital. Interviewees confirmed this is the case in Port Townsend. Lenders approach housing and construction loans through a regulatory and economic lens, making loans which either “conform” to federal standards for packaging to the secondary market or satisfy their own needs for “portfolio” loans which are not packaged for the secondary market. “Missing middle” housing types in Port Townsend are difficult to finance through conforming loans, and portfolio loans are more difficult to obtain and are more expensive. There are too few “comparable sales” in and near Port Townsend to support valuation requirements in conforming loans. In addition, lenders noted that financing structures with more than four units requires a commercial loan or a construction loan, adding to the cost of financing.

Tax credits

When discussing capital availability, interviewees also suggested modernizing the City’s multifamily tax exemption program to maximize incentive benefit, possibly extending the exemption term.

Mixed uses

Interviewees believe the existing mixed use zoning districts require too much commercial floor space as a percentage of overall project area and that the minimum parking requirements are too great. Both factors make financing difficult and impact project profitability.

Lot coverage

Some interviewees mentioned the potential disconnect between desired density and bulk and dimensional limitations (e.g. lot coverage and setbacks requirements), resulting in dedicating more land than necessary to open space on buildable lots. These requirements can contribute to a failure to attain maximum allowable densities on property in town.

Stormwater management

Interviewees pointed to local stormwater management requirements limiting lot development opportunity. Regulations and policy requiring on-site treatment of surface runoff limit the extent of impervious surfaces and require open space or other interventions to prevent runoff from impacting adjoining properties.

Setbacks

Interviewees questioned setback requirements, not universally understanding why the side setback standards require 15’ separation between detached houses or why certain rear yard setbacks apply for accessory structures or accessory dwelling units.

Tiny homes

Several interviewees see tiny houses built to RV standards as an acceptable affordable housing option, and others see them as an acceptable housing option, even if affordability is not the primary objective. Others support allowing clusters of tiny homes on foundations in multi-family zones and permitting “double density” for tiny homes. Some suggested tiny homes be permitted as ADUs, even if they are constructed to RV standards and retain their mobility.

SEPA thresholds

Some interviewees question the City’s application of SEPA thresholds for exempting certain housing types from environmental review. The State of Washington is amending its SEPA thresholds to permit additional housing intensity to be exempt, and some interviewees are very interested to see how the City responds.

The table below lists each topic, relates it to the issues distilled during the conversations (see next section) and identifies if it corresponds to zoning, policy, or other actions. Some relate to more than one issue or approach, consistent with the multi-layered complexity of providing more affordable housing. The “Other” column can relate to factors generally beyond the City’s control, such as regional market influences or the actions of others.

Topic	Issue	Zoning	Policy	Other
Employee attraction	1		✓	✓
Employee retention	1		✓	✓
Employers as housing partners	1, 7		✓	✓
Insufficient inventory	3, 4		✓	✓
Consumptive development pattern	4	✓	✓	✓
Infrastructure condition	4		✓	✓
Infrastructure extension	4	✓	✓	
Land value increases	4, 6		✓	✓
Construction and labor cost increases	3, 4			✓
Permit process	9	✓		
Zone change and property values	6	✓	✓	✓
Takings v “givings”	8, 9		✓	
Land conservation and transfer of development rights	2, 4, 7	✓	✓	✓
Land trust model	1, 7	✓	✓	✓
Permanent affordability	1, 3, 7	✓	✓	
City’s efforts to date	8, 9	✓	✓	
Public education and involvement	7		✓	✓
Volunteerism	7			✓
Substandard housing	1, 3	✓	✓	✓
Median age	1, 6			✓
Families	1			✓

