“Old Poulsbo”
Proposed Code Provisions including Design Guidelines

March 8, 2004
Purpose

To recognize and reinforce the established pattern of residential development in the area southeast of the town center.

To allow for new development, expansion and renovation that is compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood.

To encourage creativity and individuality in the design of sites and buildings.

To allow for sensitive additions of new types of housing.

To stabilize and strengthen property values and investments in the neighborhood.
**Recommendation**

Adopt an “Old Poulsbo” Overlay District for the northern portion of the area with standards and guidelines tailored to the history and character of Old Poulsbo.
Development Standards

In addition to the standards applicable to the underlying zoning district, the following provisions shall apply to all development within the Overlay District:

1. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU’s) shall be permitted only on lots that are a minimum of 7500 square feet in area.

2. Through the Conditional Use Permit process, “residential infill” lots no smaller than 5000 square feet may be allowed per City Code.

3. Building height within the Overlay District shall not exceed 30 feet, as measured to the top of a ridgeline or peak of a sloped roof.

4. The internal floor area of the principal house on a lot (excluding basements, porches and detached garages) shall not exceed an amount equal to 30% of the area of the lot. That is, the lot area x .3 = the maximum area contained within the house.

5. All buildings on any lot shall have pitched roofs, with a minimum slope of 5:12 and a maximum slope of 12:12.

6. Maximum lot size within the Old Poulsbo Overlay District shall be 10,000 sf.

7. If a residential structure contains more than one floor, the floor area of any floor above the first floor should not exceed 75% of the area of the floor below it.
Design Guidelines

Any development, renovation or expansion shall be reviewed for compliance with a set of design guidelines.

Any new development must incorporate at least three of the elements below. Renovations or expansion must incorporate at least two of the elements below.

A. Roof Features
   • The roof should incorporate roof features including dormers and intersecting gables.

B. Front Porch
   • The principal house on a lot should incorporate a porch facing the street on which the residence is addressed. In order to be usable, the porch should be at least 6 feet in depth.

C. Detached Garage
   • Any detached parking garage should be separated from the principal house by at least 10 feet.
   • The garage structure, including any “bonus” or ADU space, may not exceed the height of the principal structure.

D. Architectural Details
   • Buildings and sites should incorporate elements and details such as the following:
     Brackets supporting roof overhangs
     Corner boards
     Wide trim around windows
     Railings around balconies and porches
     Low picket fencing

E. Gardens Facing Street
   • Residential development should include gardens facing and visible from the street.
   • Walls, fences or planting should be used to define the edge of the front yard.
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The “Old Poulsbo” study area, located adjacent to the downtown and between State Highway 305 and Liberty Bay, includes many of the oldest residential homes in the city. The area sits on a scenic hillside that has been gradually developed over the past century. Recent development trends have raised various issues among residents, giving way to this neighborhood design study. The study is an analysis of development patterns and design details, with the purpose of finding an identifying neighborhood character that can be a guide to future development.

Data for this study was collected manually during field visits and online through the Kitsap County tax assessor’s parcel search and database (www.kitsapgov.com/assr/default.htm). The data was then compiled and linked to GIS (Geographic Information System) files which already attributed tax ID numbers to parcels on a map. By linking the collected data to the map, we were able to create the following analysis maps, each showing different information sorted and categorized in meaningful ways.

The analysis maps are not intended to reveal specific information about specific parcels. Instead, the maps illustrate patterns and relationships between all the parcels in the study area in order to make the complexities of development easier to understand and to be used as a tool for anticipating future development issues. Additionally, due to inaccuracies in both methods of data collecting, there are several suspected errors in the maps, which therefore should not be used independently as reliable sources of information.
In addition to the analysis maps, photos and sketches were compiled to illustrate the rich design character that we found evident in the field. These characteristics reflect only our observations and deserve more feedback and response from residents themselves.

After meeting with City staff to discuss our findings, the City hosted a neighborhood meeting on September 23, 2003, at the Liberty Bay Presbyterian Church on Harrison Street. About 62 residents attended and participated in the presentation and discussion. Residents also filled out a survey administered by the City, and a summary of survey responses is included in this report.

