

CODE COMMENTS:

ADU comments. A lot of time/energy is being spent to allow people to build a small house in their backyard.....it's not going to solve the City's basic problem. AND then severely limiting the potential of ADUs with restrictions that only make sense if applied in major metropolitan markets.

- Owner of a rental house cannot add an ADU. ADU 9. Owner of an ADU or parent house must live in the house/unit. **Severely limiting potential of ADU's.**
- Can owner occupied requirement for ADU prevent owner from selling in the future if they want/need to move.
- What are setbacks for ADU? When combined with landscaping, parking and setback requirements make it very difficult to create ADUs.
- What if minimum lot size/setbacks prevent density from being achieved? Why bother with density? How does minimum lot size fit with unit density?
- If the required parking space for an ADU is to be adjacent to the unit that will likely prevent it because of maximum lot coverage because of a driveway.
- **Inclusionary Zoning.** Does the City intend to adopt Inclusionary Zoning? Will it be possible to develop sfr without it? **“developers may choose not to build any residential housing”.....** from City provided flyer. This is totally dangerous and could ruin what remains of sfr market in City. You can bet that Burlington, Sedro Woolley won't be adopting this.

Middle Housing comments.

- Permit the number of units/lots equal to the **gross** minimum lot size, i.e., 18,000 s.f. lot in R1.7 equals 4 lots @ 4,500 s.f. However, when you start to apply setbacks, design standards, parking requirements, landscape requirements, etc., etc., etc., you end up lucky to create 3 lots. The difference is a 25% yield that can only be achieved by a jurisdiction committed to providing housing rather than preventing/restricting housing.
- Keep in mind that every restriction adds costs and defeats entire purpose of Middle Housing. Housing is supposed to be the priority but when you examine everything in totality it is far down the list of priorities. Don't use Bellingham as a model....the restrictions adopted by Bellingham are the reason that Ferndale, Lynden, Blaine have exploded. Mount Vernon is the reason that Sedro Woolley has exploded.

- Trees enhance new housing and yet, at the same time defeat new housing with any density. Increase the requirements for creating tree canopy in areas outside of building envelopes.
- 30 foot plus façade requirement creates **additional requirements**. Illustration shows a 30' front elevation (including and 10' driveway) + 15' setbacks equals a 45' wide lot. Garage has to be single car tandem which means 20' deep plus additional articulation setback. One question is how to build single story homes for an aging population?
- Other issues:
 - Orientation of front door.....must be allowed to be “side loaded” and somewhere around 15% of front elevation. Add additional design elements at the entry point for front porch.
 - Need specific sfr garage standard....don't “overshadow” pedestrian entry is totally subjective. Current 40% of front elevation (SF-G, 3) doesn't work.
 - Useable Open Space....use setbacks for open space calculations.
 - Corner lot additional setbacks. Use the additional setback requirement (10') on corner lots as common area. Use as additional landscape, softening of lot block ends, and storm drainage retention capabilities. It creates a better looking and functioning lot/block.
 - Maximize on-street parking v.s. No Parking requirements of fire department. One of the favorite scenarios is 4-5 cars parked on the lot with an additional 2-4 vehicles parked on the street in front of the home. How is it that parking was once allowed on both sides of the street and now fire department is limiting it to one side of the street?
 - More aggressive enforcement of MVMC8.05.050. Too many vehicles (cars, trucks, campers, commercial vehicles, etc.) are parked on the front (driveway, front yards, side yards) of homes. Along with commercial vehicles parked on the streets eliminating the ability of homeowners to employ on street parking. These send a message about the neighborhood and defeat all the work done to preserve neighborhoods....why bother if we're going to allow homes to become parking lots?
 - Design Standards that **can** be regulated (not will be regulated) rather than regulated how about changed. That's what this all about isn't it?