Topic	Issue	Zoning	Policy	Other
Supply increase and pent-up demand	3, 4			✓
Community character	6, 9	✓	✓	✓
ADU cost	1, 3, 7	✓		✓
ADU design	8, 9	✓		
ADU popularity	1, 4			✓
Short-term rentals	1, 9	✓	✓	
Zero lot line/duplex/single-family attached/semi-detached/townhome	9	✓		
Corner lots	1, 9	✓		
Housing types in R-IV	1, 9	✓	✓	
PUD process difficulty	1, 9	✓		
Lot size v density v housing type	8, 9	✓	✓	
Condominium applicability	9	✓		
Availability of capital	3, 5, 7			✓
Tax credits	3, 7		✓	✓
Mixed uses	1, 2, 9	✓	✓	✓
Lot coverage	9	✓		
Stormwater management	2, 9	✓	✓	
Setbacks	9	✓		
Tiny homes	1, 9	✓	✓	
SEPA thresholds	2, 6, 9	✓		

Issues

These issues derive from the orientation interviews, PC open mic session, and a review of the City's recent work to address housing challenges. They are intended to target specific zoning initiatives, ensuring whatever changes are proposed in zoning are appropriate to the community's needs and respond to community housing priorities.

1. Workforce housing

Economic development and community prosperity is hindered by the lack of suitable housing for employees – at any income level.

2. Ecological footprint

The lack of local, attainable housing leads to increased commuting distances, placing increased burden on highways and working in conflict with local policies to moderate environmental impact.

3. Shelter poverty

Residents in Port Townsend may be paying too much for housing and transportation, causing them to sacrifice elsewhere, limiting local economic activity and reducing local quality of life.

4. Land availability

Land is scarce for residential development because of land use designations, environmental constraints, inappropriate parcel sizes, infrastructure availability, or retention from the market.

5. Lack of Comparable Sales

Financing new attached single-family, multi-family and mixed-use is challenging. Conventional loans require comparable sales ideally within one mile and sold within the last six months.

6. Unintended consequences

Quick fixes – like residential upzones – may exacerbate other housing challenges by driving up land prices, disrupting neighborhood continuity, or adding stress to local fiscal policy.

7. Reliance on partners

The City cannot act unilaterally to increase housing supply or make housing more affordable, compelling it to act strategically through policy and investment.

8. Zoning consistency

City land use policy and permit processes may not be wholly effective in permitting creative housing solutions or may offer conflicting or vague direction, contributing to homebuilder reluctance to offer new ideas.

9. Zoning clarity

Zoning can make it easy to do the right thing by clarifying standards and definitions reducing risk for homebuilders and confirming public expectations of what the code's regulations will produce.

Issue	Zoning	Policy	Other
1. Workforce housing	✓	✓	
2. Ecological footprint		✓	✓
3. Shelter poverty		✓	✓
4. Land availability		✓	✓
5. Lack of comparable sales			✓
6. Unintended consequences	✓	✓	✓
7. Reliance on partners		✓	✓
8. Zoning consistency	✓		
9. Zoning clarity	✓		

Priority Directives

These priority directives relate both to policy-level initiatives and to zoning amendments, linking the topics and issues to direction for Port Townsend to consider. While this project focuses on amendments to the development regulations to facilitate providing “missing middle” housing, it also helps reveal other policy choices for the City to consider as it updates its comprehensive plan and develops department investment strategies and work programs.

Policy directives set the stage for approaching the zoning text amendments, clarifying the community’s overall housing priorities. These are the essential ingredients to any policy strategy or zoning tactic, touchstones to guide our approach to the initiatives we propose. Understanding our work now is limited to the zoning tasks, the list below also includes other items the City may wish to consider when it is time to look to policy updates, deliberating other tools to complement and enhance what the zoning work generates.