The photos on these process pages were taken at the neighborhood meeting. They show residents looking at analysis maps soon after they arrived, and watching the PowerPoint presentation. After the presentation, the remainder of the meeting was filled with questions and comments.
Age of Houses:

The map on page 5 illustrates the age of houses in the study area within four ranges: built before 1914, between 1915 and 1929, 1930 - 1950, and 1951 - 2003. These ranges represent general historic periods: before WWI, the war up to the Depression, the Depression and WWII, and post-WWII to the present. These periods affected neighborhood growth, architectural style, and other housing trends in different ways. Though this map is relatively simple to understand by itself, it becomes even more revealing when compared with many of the following analysis maps.

One of the observations that can be made from this map is the pattern of development over time. Also evident, in conjunction with parcels and streets (especially cul-de-sacs), are areas that developed as possible subdivisions (all post-WWII).

It should be noted that the age listed by the Tax Assessor may be influenced by extensive remodeling. If this is the case, any errors are likely restricted to the north and central areas.
Number of Stories:

The following analysis map illustrates the distribution of houses with one, one-and-a-half, two, and three stories (split-level houses are categorized as two stories).

The closest indication that the number of stories correlates with age is the location of one-and-a-half story houses, which occurs mostly in the north and central regions, similar to the houses oldest in age. These houses seem to give the neighborhood a particularly notable character.

The number of stories is further discussed on page 24, under Building and Site Design.
Size of House:

The total size of houses (sum of all the floors) is depicted in 1000-square-foot increments. This information was gathered from the Tax Assessor’s Data, and does not include basements, detached garages, porches or decks.

Most of the houses in the study area are between 1001 – 2000 square feet in size. Generally, houses that are 1000 square feet or less in area were built before the 1950s. Only a handful of houses include an area above 3000 square feet, and these have all been built recently, with the notable exception of the property at the corner of 4th Avenue and Moe Street. Scattered throughout the study area, with no particular pattern, are houses sized between 2001 – 3000 square feet.
Size of Lot:

The total lot size in square feet is illustrated on page 11 in increments of 7500, the minimum standard lot size for the City of Poulsbo. Lots smaller than the minimum requirement may indicate subdivision before this requirement was adopted in 1994. Most lots throughout the study area are greater than the minimum size and less than twice the minimum. Lots which are greater than twice or three times the minimum lot size may show potential for future subdivision within the study area. For further analysis of this phenomenon, refer to pages 22-23.
FAR:

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is a calculation that divides the total size of the house (pages 8-9) by the total size of the lot (pages 10-11). A ratio of .5, for instance, can be reached in several ways, e.g., a one-story building covering half of the lot or a two-story building covering a quarter of the lot. This usually indicates the bulk of a building, especially if the lot is relatively small. Most of the properties in the study area retain a floor area ratio of .2 or less. A dozen properties have a FAR greater than .30, indicating that building mass is greater than on lots of equal size, and may emphasize the building’s relative bulk.
Pathway Access to Sidewalk:

The following data was gathered solely by field survey observations. Going through the neighborhood, we noted the instances where there was a walkway leading directly from the house to the sidewalk. Initially we assumed that such a characteristic would be associated with older houses, which might be a good clue as to the neighborhood’s character.

The results displayed on the map to the right allow us to make several observations:

• Pathway access is in fact a characteristic of mostly older houses (compare to the map on page 5);
• Pathways occur mostly where there are either detached garages or no garages (see map on page 17);
• and where there are pathways, there are also porches, stoops, and inviting front doors.

The frequent occurrence of pathways in certain areas indicates a highly social and pedestrian atmosphere, even where there are no sidewalks along the street. They are clear signs of a strong neighborhood character.
Garage Types:

The garage types recorded and shown refer to attached and detached garages, and may include carports. The map on page 17 illustrates that many of the detached garage types are located in the north and central regions, which are also some of the oldest lots in the study area. Newer development has tended to reject the detached garage model in favor of the attached model.

Several lots indicate that no garage is present. Two reasons may exist for this phenomenon. First, especially in older areas, the house simply was not built to include a garage. Secondly, because most of this data was collected by field survey, many of the garages could not accurately be located, and therefore, were not depicted on this map.
Garage in the Rear:

The location of garages shown in the map on page 19 indicates where garages do not front the street. (For Garage Types, refer to page 16-17.) In these cases, the garage does not assert visual prominence on the street. This data was gathered only through field survey, and therefore, may not show all incidences. Generally, rear garages occur where a service alley is accessible, usually in the older portions of the study area (north and central areas). This phenomenon mainly developed with detached garages.
Low Improvement Value to Land Value Ratio:

Two indicators of future development or redevelopment are vacancy and property value ratios.

