



CITY OF KIRKLAND
Planning and Building Department
123 5th Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033
425.587.3600- www.kirklandwa.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Houghton Community Council

From: Sean LeRoy, Planner
Adam Weinstein, AICP, Planning and Building Director

Date: July 15, 2019

Subject: Missing Middle Housing (MMH)
Kirkland Zoning Code (KZC) 113 – Cottage, Carriage and Two-/Three-Unit Homes
and
Miscellaneous Zoning Code Amendments in Zones Requiring Density Minimums
Code Amendments, File Number CAM19-00152

Staff Recommendation

Receive a staff briefing on responses made to questions posed by the Houghton Community Council at the May 30, 2019 meeting, and provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission on specific MMH concepts. Amendments to the presented concepts may be recommended.

Background

As part of the City's 2019-2020 work program, staff is proposing to amend Chapter 113 of the Kirkland Zoning Code in order to further incentivize construction of MMH. An increase in MMH housing will provide more variety in housing choice and stock, in addition to more affordable options for those individuals and families looking to buy or rent in the City.

At the [May 30, 2019 Houghton Community Council meeting](#), staff presented a comprehensive list of proposed amendments and received feedback from the Council. In addition to providing useful input, the Council expressed a need for further analysis and clarification of some of the zoning concepts presented by staff.

Below is a list of the main points raised and questions posed by the Council, followed by a staff response.

Parking and MMH Projects

The number of parking spaces required by the City is an important consideration for the developers and applicants of MMH projects and for the residents in the neighborhoods in which MMH developments are located. The current standards for MMH parking are included in KZC 113.25 (table), and summarized as follows:

- *MMH units under 700 square feet → 1 space per unit*
- *MMH units between 700 and 1,000 square feet → 1.5 spaces per unit*
- *MMH units over 1,000 square feet → 2 spaces per unit*
- *Parking spaces for MMH projects are required to be provided on site.*

- *Guest parking, pursuant to KZC 105.20.3, is subject to the following requirements:*
 - *10% of the required parking must be set aside as guest parking stalls; if the required number of guest stalls results in a fraction, the applicant shall supply the number of spaces equal to the next higher whole number. If the result is a fraction less than one guest stall, no guest parking is required if on-street parking is available within 600 feet of the subject property.*
 - *Residential dwelling units with driveways that meet the minimum parking stall dimensional standards of this chapter and with an associated garage containing their respective required number of parking stalls may be excluded from the guest parking calculation required in subsection (3)(a) of this section since the driveway can be used to provide guest parking for the associated dwelling unit.*
 - *Guest parking stalls located in a common area shall not be leased or assigned to residents.*
 - *Guest stalls shall not be gated and shall be accessible to guests between 6:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m.*

As presented at the May 30 meeting, staff proposes to amend the current requirements related to parking in the following manner:

- *For MMH units within a ½ mile from transit service (with 15-minute headways during commute hours) → 1 space per unit;*
- *Where MMH projects are located more than ½ mile of transit service (with 15-minute headways during commute hours) staff has proposed the following changes:*
 - *MMH units 1,000 square feet or less → 1 space per unit*
 - *MMH units over 1,000 square feet → 1.5 spaces per unit*
 - *No additional space required for ADUs*
- *Staff proposes to retain the existing requirements for guest parking*

As staff noted at the May 30, 2019 HCC meeting, MMH serves to fill a niche for a more compact housing option, with smaller footprints, and a smaller scale, necessitating less parking. The difference in parking reductions proposed by staff compared to existing code requirements are fairly modest, depending upon proximity to transit services.

Staff's goal in revising this section of the KZC is to more appropriately align parking requirements with the scale of typical MMH development. Doing so will accomplish two primary objectives. First, as the construction of a typical parking stall on a residential lot can cost upwards of \$10,000, appropriately matching parking requirements to the more compact nature of MMH can save developers time and money, in addition to potentially reducing lot coverage. Finding an appropriate balance of required parking spaces relative to unit scale also affords the applicant/developer more creativity in site design, layout and parking configuration.

