

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
OF THE KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION,  
TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,  
REGARDING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS  
TO KITSAP COUNTY CODE TITLE 17 'ZONING'**

The Planning Commission of Kitsap County, Washington, finds as follows:

1. Kitsap County is subject to the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), Chapter 36.70A RCW.
2. The GMA, RCW 36.70A.130(4) and (5), establishes a schedule whereby each city and county in Washington must take action to review and, if needed, revise its Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to ensure consistency with the Act. Kitsap County's deadline for this periodic update was June 30, 2016, and every eight years thereafter.
3. On January 12, 2015, the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners ("the Board") adopted Resolution 016-2015 setting forth a process and timeline that combined the annual Comprehensive Plan amendment process set forth at KCC 21.08.040 with the GMA mandated periodic review pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(5). In this resolution, the Board identified a schedule for the periodic update process between January 2015 and final adoption by June 30, 2016, a public participation program providing for public participation in the development and amendment of the Plan and development regulations, and types of amendments for consideration in the Plan update.
4. Kitsap County Code section 21.08.100 establishes procedures for Planning Commission review of the County's development regulations, and amendments thereto.
5. On April 26, 2016, Kitsap County issued preliminary draft documents for reasonable measures. Draft documents included a "white paper" explanation as to why Kitsap County proposed reasonable measures and a matrix of the six proposed measures.
6. On April 29, 2016, Kitsap County issued the final draft Comprehensive Plan documents (GPS, CFP, Final SEIS, and development regulations).
7. Utilizing legal notice in the Kitsap Sun, and notification to interested parties via Kitsap County's GovDelivery electronic notification system and main website, public hearings were advertised for the Planning Commission to accept testimony on the final draft Plan.

8. Approximately 107 comments (or groups of comments) were received via verbal and written testimony on the final draft Plan documents. The comments were summarized, and linked where larger documents were provided, in a matrix provided to the Planning Commission on the evening of May 13, 2016, following the final Planning Commission hearing. Comments were generally categorized under the categories of CFP, Code, GPS, Reasonable Measures, Reclassifications, and Zoning.
9. On May 16, 17 and 19, 2016, the Planning Commission deliberated on the final draft Plan documents. Deliberations generally occurred in the following order, utilizing the May 2016 Public Comments Matrix as a guide (including 107 comments, or groups of comments):
  - CFP clarifications/additions
  - Zoning requests
  - Code revisions
  - Reasonable Measures
  - Net vs. Gross Density Calculations
  - Adoption of CFP
  - Support of SEIS
  - Goals, Policies and Strategies
  - Development Regulations
10. The Planning Commission considered and deliberated on the list of new reasonable measures recommended by staff for adoption, as detailed in the April 29, 2016 staff report, Appendix B of the FSEIS, and the April 28, 2016 version of the draft development regulations. The list of six new reasonable measures was proposed in response to the January 2016 Growth Management Hearings board order in response to an appeal of the County's Buildable Lands Report. The Growth Board stated that additional reasonable measures are necessary to address inconsistencies revealed by the BLR. The Planning Commission received public testimony in opposition to several of the reasonable measures, including revisions to the TDR program, restrictions on rural legacy lots, maximum urban lot size requirements, and ADU restrictions. The Planning Commission also discussed and expressed concerns regarding adequate time availability for all parties to review and respond to the proposed list of reasonable measures, and concerns regarding notification of potentially affected parties (particularly those that might be affected by measure no. 2, Recognition of Rural Legacy Lots).
11. The Planning Commission considered the recommended Comprehensive Plan update and Development Regulation amendments for GMA Compliance. The Planning Commission's recommendations for the six new reasonable measures associated with the Comprehensive Plan update were as follow.

12. **Reasonable measures.** The Planning Commission passed motions for the following actions relative to the draft list of six reasonable measures:

- TDRs: Approved, with text revision specifying numbers from .5 shall be rounded upward
- Recognition of Rural Legacy Lots: Deleted
- Maximum Urban Lot Size: Deleted
- Silverdale Regional Center: Approved
- Technology improvements for annual monitoring: Approved, with text revision establishing annual due date for monitoring report
- ADUs on rural lots: Deleted

13. On June 27, 2016, the Board of County Commissioners adopted the 2016 comprehensive plan update and development regulations via Ordinance 534-2016, and committed to continue reviewing additional reasonable measures subsequent to the Plan adoption. Plan adoption included the three reasonable measures comprised of a modified monitoring program to track the effectiveness of adopted reasonable measures, code changes for Transfer of Development Rights, and code changes for Silverdale Regional Center. Additionally the Board of County Commissioners issued a revised list of reasonable measures for further consideration, Appendix E of the revised Buildable Lands Report. The revised list included an additional fourteen potential reasonable measures.