- A. Increase housing supply
 - Land availability analysis
 - Permitted housing types assessment
 - Zoning density analysis
 - Mixed-use land use mix analysis
 - Infrastructure analysis and investment
 - Land efficiency strategies and fiscal policy
- B. Ensure continued affordability
 - Community and trust ownership facilitation
 - Cohousing facilitation/lender coordination
 - Bonus density/affordability linkage
 - Affordable housing fund
- C. House local workforce locally
 - Employer cooperative
 - Economic development initiatives
- D. Nurture partnerships
 - Housing agency/advocacy coordination
 - Property acquisition
 - Lenders portfolio loan facilitation
 - TDR program with Land Trust

- E. Facilitate permitting for attainable housing
 - Process management and evaluation
- F. Facilitate access to capital for “missing middle” housing types
 - Municipal affordable housing revolving fund
 - Down payment assistance program
 - Community Reinvestment Act outreach
- G. Clarify definitions
 - Single-family attached
 - Duplex
 - Townhouse
 - Condominium
 - Tiny home
 - Manufactured home

Zoning Actions Array

While many of the issues and directives relate to policy, budgeting, and municipal strategy, others can be at least partially addressed through zoning. Of those, this list targets amendments to the development regulations which first address making “missing middle” housing more available for households in the 80% to 150% area median income category. These suggested text amendments may also have the additional impact of making housing more affordable overall, an important consideration when addressing the community’s housing issues but not the first priority for this particular project.

But we cannot tackle all of the possible zoning text amendments by April 1, 2023. This table facilitates prioritizing our work program, describing the types of zoning actions we believe may address the issues described here, the type of work we would do for each, and an estimate of the level of effort each type of action may take. We have scored these actions based on our ability to achieve work represented by a score of 100. Some actions require more time and energy, while others may be a relatively simple act. This table allows the Planning Commission to assemble an assignment for us totaling 100. Electing to pursue all 24 actions, for example, would commit us to 223 points. Some items will need to fall off this list and must be taken up later.

As we work through the list the Commission prioritizes, we may discover various barriers to completing one item or another. As you consider the options, it will also be helpful to identify up to three “back-up” priorities if items have to be deferred.

Type of action	Description	Work effort	Issue	Points
Single-family attached	Amending definitions to clarify housing types	Review the definitions for various housing types to ensure applicability and consistency with objectives to facilitate “missing middle” types. (17.08 Definitions)	1, 8, 9	8
Permitted housing uses	Modifying permitted use tables to make more housing types available in residential, commercial, and mixed-use zones	Study the various permitted use tables and ensure there’s more flexibility in providing varied housing types in most residential zones and, where appropriate, in commercial or mixed zones, consistent with comp plan density policy. (17.16.020 Residential Zoning Districts – Permitted, Conditional and Prohibited Uses)	1, 8, 9	6
Lot size minimums	Re-evaluating minimum lot size requirements; consider maximum density requirements	Review lot size and plat requirements to make sure they permit intensities consistent with comprehensive plan density ranges, potentially through condominium provisions. (17.16.030 Residential Zoning Districts – Bulk, Dimensional, and Density Requirements, 17.32.030 PUD lot area, and Title 18.Plat)	1, 8, 9	8
Accessory dwelling units	Permitting more than one ADU on a single-family lot while achieving consistency with the comprehensive plan	Revisit ADU provisions to modify ADU area limits, encourage “carriage house” (above garage) style or explicitly permit multiple units on a single lot	1, 8, 9	10