In the attempt to match parking requirements to the more compact nature of MMH development, staff is also cognizant of potential increases to on-street parking. Most residential streets in the City allow parking on at least one side of the right-of-way. In addition, staff does not anticipate that the proposed code amendments would result in a substantial increase in new MMH stock throughout the City. While actual production of MMH is hard to predict and would be based on some factors outside the City's control (such as preferences for detached single-family housing and regional economic growth), staff believes that 50 additional units of MMH a year would be an aggressive but not entirely unrealistic expectation for increased production under the code amendments, meaning that new MMH is likely to be widely dispersed across Kirkland. Therefore, staff believes that, in most cases, any additional parking demand created by the construction of MMH, could be absorbed by the spaces already available in the right-of-way.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

During the MMH amendment process, staff has received several inquiries regarding the City's plans for updating the existing ADU regulations. ADU code updates are included in the 2019-2021 Planning Work Program, and staff will present initial ADU amendment proposals at the July 22 Houghton Community Council meeting. As ADUs represent a subset of MMH and constitute an opportunity to incentivize construction of compact housing, staff is exploring ways to merge the two code amendment projects.

Design Guidelines for Two- and Three-Unit Homes

The current iteration of KZC 113 states that two- and three-unit homes should be *"consistent in height, bulk, scale and style with surrounding single-family residential uses"*. At the May 30 meeting, staff presented the Houghton Community Council with design standards for the construction of two- and three-unit homes. The Council provided helpful feedback and specifically encouraged staff to use clear, concise, and objective language in crafting design guidelines for MMH.

Additionally, some members of the Council expressed the desire for applicants and developers to employ more than two of the design elements included in staff's "bolder" approach. In response to the Council's feedback, staff has sharpened some of the terminology and design elements, as excerpted below:

Maintain the scale, form, proportionality and character of detached dwelling units by employing at least three (3) of the following design elements:

- *Façade modulation*
- *Architectural articulation in walls and roofs*
- *Covered entry porch (not permitted to extend into required front yard within Houghton)*
- *Second story step back or modulation*
- *Entry features should be dominant elements facing the street*
- *Minimize the appearance of garages on the front façade with:*
 - *Windows so that it appears to be habitable space*
 - *Vegetation*
 - *Recessed from the remainder of the façade*
- *Roof forms compatible with surrounding single-family residences*
- *Utilize a variety of high-quality materials reflected in the surrounding neighborhood*

An alternative approach staff has considered is to make three (3) of the design elements listed above mandatory for all two- and three-unit home projects, and to require developers to choose another two (2) design elements, at their discretion. This approach could potentially provide more predictability for both developers, as they design projects, and for staff, as they review and approve projects.

Projects Constructed Under KZC 113

Certain members of the Houghton Community Council present at the May 30 meeting requested a list of the MMH projects built under KZC 113. Despite the City having MMH code in place for a number of years, construction of MMH has been limited. To address the City's present housing supply and affordability challenges and support the goals of the City's housing policy, a key objective in amending KZC 113 is to allow MMH development in all single-family zones.

Since the inception of City's MMH code, the following projects have been constructed under KZC 113:

- *Danielson Grove – 10500 128th Ave NE (16 one-, two-, and three-bedroom compact homes)*
- *Juanita Farmhouse Cottages – 9403 NE 128th Street (Eight (8) cottage homes, one (1) common building and one (1) carriage unit)*
- *Stacey Properties – 13003-13131 NE 97th Street (15 fee simple, compact single-family houses)*
- *Terrace Homes at Rose Hill – 7423 132nd Ave NE (Three-unit home)*

Though not submitted under the provisions of KZC 113, other notable MMH projects include:

- *Trenton Condominiums, 4605 Lake Washington Blvd (Triplex in the WD III zone – medium-density residential) – Constructed*
- *Tran Townhomes – 342 5th Ave South (Duplex in the PLA 6D zone High-Density Residential) – Approved*
- *Shelter Homes – 335 3rd Ave South (Two Duplexes in PLA 6D zone, High-Density Residential) – Approved and Permit Issued*

Finally, the following MMH projects, submitted and reviewed under KZC 113, have yet to be constructed:

- *NE 116th Street Cottages, 11229 NE 116th Street (Six (6) new Cottages with attached one (1) car garages) – Issued*
- *Samad Cottages, 11430 NE 101st Place (Four (4) Lot Cottage Subdivision) – Pre-Design*

In the above examples, compatibility with surrounding single-family residences was achieved by utilizing a common design language reflected in materials and form, and in meeting the code standards for lot coverage, setbacks and height.

Ownership

Current MMH zoning allows ownership to be established in a variety of ways – short plat, condominium and rental. Staff is not proposing to change the current code provisions regulating

to ownership. Maintaining the existing code would continue to allow developers flexibility in establishing an ownership structure which best suits the economic and functional goals of the respective project. The ownership rules would therefore be similar to those pertaining to detached single-family residences (which can also be rented).