14. Beginning in July 2016, regularly scheduled Planning Commission Code Update: Reasonable Measures work study sessions occurred as follows:

- July 5, 2016: Project overview, timeline, and review of direction resulting from the Comprehensive Plan adoption process.
- July 9, 2016: Continued Buildable Lands Report Appendix E review with initial draft language.
- August 3, 2016: Detailed code changes in redline format.

15. Utilizing legal notice in the Kitsap Sun, and notification to interested parties via Kitsap County's GovDelivery electronic notification system and main website, a joint public hearing was advertised for the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners to accept testimony on the final draft code for reasonable measures on August 8, 2016.

16. Fourteen comments (or groups of comments) were received via verbal and written testimony on the final draft code for reasonable measures on August 8, 2016. The comments were summarized, and linked where larger documents were provided, in a matrix provided to the Planning Commission the morning of August 9, 2016.

17. During the evening of August 9, 2016, the Planning Commission deliberated on the final draft code for reasonable measures. Deliberations generally utilized the August 8, 2016 Public Comments Matrix as a guide.

Based upon the foregoing findings, the Kitsap County Planning Commission finds that the proposed 2016 updated Development Regulations and recommendations on reasonable measures promote the public interest and welfare of the citizens of Kitsap County, and therefore should be approved as specified below.

THEREFORE, the Kitsap County Planning Commission in regular session assembled, hereby concludes and makes the following recommendations to the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners:

- That revisions to the August 8, 2016 version of the draft code revisions as shown in the attached matrix titled "Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and recommendations on reasonable measures" be approved. Additional Planning Commission comments are included immediately below the recorded motion vote.

Approved by the Planning Commission of Kitsap County, Washington, at a regular meeting thereof, held this 16<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2016.

By James E. Sommerhauser  
James E. Sommerhauser, Chair

Attachment: "Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and recommendations on reasonable measures"

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
 PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and  
 recommendations on reasonable measures

#	Topic Title and Revision	Planning Commission Recommended Draft
<p>1.</p> <p><b>Topic:</b>  <b>Dry Sewer Policy</b></p> <p><i>Use table footnote 48 revised to include a reference to exemptions in KCC 17.460.020.</i></p> <p><i>Allow properties within an Urban Growth Area, that are too far from sewer, to develop with increased densities provided a dry sewer is constructed with a mandatory sewer hook-up agreement to connect once sewer is available. The properties must be located within an area where sewer service will become available as identified by in the Kitsap County Wastewater Facility Plan.</i></p>	<p><b>17.410.050 Footnotes for zoning use table.</b></p> <p>A. Where noted on the preceding use tables, the following additional restrictions apply:</p> <p>48. Within urban growth areas, all new residential subdivisions, single-family or multi-family developments are required to provide an urban level of sanitary sewer service for all proposed dwelling units <u>unless exemptions identified in KCC 17.460.020 allow for the implementation of a dry sewer.</u></p> <p><b>17.460.020 Public sewer connections in UGAs</b></p> <p>In accordance with Sections 13.12.020 and .025, <u>17.410.050(48)</u>, Health District Ordinance 2008A-01 and WAC <u>246-272A-0025</u>, all new development or existing development requiring a replacement on-site septic system that is located within an urban growth area must connect to public sewer if the property is within two hundred feet of an existing public sewer main that has adequate capacity for the development.</p> <p><u>New urban developments may be allowed to utilize interim on-site septic systems and shall install dry sewer facilities provided the following conditions are met:</u></p> <p><u>1. The Kitsap County Wastewater Facility Plan must indicate an expectation of future sewer provisions that would serve the area where the proposed development would occur;</u></p> <p><u>2. A temporary drainfield may be located on developable lots provided that the drainfield is removed and connection to the sewer is established once sewer service is within two hundred feet of said developable lots and which includes a sewer main that has adequate capacity for the development;</u></p> <p><u>3. When dry sewer lines are installed, a residential development up to the maximum density may be allowed, provided that lots in excess of the density permitted with on-site septic shall not be built upon until the sewer line is extended and connected to all the lots; and</u></p> <p><u>4. Dry sewer lines shall be installed in conformance with the standards established by the Kitsap County Public Works Department, or other applicable permitting jurisdiction.</u></p>	<p><u>Motion: Passed 6-0</u></p>