In this study, the vacant parcels are empty lots with no structures, or zero improvement value, according to the tax assessor.

To determine the redevelopment potential for remaining lots, the improvement value (anything added to the land) is divided by the land value. If the calculation is less than .5, then the parcel is determined to have a low value ratio, and therefore a high redevelopment potential. In other words, when the building is less than half the value of the land, there is a higher potential for redevelopment.

This method of analysis is used to determine buildable lands within urban growth boundaries.
High Potential for Infill and Development:

Another indicator of future development is lot size. In an attractive neighborhood with several large parcels that is otherwise physically constrained by natural and other boundaries, the potential for gradual infill development is very likely.

The City of Poulsbo’s minimum lot size requirement is an area of 7500 square feet. All of the parcels indicated in the following map exceed 15,000 square feet, which implies at least one subdivision per lot. However, because of irregularities in shape or access, some of the smaller lots may not be subdividable at all.

Several people at the September neighborhood meeting noted that the waterfront parcels, which contain tidelands, shouldn’t be considered divisible due to the natural restrictions on those parcels. The map to the right includes the original analysis in order to identify potential subdivisions based strictly on total lot square footage, with the presumption that there may be several cases where a subdivision is not actually feasible.

In order to identify areas of greatest potential for infill, parcels that exceed 15,000 square feet and also have a currently low value ratio (see previous map, page 21) are highlighted in a darker shade.

An additional level of analysis could be illustrated in this map if the City’s special provision for residential infill incentive densities were taken into account. In this provision, the minimum lot area becomes 5000 square feet.
Character and Design:

Many references to neighborhood character have already been made in the previous pages. The collage to the right illustrates many of the ideas already mentioned, beginning with house types and finishing with building and site details.

The first house type is the “One Story,” which represents the older one-story houses with a front porch or stoop, a walkway from the front door to the street, and no attached garage.

The “One & 1/2 Story” house type has all the same characteristics of the “One Story” plus an extra half story, usually seen as a single dormer or small gable above the front porch or stoop. Though sometimes at least partially recreated in later styles, these first two house types are typical of the first half of the 20th Century (up to WWII).

The “One Story Rambler” represents the low rectangular (horizontal) one-story houses with an attached garage or carport at one end. This type is prevalent in the post-WWII era.

The “Two Story” house type does not represent a house style or characteristic other than a second story.

There is no category for houses with three or more stories because of size, FAR, context, and other issues.

Our inventory of characteristic building details, predominantly found in older houses, includes stoops or porches, dormers and mullions, roof brackets, wood columns, wood siding, cross-gabled roof, exposed rafters, and masonry bases and latticework. Site details include yard retaining walls at the sidewalk and accessory units.
1. Do you live inside the Poulsbo Study Area?
   - Yes 45
   - No 2
   - Did not Answer 4

2. Do you have property that could potentially be subdivided and developed for another single family home (or more)?
   - Yes 8
   - No 28
   - Did not Answer 15

   What do you think is an appropriate lot size?
   - 7500 min 15
   - up to 15000 5
   - Did not Answer 26

   Other answers:
   - Lot sizes should keep buildings/land use to similar scale w/ rest of neighborhood
   - .15 - .2 acre
   - 1/3 - 1/2 acre
   - Depends on construction plans/scale - cottage on small, large on large
   - Lot size = 4.00 x house square footage

3. Do you think you might add an accessory dwelling unit on your property over the next several years?
   - Yes 3
   - Possibly/ in favor of idea 9
   - No 34
   - Did not Answer 5

4. What are major concerns with new residential buildings in the neighborhood?
   - Height/Size 22
   - Style 17
   - FAR/ Density 12
   - View 9
   - Waterfront 2
   - Prop Tax 2
   - None 3
   - Did not Answer 7