Will proposed amendments result in the construction of more Adult Family Homes and Recovery Homes?

Adult family homes, defined by the State of Washington under RCW 70.128.010 as “residential homes in which a person or persons provide personal care...to more than one but not more than six (6) adults who are not related by blood or marriage to the person or persons providing the services,” are permitted in all residential zones within the City of Kirkland. Adult family homes can take the form of a detached dwelling unit or any other residential dwelling, including those permitted under KZC 113. Recovery Homes, on the other hand, are permitted under the use listing “Convalescent Centers” and are not allowed in single-family zones. Therefore, a recovery home could not be part of a MMH housing proposal.

Adult family home projects in the City of Kirkland have tended to be located in low density zones, in the form of large single-family residences. Since the inception of the City's MMH ordinance, no adult family home has been constructed as a MMH project. It is not anticipated, therefore, that the proposed code amendments will result in a substantial increase in Adult Family Homes.

Will current homes values be impacted, if MMH units are constructed in single-family zones?

The City has no data suggesting that a change to the MMH zoning standards would result in a devaluing of single-family homes. On the contrary, well-designed, new MMH, in addition to supplying new housing stock, is expected to positively contribute to the overall value of the neighborhood as a whole, including parcels improved with single-family residences.

How will properties be taxed, if zoning is changed to allow MMH within single-family zones?

The two key factors the County Assessor's Office uses in assessing individual property values are neighborhood sales data for comparable homes (in age, square footage and improvements) and changes to homes, such as a remodel or an addition. While allowing more flexibility in developing MMH in single-family zones could theoretically increase property values, which could increase property value assessments, staff has seen no evidence that the County Assessor would take into account zoning code amendments such as the ones proposed for MMH in assessing the value of a residential property. Therefore, amending the MMH code is expected to have a de minimus effect on assessed property values.

How do access easements and tracts, relative to lot density and lot size, impact proposed amendments to KZC 113?

Density

Staff is not proposing to amend the existing provisions of KZC 113, as they relate to density and minimum lot size.

Density for MMH housing projects is permitted at two (2) times the density of the underlying zone. For example, on a 10,800 square feet parcel in the RS 7.2 zone, a three-unit home could be constructed utilizing the following calculation:

- Lot area / minimum lot size per unit in the underlying zone x 2 (the number of units allowed will always be rounded down to the nearest whole number). As an example:

$$10,800 \text{ square feet} / 7200 \text{ square feet} = 1.5 \text{ units} \times 2 = 3 \text{ units}$$

Lot Size and Access Easements or Tracts

Current MMH code does not have a required minimum lot size for lots created through the subdivision process.

The zoning code defines “Lot Size” in KZC 05.10.482 as “the total area of the subject property, minus the area of vehicular access easements or tracts serving more than one (1) lot not abutting a right-of-way”. Finally, pursuant to KZC 115.90.2.a – Lot Coverage Exemptions, an easement or tract *not* included in the calculations of lot size will not be used in calculating the lot coverage of any lot it serves or crosses.

Staff is not proposing amendments to the existing codes governing density, lot size minimums and lot coverage exemptions relative to access easements and tracts.

Any lessons learned from MMH experiences in other cities?

Staff has reached out to Planning staff in Olympia, WA; Minneapolis, MN; Nashville, TN; Des Moines, IA; San Mateo, CA and Eugene, Oregon. For the most part, due to the recent adoption of MMH regulations, and, therefore, the construction of a limited number of projects, little data exists to elucidate success stories, lessons learned or unintended impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.

The City of Olympia, WA has published a two-part blog entry for Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington (MRSC) on the City’s approach to MMH. [Part one](#) discusses the challenges of and opportunities in incentivizing MMH housing. [Part two](#) discusses lessons learned in public outreach, policy development and code revision. No substantial adverse impacts associated with a potential new supply of MMH have been identified, but many positives have been mentioned in the literature surrounding Olympia’s initiative, including additional housing choice and affordability, reduced urban sprawl, the promotion of walkable neighborhoods with local-serving retail uses, land use that support transit accessibility, and the potential for reduced commutes if MMH allows residents to live closer to job centers.

Cities as diverse geographically and demographically as those listed above generally agree on the goal – increasing the supply of more affordable housing options such as cottage and two- and three-unit homes in low density zones.