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and recommendations on reasonable measures		Planning Commission Recommended Draft
#	Topic Title and Revision	
2.	<p><b><u>Topic:</u></b> <b>Reduced Regulatory Fees in UGA</b></p> <p><i>Allow use of general funds for permit review when a project achieves the maximum density allowed by the zone.</i></p>	<p><del>Commitment only during this code update. Code changes in development.</del> <del>Not enough information to make a recommendation. Motion to remove: Passed 5-1 (J. Phillips)</del> <del>Motion to reconsider.</del> <del>Motion to remove: Passed 6-0</del></p>
3.	<p><b><u>Topic:</u></b> <b>Tax Incentives for Infill or Redevelopment</b></p> <p><i>Temporarily reduce taxation rate for infill developments.</i></p>	<p><del>Commitment only during this code update. Code changes in development.</del> <del>Not enough information to make a recommendation.</del> <del>Motion to remove: Passed 6-0</del></p>
4.	<p><b><u>Topic:</u></b> <b>Minimum Lot Size</b></p> <p><i>Use lot averaging calculation method to achieve the minimum lot size in urban residential zoning districts.</i></p>	<p><u>See topic number 8 "Lot Averaging"</u></p>
5.	<p><b><u>Topic:</u></b> <b>Streamline Short Plat Process in UGA</b></p> <p><i>Allow use of general funds for permit review when a detached single family dwelling permit requires the subdivision of one parcel into three or less parcels.</i></p>	<p><del>Commitment only during this code update. Code changes in development.</del> <del>Not enough information to make a recommendation.</del> <del>Motion to remove: Passed 6-0</del></p>

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
 PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and  
 recommendations on reasonable measures

#	Topic Title and Revision	Planning Commission Recommended Draft
6.	<p><b>Topic:</b>  <b>Increased Heights Allowed in UGA</b></p> <p><i>Increase allowed base height and incentivized heights.</i></p>	<p>See Design Standards Table 17.420.050 (A).                      Base height                      UM: <del>35</del> 45 feet                      UH: <del>35</del> 55 feet                      With footnote 17                      UM: <del>35</del> 55 feet                      UH: 65 feet</p> <p><b>17.420.060 Footnotes for tables.</b></p> <p>A. Where noted on the preceding tables, the following additional provisions apply:</p> <p>17. A greater height may be allowed as set forth below and in accordance with the procedures in Title 21 of this code. Such approval must be consistent with the recommendations of the fire marshal/fire district and compatible with surrounding uses and zones. Such approval shall result in a decrease in building coverage, an increase in public amenities, and/or a more creative or efficient use of land. The maximum building height approved by the director shall not exceed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the <del>UM</del>, NC, and P zones: forty-five feet.</li> <li>In the UH and C zones: sixty-five feet.</li> <li>In the <u>UM</u>, BP, BC, and IND zones: <u>fifty-five</u> feet.</li> </ol> <p>Height and density requirements for Urban High and Regional Center reflected in Table 17.420.050D Silverdale Regional Center and Design District Density and Dimension Table.</p> <p><b>Motion to pass: 6-0</b></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Comments: Along with increased building heights, view corridors and incremental setbacks should be kept in mind with regard to view impacts to nearby properties. The increased heights are subject to all existing view protection requirements, including but not limited to, shoreline view protection standards in KCC Title 22.</u></p>