   Other answers:
   - standards applied evenly
   - setbacks
   - don’t add sidewalks on side streets that aren’t heavily travelled
   - economic division
   - traffic/ noise
   - really none if the building meets present codes
   - ADUs should be heavily restricted
   - We need a plan and philosophy for this area
   - Keep with the character of the “Old Town”, whether the homes be small or large 1 story or 2 story. The mix is nice. Would like to keep away from apartments, condominiums and duplexes in Old Town Poulsbo. They do not seem to fit the character and style.
   - “Teardowns” replaced by “mega-houses”
5. If you were going to increase the size of your home, what size/height do you think would be appropriate for your lot?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>2000 sf</th>
<th>2400 sf</th>
<th>3000 sf</th>
<th>Depends on Scale</th>
<th>No/ Current Codes OK</th>
<th>Did not Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Height   | 25' / 1.5 story | 30' / 2 story | 40' | 2 | 4 | 1 |

Other answers:
- 20' - 25' height restriction if an interference to adjacent neighbors, if not, 35' is okay
- On Matson, if remodels come about, sq ft on ground level should not exceed largest structures in existence and streets similar
- 50% footprint including paving
- Size or height would not be important as its natural blending would be most important. That is what the neighbors say about it. Have a set of basic guidelines to get plans approved, but then post computer pictures on and 10 days before the construction even can be started, after plans have been approved. If complaints come in, plan approval should be reassessed.
- Below the neighbors' view sight. Because we all value our views and pay extra taxes for them.
- Stay within boundaries. Do not crowd property in.

6. Do you have favorite streets within the Old Poulsbo study area? Where and what is special about them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(top choices):</th>
<th>Fjord Drive</th>
<th>Nelson Pl</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>Matson</th>
<th>Harrison</th>
<th>Ryen</th>
<th>Somerseth</th>
<th>4th /</th>
<th>Did not Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons:
- Homes | View | Walkable | Low Traffic | Yards/Trees | Neighborhood Feeling
- 11    | 6    | 3        | 3           | 2           | 2                

continued on next page
7. Do you think the Old Poulsbo Study areas should be divided into different sectors, with possibly different development standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibly in favor of idea</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Did not Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes Comments:
- South of Hostmark, west of 305 to Fjord and North of Hostmark, west of Cemetery of Lutheran Church
- Looks to me like 3-4 NW, SW, E, SE
- (map bounded by Fjord, Hwy 305, Hostmark)
- 2 areas - north and south of Hostmark/Lincoln - downtown should be separate
- With Iverson south to Sixth and Fjord to return the Old Poulsbo houses with new buildings to conform to the neighborhood
- Area near Lutheran church and Fjord - buildings should remain in architectural style of older homes

Possibly/ Maybe:
- Perhaps waterfront and view areas - should have standards to preserve the amenities that non-waterfront/ view lots don’t need

No Comments:
- What is good for one area should fit with the entire area.
- There is nothing wrong with the standards we have in place today.
- What- another escape clause for real estate agents and developers?
- No accessory dwelling in Old Town - keep old town atmosphere look and maintain its character
- As it began as a residential area it should stay that way - NO commercial!
- Not different sectors - keep the homes unique and individual.
- I don’t think it is appropriate nor would it work well. I don’t think it is good judiciously yet we definitely have different sectors in Old Poulsbo - the area just above the Old Downtown, the area along Fjord and behind Fjord and then “Upper Old Poulsbo” which tends to have more Rambler styles.