As previously mentioned at the May 30 meeting, MMH housing is already permitted in most low-density residential zones in Kirkland and, with the few projects constructed thus far, the City has observed little or no adverse effects (although parking requirements have contributed to the construction of large paved areas in the front yard of a recent project, reducing compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood). Within many desirable single-family oriented King County neighborhoods, duplexes and triplexes are found, allowing for additional (and more affordable)

housing choices in a manner compatible with the look and feel of predominantly single-family neighborhoods. The same observation has been made in closer-in, established neighborhoods in communities throughout the U.S., where MMH was historically permitted.

Summary

Staff would like to leave this meeting with clear feedback and input from the Houghton Community Council on the following questions:

- Has staff sufficiently addressed the questions raised by the Council at the May 30 meeting?
- Does the Houghton Community Council have sufficient information to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission?
- If so, does Houghton Community Council generally agree with the MMH concepts presented in Attachment 1 and/or are changes to these concepts recommended?

Following the July 22, 2019 Houghton Community Council meeting, staff intends to begin the process of preparing formal code amendments and to schedule a public hearing with the Planning Commission, prior to a presentation to City Council.

Attachments:

1. MMH Proposed Zoning Elements Matrix

KZC 113 Concept Amendments – Cottage, Two- and Three-Unit Homes

Table 1: Concept Amendments to KZC 113

Topic	Cottage	Carriage	Two- /Three- Unit Home	Proposed Amendment	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
<i>Applicable Use Zones</i>	The housing types described in this chapter may be used only in the following low-density zones: RSA 4, RSA 6, RS 7.2, RSX 7.2, RS 8.5, RSX 8.5, RS 12.5 and RSX 12.5			Allow in all low-density zones (including in Houghton)	NA	
<i>Maximum Unit Size</i>	1,500 square feet	800 square feet	1,000 square feet average unit size Structure total: Two-Unit: 2,000 sf; Three-Unit: 3,000 sf	Eliminate maximum unit size provisions for two-/three-unit homes. Allow maximum sizes of two-/three-unit homes to be dictated by underlying floor area ratio (FAR) maximum. Within the jurisdiction of Houghton Community Council, MMH housing developments would be regulated and/or limited by lot coverage, maximum allowed height and required setbacks	Same as Initial Staff Option, but increase maximum size of Cottages to 1,700 square feet (not to include attached ADUs)	Unit size will further be controlled by lot coverage, setbacks and height

Topic	Cottage	Carriage	Two- /Three- Unit Home	Proposed Amendment	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
<i>Density</i>	2 times the maximum number of detached dwelling units allowed in the underlying zone			Retain existing provisions	NA	No density amendment is warranted in order to preserve compatibility with single-family neighborhoods
<i>Max Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</i>	0.35			Allow the same FAR as would apply to a single-family house built on the property.	Grant an additional 10% FAR bonus above that which is allowed for single-family development, including: -5% for developing MMH - An additional 5% FAR will be allowed if at least two of the design elements below are used: -Roof form is peaked at a minimum pitch of 4 feet vertical to 12 feet horizontal -All structures are set back from side property lines by at least 7 ½ feet	FAR not applicable in Houghton The additional 5% FAR increase tied to design elements, derives from recent amendments to the City's FAR regulations (KZC 115.42)

Topic	Cottage	Carriage	Two- /Three- Unit Home	Proposed Amendment	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
					-The gross floor area of any floor above ground level shall be reduced by a minimum of 15 percent of the floor area on the ground floor	
<i>Development Size</i>	For cottage: Min. 4 units Max. 24 units Maximum cluster: 12 units	Allowed when included in a cottage project	Must be limited to either one (1) two-unit home or one (1) three-unit home, or be part of a cottage development, unless approved through Process IIA, Chapter 150 KZC	Reduce to 2 units; or delete minimum but keep maximum)	NA	Provides the potential to construct a cottage development on smaller lots
<i>Review Process</i>	Process I Planning Director decision, appealable to the Hearing Examiner	Allowed when included in a cottage project	Single two-unit home or single three-unit home: Process I Developments containing more than one two-unit or one three-unit	Retain existing provisions	Process Cottage and Two-/Three-unit homes through the same review process as a single-family residences	Removing the requirement for zoning permit approval would allow for a more streamlined and expeditious approval, similar to a single-family residence

