

Submitter (Commissioner or Working Group)	Title (Short Description)	Intent	Suggested Text	Justification
Residential Design Working Group	Incentivize ADUs on owner-occupied properties	ADUs may be the most efficient way to expand housing and assisted current residents who are squeezed with higher property taxes and the costs of building. For owner-occupied properties, we should streamline processes and waive fees to encourage their development	Council directs staff to implement incentives including but not limited to streamlined processes, waived fees, and public education to encourage development of owner-occupied ADUs across the city	to address concerns raised about rising costs for current residents; to build density in existing neighborhoods across the city
Residential Design Working Group	Designate an owner-occupied density "ombudsman" to assist residents in owner-occupied properties adding dwelling units	in addition to financial and administrative assistance, they city should have an office that can help property owners to add dwelling units on property where they live to build density and help homeowners remain in their homes	The City Manager shall designate city staff as an Ombudsman to assist residents who wish to build additional dwelling units on owner-occupied lots. The Ombudsman will develop metrics to evaluate whether	dedicate city resources to dramatically improve adoption of more density on existing properties
Residential Design Working Group	Develop goals and metrics -- both for improved processes and for outcomes -- for building more dwelling units on existing properties	the lower-hanging fruit is adding dwelling units on existing properties, we know there has been anemic adoption of ADUs in the city. The city manager should develop goals and measures, reviewed annually, and make changes to improve adoption	The City Manager shall establish goals and measures to evaluate progress on building increased density on existing properties including addition of ADUs, use of the preservation incentive and other approaches to grow housing, with separate goals and measures on progress on owner-occupied properties. Those metrics shall include but not be limited to improvements in processes like the time and complexity for owner-occupied properties to construct additional dwelling units. The City manager shall report annually to the Planning Commission and Council and make recommendations for improvements.	changes to zoning are not fully tested in the city, we need goals, measures, and ongoing evaluation and changes as appropriate
Residential Design Working Group	New residential zone for greenfield tract development: Flexible zone expressly for greenfield, similar to SF3/R2A, w/ cottage court and other misc. forms, 2 units but using per-acre instead of per-lot standard. No FAR (McMansion) limits. Smaller min lot size.	Give some flexibility in undeveloped areas for tract builders to produce homes economically at approx R2A/SF-3 levels of density. Not for use near transit or in already developed parts of town.	New zone with entitlements TK.	Affordability and lack of disruption to "neighborhood character" as it's just for greenfield. Does not need preservation bonus and affordable bonus economics likely don't work.
Residential Design Working Group	New residential zone: Similar to R2B but with units/acre standard and more allowed forms.	A zone for large and oddly-shaped lots that would allow multiple units based on size of lot. Similar to SF-5.	New zone with entitlements TK.	Affordability and flexibility - allows large and oddly shaped lots to be developed without flag lots, etc.
Residential Design Working Group	Make R2B more of an urban, transit-supported zone via affordable bonus.	Current R2B is designated as the main "urban" residential zone, but only has reduced front and rear setbacks. Add flexibility on forms. Add an affordable ADU bonus allowing two base units + 2 ADUs (one affordable). Bonus comes with modest increase in impervious cover.		Affordability, transit-supportive land use planning, goals for housing (market and affordable) near transit corridors. Diversity in housing types / missing middle.
Residential Design Working Group	Double-lot development options for R2A, R2B.	Much like cottage courts in R3 and R4, allow double units when lot is double width/size, eliminating need for subdivision of lots.		Affordability and simplicity. Reduces costs by not requiring costly subdivision of lots.
Residential Design Working Group	Cottage-Court form options for R2A, R2B.	Allow cottage courts on lots of larger/sufficient size in R2A and R2B so a rezoning is not required.		Affordability and missing middle.
Residential Design Working Group	Graduated impervious cover for R4.	R4 in draft allows 50% IC even for two units. Lower IC to 45% for duplex (40% for single family?) and only allow higher IC with three or four units. Potentially allow 50/55% IC for four units and potentially 60% for bonus. Looking for no net overall increase in IC. This will incentivize at least four units and taking of bonus. More than 3 or 4 units is very hard to achieve with 50% IC.		Affordable housing goals (near transit, production, etc.) while maintaining council direction on net IC.
Residential Design Working Group	Get rid of R1, modify R3.	R1 doesn't seem to serve a purpose? And R3 would be better served as an R4 with no bonus (maybe with only 3 units on smaller, interior lots). There is a gap in residential zoning for 4 unit max zones that fit inside tent.		Simplicity, housing production goals (near transit, overall).
Residential Design Working Group	Maintain R2A zoning for block sides with frontages built with majority of 25' front setbacks.	R2B vs R2A front setback differences are not compatible		Various setback distances within R2X zones create non-harmonious facade
Residential Design Working Group	Private Frontages	Setback averaging will additionally cause irregular block façade if R2A is mixed with R2B/C		Map zones requiring private frontages only on block frontages which already have similar setbacks
Residential Design Working Group	Residential Site Plan	Create new category of R-sp which allows large lots to develop house-scale under "units per acre." Building form would be detached and duplex to allow compatibility with surrounding R zones.		Allows creation of a development that can react harmoniously with the natural setting.
Residential Design Working Group	Create new MH zone	Code only addresses MH zones of min. 90,000 sq. feet. Need another small lot zone should allow similar number of units as R zones, for example 3,500 sq. feet per unit.		Allows more areas for manufactured homes. Alternatively rezone MH to R2A

Residential Design Working Group	Fences	This version is contradictory to itself in Fence section vs. Building Setbacks vs. Private Frontages vs. Driveways, as well as overly restrictive compare to other municipalities.	Revert to current code.
Residential Design Working Group	Townhouse Side Setback	Townhouse use requires zero setback to allow attachment to adjacent unit. R3 has side setback, R1 has zero side setback however 25" min lot width.	Move zero side setback provision in R1 to R3 when Townhouse form is required.
Residential Design Working Group	Mapping Prioritization	There is significant area which has investments and growth along major corridors which did not receive corridor or transition area mapping. Mapping in this manner, areas that do not currently, near future or even planned for additional supportive density, will only create additional unaffordability in that area.	Mapping IA corridors, TPN with supportive ridership, TPN with bus stops, TPN without bus stops. This can relieve the pressure on controversial mapped areas which will likely not yield any affordable areas.
Residential Design Working Group	ADU Size	Scale ADU permitted to square footage of lot size. Apply a size ranging from 850 sq. ft to max 1,100 sq. ft.	Smaller ADUs are less expensive to build and maintain and accordingly more affordable.
Residential Design Working Group	F25 Zoning except NCCD and PDA	F25 zoning is confusing. With the exception of NCCD and PDA zoning, achieve zoning consistency with current regulations and minimize reliance on prior regulations.	Reasonably phase out F25 zoning with rezoning to current regulations.
Residential Design Working Group	Additional R Zones (referred from the Transition Working Group)	Additional R Zones should be included as Transition Zones in order to adhere to criteria established by Council direction.	Include an R zone that is lower in intensity than R4 and between R3. The new zone(s) should provide a gradual increase between R2 and R4 Zones. The new zone(s) should not trigger compatibility.