8. Other Comments:

- The speaker was very good at explaining issues from various points of view. Charts were a great way to get ideas across. Possibly write a summary of comments on these surveys - have it posted at Library and City Hall.
- Data presented in charts has too much error. Better data will likely change the view.
- Mr. Hinshaw said: “People come here - look at the small town ambience and say, Oh! I want to live here!”. I doubt if anyone came and looked at one of the “monster” houses and said - “Oh! I want to live here!”
- Hold open council meetings at venues suitably sized to allow public attendance. Poulsbo City Hall too small.
• There should not be residential infill incentive integrating high density housing into existing low density areas such as Old Town Poulsbo - no high density - infill is a bad idea. Sink the power lines. Control height to preserve views. Bulk building sizes affect water run-off for lower properties. Maintain character - by keeping and maintaining the integrity that currently exists. The integrity should allow for community matching new development along with conservative additions to existing properties.
• I support physical (size and stories) AND economic diversity. Except for ADUs, prefer limited infill (PUD) or outside Old Town. I think Old Town should be allowed to change, yet reflect and remember its history.
• What about all the overhead phone and power lines?
• I think lot size is VERY important - and our threatened Liberty Bay should not have more building in it.
• I want the community should honor the craftsmanship revealed by “carpenters” of our past.
• The access to this neighborhood from 305 via Tollefson should be closed off, too much traffic now.
• I think its time to stop mega houses in the old sections of Poulsbo.
• Height limits should apply level of land before ground work begins. If you do consider footprint of house in future include garage attached and separate. Yes! It is a character issue and a footprint issue! Keep it similar as today. Buildings on the water side of Fjord Drive should be included in the “Old” Study area. Utilities should be put underground. I hope that Old Town never looks like Poulsbo Place.
• “Old Town” has, over 100 years, undergone many changes, parts of Fjord Drive were very commercial... Fuel docks, gas stations, fuel storage tanks... hardly residential. Now they are gone - no one seems to complain about them! But build a larger house and watch the sparks fly! Do we want gas stations back? What about the old oyster plant? It’s part of “Old Town”... How about the existing duplex on Fjord? It seems to me that “Old Town” is very diverse, and should remain diverse. Let nature go forward. Allow private land owners to make reasonable decisions. Less government intervention.
• Keep “Old Town” character.
• I don’t want to stop building or development. However, the 2 houses on Fjord look like they hate owners who exploited the limits of the code. That offends me and I suspect offended their neighbors. My husband and I plan to add a garage to our house and have gone to considerable effort to have the garage (designed by an architect) to make it look like it was “always there”. There are huge areas of incorporated Poulsbo that are available for development (Olhava, over by Poulsbo Elementary). What works for those “newer” areas don’t of necessity need to be applied to Old Town. There are lots of ways that Poulsbo already has provided for increased rental density without “infringing” on “property rights”. The “property rights” statement is inflammatory. Any code at all infringes on “property rights” of necessity. Living around other human beings means I can’t do whatever I want - it’s obvious that this is true in a town.
• I want old community to remain similar to what it is today. Provisions needed to be predicatable - Suggestion: Incentive regulations to build compatibly.
• I think F.A.R. could be very useful in maintaining the scale of the area. Building height should be from existing grade not final which can be easily manipulated.
• See attached prepared discussion (not attached here; see original surveys). We want character of “Old Town” to be preserved.
The infill concept is a bad idea - for 36 years we've lived with side yards dimensional requirement - rear yard setbacks and front setbacks.

My only concern is that this area does NOT become another "Poulsbo Place" which means no major developer come in and build the same exact house (or 3 or so different models) everywhere.

The diversity of our neighborhood is because all our houses are different. If someone wants to buy or build a house that is different or unique, then this house fits the diversity of the neighborhood.

Need definition of height from the City. Need to find ways to protect people's views. Need to have a way to heal all alike but remain Old Poulsbo. Need ordinances, measures, etc. So people, major, planning dept. and Council are all on the same page. Want old community to continue to look like it does today.

The monster houses are not only an eyesore - but they do not fit with the present "one-story" type construction. Poulsbo either stays as a "neighborhood" community OR the city will let the ones with the most money to do whatever they wish. Please protect the "Old Poulsbo".

People should have the ability to develop their property as they choose thereby not violating their property rights.

Cease granting waivers for MOVs, i.e. reduction in setback requirements, waiver for height restrictions.

Will they build high-rise in front of us? Keep the Old Town as it is.

Keep height in regulation. Keep a fun appearance.

Protecting the views is very important.

My concern is potential building of multi-story of condos or apartments along the waterfront.

I want Old Poulsbo to continue to look similar as it does today.

Leave this area alone - do not subdivide. Do not build 2 and 3 houses on a one-house lot. Our area is being ruined! The developers are greedy! Extend sidewalk down Fjord and Lemolo for walkers.

I would like to look at what we already have for codes to say is this adequate and appropriate? I don't want to reinvent the wheel if it's not needed or add layers of red tape that open us up to judicial review. I want to keep the character, style, flavor, uniqueness and beauty of Old Town Poulsbo, yet I don't want to box each property owner in with a hard set of rules and codes like square footage restrictions and number of stories. Yet, have a broader set of guidelines like we currently have.

What makes Old Poulsbo different is the space we have and character of the homes. If we start cramming in ADUs we lose the character of our neighborhood.

People are filling with dirt in order to get more heights.

Traffic congestion on 305. I'm very happy with current neighborhood. Need protection of Bay view.

Restricting people's rights for other than safety or health reasons is a slippery slope for the City to take. Disagree with the definition of "Old Poulsbo".

Change code - do not allow accessory dwellings.

