

**2019 Proposed Code Amendments to Title 18 of the OMC
Case # 19-0112**

Proposal 1: Corrects code reference on last page of Table 4.01 for Schools. The applicable regulations reference should be 18.04.060(CC) not (DD).

Proposal 2: Removes a rarely used code section that is confusing to the public and there is concern that it does not get applied consistently at the permitting stage because of the way it is worded. We've received complaints that the language is misleading and confusing and people have expressed frustration over this section in the past to staff.

The effect would be that proposed single family homes on lots within the Infill & Other Residential Design Review District - where at least 50% of the lots within 300-feet and on the same street are vacant or occupied by homes with flush or recessed garages - would not have to meet the garage standards in subsection 3. These standards address how far the garage can protrude from the ground floor's front façade and how much of the dwelling's front façade can be occupied by the garage.

Proposal 3: The proposal is to delete a provision for varied lot widths in new subdivisions of ten lots or more. It requires that every fourth lot be six feet wider or narrower than the adjacent lots.

We've received comments that this provision does not really create a variety of lot widths because the pattern is monotonous/creates its own pattern. There is a belief that the design guidelines address character more so than lot width.

Please be aware though that design review is not required everywhere a subdivision of single family detached homes would be allowed.

Proposal 4 – Remove a front yard setback reduction provision; add language for front yard setbacks on “through” lots.

The first part of the proposal relates to reduced front yard setbacks. If approved, the front yard setback reductions listed in a-c would be allowed in instances where the allowed setback would be 50% or less than the setback of an existing dwelling on an adjacent lot.

The second part of this proposal addresses front yards for “through” lots. Through lots are defined in 18.02.180 as having two front yards (but it is not a corner lot). Essentially, both the front and rear property lines abut streets so both are considered front yards. Coupled with the provisions in Section 18.04.080(H), the result is it can be challenging to site an accessory structure in what probably feels like and functions as a rear yard. This would provide a means for the City to identify one of the yards as a rear yard when at least 60% of the lots or structures on the block are oriented in a similar direction.

It should be noted that through lots are fairly rare. The intent is to provide continuity to an approach for how to address this situation over time.

Proposal 5 – Remove reference to a zoning district (Community Retail District) the City no longer uses.

Proposal 6 – Removes reference to nonexistent code section.

Proposal 7 – Corrects a typo. The reference to the state rules should be WAC 197-11-800(2)(g), not (f).

Proposal 8 - Removes reference to nonexistent code section.

Proposal 9 - Removes reference to nonexistent code section.

Proposal 10 – Update chart to reflect that the Director is the decision-maker for some types of Conditional Use Permits.

Proposal 11 - Revisions to the Public Notice chapter to provide clarity, correct a typo, address situations that were unclear.

No public notice requirements have been reduced in the amount of time or to those receiving notification. The intent of the changes is to acknowledge that not all public hearings are before the Hearing Examiner, that not every project is site specific (e.g. a rezone or specific development project), and to clean up language to be more clear. A new category – Code Amendments without a Comprehensive Plan Amendment – was added. Information about the City's public notice signs was contained in two sections. The language was consolidated in one location to help streamline the code and reduce opportunity for discrepancies between two sections over time.

Examples of when to send a notice:

Current language: Public meeting 10 days. The proposed language is: 10 days before the public meeting.

Current language: Public hearing 10 days. The proposed language is: 10 days before the public hearing.

For the Comprehensive Plan Amendment section, clarification was proposed regarding preliminary applications (prior to City Council screening) and for the Final Application. It was unclear to me as the staff person responsible for processing Comprehensive Plan Amendments when to send the notice. "Proposal" and "Application" probably apply to Preliminary Proposal and Final Application but I was unclear and wanted more clarity.

Proposal 12 – Update references to new sign code (cite to chapter 18.43 instead of 18.43).