Topic	Cottage	Carriage	Two- /Three- Unit Home	Proposed Amendment	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
			home (other than a cottage project): Process IIA (Hearing Examiner Decision, appealable to the City Council)			
Location	Developments containing cottage, carriage and/or two/three-unit homes may not be located closer than the distance noted below to another development approved under the provisions of KZC 113 or under Ordinance 3856 (Interim Regulations - Innovative Housing Demonstration): 1 to 9 Units: 500' 10 – 19 Units: 1,000' 20 – 24 Units: 1,500'			Eliminate location requirements (i.e., restrictions on proximity to another similar housing type)	NA	Staff did not identify adverse impacts associated with clusters of MMH
Minimum Lot Size	Beyond density restrictions, there is no required minimum lot size for lots created through the subdivision process. (The number of allowed units on the subject property is determined by the density provision of this chart.)			Retain existing provisions	NA	Limited and/or regulated by density (see above)
Parking Requirements	Units under 700 square feet: 1 space per unit Units between 700 – 1,000 square feet: 1.5 spaces per unit Units over 1,000 square feet: 2 spaces per unit. Must be provided on the subject property.			Reduce parking requirement to 1 space/unit if unit is located within ¼ mile of transit service with 15-minute headways during commute hours	Reduce parking requirement to 1 space per unit within ½ mile of transit service with 15-minute headways during commute hours For units more than ½ mile	Staff believes that current and projected transit service in Kirkland is not sufficient to support parking ratios below 1 space/unit

Topic	Cottage	Carriage	Two- /Three- Unit Home	Proposed Amendment	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
					<p>away from transit service with 15-minute headways during commute hours:</p> <p>Units 1,000 square feet or less = 1 space per unit</p> <p>Units over 1,000 square feet = 1.5 spaces per unit</p> <p>See KZC 105.20 for visitor parking</p> <p>Attached ADU = no additional on-site space required</p>	
<i>Minimum Required Yards (from exterior property lines of subject property)</i>	Front: 20' Other: 10'	Must be included in a cottage project	Front: 20' Other: 10'	Revise to: Front: 20' Rear: 10' Side: 5'	NA	This would provide more development flexibility; already allowed in some residential zones (w/ larger structures)
<i>Lot coverage (all impervious surfaces)</i>	50%	Must be included in a cottage project	50%	Retain existing provisions	NA	Staff does not see a compelling reason at this point to change this regulation

Topic	Cottage	Carriage	Two- /Three- Unit Home	Proposed Amendment	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
<i>Height</i>	25' (RS Zones) and 27' (RSA and RSX Zones) maximum above average building elevation (ABE), (where minimum roof slope of 6:12 for all parts of the roof above 18' are provided). Otherwise, 18' above ABE			RS zones – 25' RSA and RSX – 30'	NA	Raising the height allowance in the RSA and RSX districts would equate to current allowances for single-family residences
<i>Accessory Structures - Height</i>	One (1) story, not to exceed 18' above ABE			Retain existing provisions	NA	
<i>Tree Retention</i>	The tree retention plan standards contained in KZC 95.30 apply to development approved under this chapter			Retain existing provisions	NA	
<i>Common Open Space</i>	400 square feet per unit. Private open space is also encouraged (see KZC 113.35)			Retain existing provisions	300 feet per unit for Cottage developments of 5 or more units and not required for duplexes Can be reduced to 200 feet per unit if a permanent recreational or communal feature, such as cooking facilities, play equipment or permanent outdoor furniture, is provided	Provides more land area for parking and/or structures, while allowing for community and common use
<i>Comm. Buildings</i>	Community buildings are encouraged. See KZC 113.30 for further regulations			Retain existing provisions	NA	
<i>Attached Covered</i>	Each unit must have a covered porch with a minimum area of 64 square feet			Retain existing provisions	NA	

Topic	Cottage	Carriage	Two- /Three- Unit Home	Proposed Amendment	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
<i>Porches</i>	per unit and a minimum dimension of 7' on all sides.					
<i>Development Options</i>	Subdivision, Condominium, Rental or Ownership			Retain existing provisions	NA	
<i>Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)</i>	Not permitted as part of a cottage, carriage or two/three-unit home development			Allow attached ADUs	NA	

Table 2: Other KZC 113 Proposed Amendments

Topic	Initial Staff Option	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
<i>Prohibition in Houghton of stand-alone two/three-unit homes</i>	Allow stand-alone two/three-unit homes within Houghton	NA	Provides potential for construction of MMH which is compatible with single-family residences
<i>Limitations on single-family zones</i>	Allow in all single-family zones, including RSX 35, RS 35 and PLA 16 zones	NA	Maintain paddock requirements in applicable zones