I like the community as it is today. I moved here because it had the feel of a small-middle class town or village. If it turns into another upper class Bainbridge I will want to leave. I do not want to see a lot of infill.
Response to Public Comments

1. Lot size should be minimum 7,500 s.f. No infill.

We do not recommend any change from the current minimum allowance of 5,000 sf lots permitted on a conditional land use basis.

2. Better definition should be developed for “average finished grade” as relates to the building height calculation.

We agree. But this is an issue for the land use code as a whole and is not confined to Old Poulsbo. The City may wish to address this as a separate subject.

3. Setbacks: side yards minimum 7.5 feet; or if 5 feet, require consent of adjacent property owner.

We believe this comment reflects a misunderstanding of the code. Currently, the total of both side yard setbacks on a given a parcel must be 15 feet. But one side may be reduced to 5 feet. No matter what one property owner does, the adjacent one is entitled to the same dimensions.
(As a note, it is not legally defensible to allow individual property owners to waive code standards for their neighbors.)

4. We like all the ideas presented; but request underground utilities; would support LID.

Comment is acknowledged. But the subject being addressed now has to do with the land use code not utility lines.

5. Clarify height regulation. Specifically, no mounding to obtain additional height.

As with comment #2, this is a subject for the land use code as a whole. The definition of grade could be expanded to prohibit this.

The measurement of building height includes the entire vertical bulk of the building from average finished grade, regardless of a basement.

7. Limitation (on infill lots) on FAR is too restrictive; especially if garage is attached or under house and is counted in the FAR. Rather the footprint be 30% than FAR.

The footprint is already limited by lot coverage. FAR is the only way to address the bulk of buildings. Our previous research shows that the vast majority of houses in Old Poulsbo do not exceed an FAR of .3. The few houses that exceed this tend to stand out in bulk and break the established, predominant pattern of the neighborhood. Therefore, we believe that .3 is an appropriate standard. (If someone needs more than this, perhaps it would be better to look elsewhere in the city.

8. Like maximum 10,000 s.f. lot.

Comment acknowledged.

9. Enforce the code, rather than forgiving if structure is built before obtaining permit.

Comment acknowledged. Enforcement of the code is always important.

10. Avoid height of garage, or other accessory structure, being taller than main structure.

We suggest that this is perhaps is a city-wide issue, more properly addressed by clarifying the code as a whole.

11. Change boundary of overlay district to Matson or Shorewood north; and include shoreline from Somerseth to Hostmark.

We agree that the southern boundary of the overlay district should include properties on the south side of Matson, so that structures on both sides of the street are similar in scale.

12. Maximum 10,000 s.f. lot is a problem.

We do not agree. Development on very large lots is not consistent with the character of Old Poulsbo.
13. Like pitched roof ratios.

Comment acknowledged.

14. Factors other than lot size (environmental issues) should be considered in creating a lot.

For a code to be legally defensible and consistent, standards must be generally applicable. Permitted development cannot be determined on a case by case basis. However, the City’s sensitive area standards may limit development in certain areas.

15. Public notice should be required for residential building permits, at least for surrounding neighbors.

This could be done. But the implication might be that there is a possibility of comment, appeal or a hearing, which is not done for building permits in this state. (Building permits are “administrative” not “discretionary.”) If a sign were to be installed, it would be for information purposes only.

16. Lot size and house size should be limited by average of surrounding properties.

Land use regulation must be consistent for each parcel within a district, that is, each property owner is entitled to the same rights under the law. Calculating the size of lots or houses based upon adjacent development would not be legally defensible.

17. A 30% footprint is OK, but should have greater FAR.

This is the same as question #7.

18. ADU should be included in FAR

We agree. The definition of FAR should include area devoted to an accessory dwelling unit.

19. Keep in mind current code, consider property values, don’t add too many more regulations.

We have attempted to keep the amount of regulation to a minimum.
20. Like upper floor bulk reduction idea.

Comment acknowledged.

21. Maintain views; require consideration of position of new house relative to other’s views.

This would not be a legally defensible regulation. Washington State law does not recognize the protection of private views.

22. Design details too specific.

Details shown are an option, not a requirement. The way the guidelines are being proposed, the home builder chooses several from the set. The Design Details guideline need not be selected, so long as other guidelines are.

23. But we like them.

Comment acknowledged.

24. Like the idea of selection from menu of guidelines.

Comment acknowledged.