Type of action	Description	Work effort	Issue	Points
Mixed use FAR	Changing residential intensity standard from units per acre to a floor-area ratio, permitting construction of a higher number of smaller units in mixed-use structures	Consider options to expand residential unit construction by converting to height and bulk formulas rather than just residential density where permitted by comp plan (as in mixed use subarea plan Table 17.31.080)	1, 8, 9	12
Building height limits	Increasing allowable building height in higher-intensity zoning districts to permit an additional floor	Review height limits and likely building types to ensure standard reflects constructability and financial feasibility (other than in 17.28 Height Overlay District and SMP)	1, 8, 9	10
Density bonus	Permitting higher density by right providing certain minimum design criteria are met	Examine PUD approach and find ways to simplify density bonus process, possibly also by modifying use and intensity standards by right while still consistent with comp plan	1, 7, 8, 9	14
SEPA thresholds	Adopting new SEPA exemption thresholds to facilitate construction of infill housing	Propose new thresholds consistent with new Ecology rules for housing in “urban” areas	1, 8, 9	7
Condominium definition	Clarifying “condominium” as an ownership type and not a building type	Evaluating subdivisions and definitions codes to ensure availability of condo option	1, 8, 9	5
Land trust facilitation	Auditing zoning to ensure no explicit or implicit limitations on land trust ownership in residential zones	Reviewing subdivision/zoning codes and removing potential roadblocks to land trust instruments	1, 2, 7, 8, 9	6
Cottage housing	Simplifying design standards	Updating standards for cottage housing and parking to simplify permitting and increase opportunity to develop this type, potentially through “unit lot” subdivisions, condominiums, or other avenues. (17.34 Cottage Housing Development Design Standards, administrative procedures, residential zones, use tables by zone)	1, 8, 9	16
Parking for attached SF	Reviewing limitations on curb cut requirements and backing on to the right-of-way	Amending parking access and location standards to be consistent with likely resident demand and impacts to adjoining areas	1, 8, 9	7
Parking	Considering further reductions in parking requirements, exploring different standards in different zones or neighborhoods	Amending parking requirements to further reduce off-street parking in certain cases where on-street parking may cause minimal impact	1, 8, 9	7
Temporary housing	Facilitating employer-provided housing for temporary employee occupancy, potentially on commercial or industrially-zoned property	Reviewing use tables by zone, special use standards, and administrative procedures, putting in place new guidance for housing in traditionally non-residential areas	1, 7, 8, 9	14

Type of action	Description	Work effort	Issue	Points
Minor building height variance/ exemptions	Permitting mechanical equipment to pierce height limit and providing for administrative relief in certain circumstances	Reviewing administrative procedures to clarify when administrative relief can be applied for residential purposes	1, 8, 9	8
Lot line adjustments	Removing Type II process for reorientation	Simplifying lot line adjustment process to eliminate need for public notice in most cases	1, 8, 9	5
Setbacks	Redesignating frontage setbacks in the R-III and evaluating front, side, and rear setback requirements in other residential zones	Permitting additional flexibility in setbacks to make properties more easily developed, while also retaining “daylight plane” requirements and not necessarily encouraging larger single-family homes	1, 8, 9	10
Bonding requirements	Requiring adequate infrastructure improvement	Reviewing subdivision bond requirements to ensure effectiveness, surety, and flexibility	1, 8, 9	9
Duplex, triplex, fourplex	Clarifying permissibility by zoning district and ensuring achievable design standards	Reviewing definitions for various housing types and updating permitted use tables to allow opportunity for varied housing types	1, 8, 9	7
Courtyard apartments	Ensuring this is a permitted type and consistent with zoning district intensities and design standards	Reviewing zoning permitted use tables and ensuring this type is allowable by right, consistent with district density ranges and comp plan policy	1, 8, 9	12
Micro-housing	Ensuring compatibility with definitions and minimum unit size requirements, anticipating application of FAR standards	Reviewing zoning permitted use tables and ensuring this type is allowable by right, consistent with district density ranges and comp plan policy	1, 8, 9	12
Permanent affordability	Providing for density bonuses on the condition bonus units are “permanently” affordable	Inserting density bonus opportunities more broadly by PUD or by right and attaching affordability requirements	1, 7, 8, 9	12
Subdivision options	Providing clarity and opportunity for binding site plans, “unit lot” subdivisions, or other instruments	Reviewing zoning and subdivision codes to permit more land division variety, potentially incorporating new provisions	1, 8, 9	12
Application requirements	Confirming materials required for applications are consistent with the degree of review and breadth of permit	Reviewing application requirements in administrative procedures and subdivision codes to ensure the City requires only what is necessary to consider permit scope	1, 8, 9	8
Tiny home/ manufactured home park communities	Permitting these development types under certain circumstances and with design standards	Reviewing development type options, best practices to target potential changes to permitted use tables, design guidelines, and special regulations	1, 3, 6, 9	15