Table 3: Design Guidelines: Cottage Developments

Topic	Existing	Initial Staff Option	Staff Notes
<i>Building Orientation</i>	<p>Oriented to promote a sense of community</p> <p>Where feasible, each dwelling unit that abuts a common open space shall have a primary entry and/or covered entry porch, oriented to the common open space</p>	Retain existing provisions	

Topic	Existing	Initial Staff Option	Staff Notes
	Each dwelling unit abutting a public right-of-way shall have an inviting facade		
<i>Required Common Open Space</i>	<p>Required Common Open Space:</p> <p>Provide a sense of openness and visual relief, being centrally located with prescribed dimensions</p>	<p>300 feet per unit for Cottage developments of 5 or more units and not required for duplexes</p> <p>Required open space may be reduced to 200 feet per unit if a permanent recreational/communal feature, such as outdoor furniture, pool, cooking facilities, play equipment, is provided</p>	
<i>Shared Detached Garages</i>	Parking clusters must be separated by a distance of at least 20 feet	Surface parking clusters must be separated by a distance of at least 10 feet (113.35.5)	Reduces amount of subject property dedicated to parking area, while allowing for sufficient landscape buffers around parking areas
<i>Low Impact Development (LID)</i>	Must employ LID strategies (techniques that mimic natural watershed hydrology)	MMH developments shall comply with current King County Surface Water Design Manual (2016); LID techniques shall be employed if feasible	Surface Water Design Manual (2016) requires LID techniques if feasible
<i>Variation in Unit Sizes, Building and Site Design</i>	Cottage projects should establish building and site design that promotes variety and visual interest, compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood	NA	Retain current guidelines

Table 4: Design Guidelines: Two-/Three-Unit Homes

Topic	Existing	Initial Staff Option	Staff Notes
Two and three-unit homes should be consistent in height, bulk, scale and style with surrounding single-family residential uses			
<i>Entries and materials</i>	Maintain the traditional character of detached single-family dwelling units by using elements such as the appearance of single points of entry addressing the street, pitched roofs, substantial trim around windows, porches and chimneys	<p>To maintain and reflect the traditional character of single-family dwelling units, projects shall include at least two of the following design elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appearance of single points of entry • Covered entry porch (not permitted to extend into a required front yard within Houghton) • Peaked roof with a minimum pitch of 3:12 • Façade modulation; • Entry features and front doors should be dominant elements facing the street • Provide second story step back or modulation • Utilize a variety of materials with decorative or textural qualities • Provide 	

Topic	Existing	Initial Staff Option	Staff Notes
		trimming around windows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divided window panes 	
<i>Low Impact Development</i>	Must employ LID strategies (techniques that mimic natural watershed hydrology)	MMH developments shall comply with current King County Design Manual (2016); LID techniques shall be employed if feasible	SWDM 2016 requires LID techniques if feasible
<i>Shared Detached Garages and Surface Parking Design</i>	Must meet the standards established in KZC 115.43 and 115.115.5 and no more than three (3) garage doors may be visible on any façade of the structure Surface parking limited to no more than three (3) stalls; areas with more than two (2) stalls must visually separate from the street, perimeter parking lines and common areas through site planning, landscaping or natural screening	NA	Retain current guidelines

Miscellaneous MMH Proposed Amendments (Medium- and High-Density Residential Uses)

Regulations in several medium-density and high-density zones within the City of Kirkland, such as RM 3.6 and RM 5.0, establish density maximums for new development. Density is calculated by dividing the lot area by the minimum lot size required in the respective zone.

As the housing market has continued to favor larger detached single-family residences, properties located in medium- and high-density zones have often developed at a density less than the maximum allowed. As a result, areas which the City has previously determined can accommodate density and thereby contribute toward MMH stock, have been underutilized. The concepts presented in Table 5 would establish minimum densities in the City's medium- and

high-density zoning districts, promoting the development of more compact housing in these areas.

Table 5: Density Requirements for Medium- and High-Density Development

Topic	Existing	Initial Staff Option	Bolder Option	Staff Notes
Minimum Density in Medium- and High-Density Residential Zones	Properties can be developed at any density proposed by an applicant, as long as the maximum allowable density isn't exceeded	New projects shall develop at 80% of the maximum density allowed in the underlying zone	New projects shall develop at 100% of the maximum density allowed in the underlying zone	Potential for increased density in areas zoned for MMH type housing. The Planning Commission supports the initial staff option in order to provide development flexibility.