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
 PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and recommendations on reasonable measures		Planning Commission Recommended Draft
#	Topic Title and Revision	
7.	<p><b>Topic:</b>  <b>Infrastructure Investment in UGA.</b></p> <p><i>Target infrastructure development to support other reasonable measures. For example, combine incentives for building in certain areas of a UGA with increased infrastructure development in the same area.</i></p>	<p><b>Coordination with public works TIP and CIP</b>  <u>Planning commission recommends that the Board of County Commissioners pass a resolution to target infrastructure development to support other reasonable measures.</u></p> <p><u>Motion: Passed 6-0</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Comment: A resolution will show the County's commitment to implement this measure.</u></p>



CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
 PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and  
 recommendations on reasonable measures

#	Topic Title and Revision	Planning Commission Recommended Draft
8.	<p><b>Topic:</b>  <b>Lot Size Averaging in UGA</b></p> <p><i>Use lot averaging calculation method to achieve the minimum lot area and dimensions in urban residential zoning districts.</i></p>	<p>See Design Standards Table 17.420.050 (A).  <u>17.420.060 Footnotes for tables.</u></p> <p>A. Where noted on the preceding tables, the following additional provisions apply:</p> <p><u>19. RESERVED-Lot averaging. In order to preserve natural features, address irregular site shape, and provide a variety of housing sizes, for subdivisions creating ten lots or more in urban residential zoning districts that do not utilize the provisions of the KCC 17.450 'Performance Based Development', lot averaging may be used as the method of calculation for lot area and dimensions; provided, that:</u></p> <p><u>a. The average developable lot size must equal at least the minimum lot size as required by the zone;</u></p> <p><u>b. No single developable lot may be greater than the maximum lot size as required by the zone;</u></p> <p><u>c. A lot less than the minimum lot size as required by the zone may not be placed adjacent to previously developed lots which meet the minimum lot size requirements; and</u></p> <p><u>d. All other development standards identified in Table 17.420.050 (A) Rural, Resource, and Urban Residential Zones Density and Dimensions are required; provided, that the following alternative standards are allowed:</u></p> <p><u>i. Lot width: Each lot shall have a minimum of twenty feet of frontage on a dedicated street or approved access way and shall be a minimum of fifty feet at the midpoint of the lot.</u></p> <p><u>ii. Lot depth: Each lot shall have a minimum lot depth of eighty feet.</u></p> <p><u>Motion: Passes 5-1</u>  <u>(T. Nevins: Item C should be removed if we want to increase densities inside Urban Growth Areas)</u></p>

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and recommendations on reasonable measures		Planning Commission Recommended Draft
#	Topic Title and Revision	
9.	<p><b><u>Topic:</u></b> Remove minimum lot widths in UGAs</p> <p><i>Use lot averaging calculation method to achieve the minimum lot widths in urban residential zoning districts.</i></p>	<p><u>See topic number 8 "Lot Averaging"</u>.</p>
10.	<p><b><u>Topic:</u></b> Transfer of Development Rights</p> <p><i>Established increased ratios and use market based values for Transfer of Development Rights.</i></p>	<p><u>Resolution in development.</u></p> <p><u>Planning commission recommends that the board of county commissioners pass the draft resolution to establish increased ratios and use market based values for Transfer of Development Rights.</u></p> <p><u>Motion: Passed 6-0</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Comments: Passing the draft resolution will complete action needed to implement this measure by supporting code revisions adopted with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.</u></p>

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

<p><b>Topic:</b> <b>Rural Legacy Lots: Footnote 39</b></p> <p><b>11.</b> <i>Building permits are not allowed for rural lots located outside a UGA or designated LAMIRD, created prior to July 1, 1974, less than one acre, contiguous ownership, and no improvements.</i></p>	<p><b><u>17.420.060 Footnotes for tables.</u></b></p> <p>A. Where noted on the preceding tables, the following additional provisions apply:</p> <p><del>39. Unless otherwise stated in this title, if a lot of record which was legally created as of after July 1, 1974, is smaller in total square footage than that required within the zone, or if the dimensions of the lot are less than that required within the zone, said lot may be occupied by any use allowed within that zone subject to all other requirements of the zone. Lots that were created prior to July 1, 1974 and that are located outside of an Urban Growth Area (UGA) and a Limited Area of More Intense Development (LAMIRD) may only be considered for development permits if:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a. The lot is at least one acre in size; and</del></li> <li><del>b. They are not contiguous lots under common ownership; or</del></li> <li><del>c. There have been specific development investments in the lot prior to the enactment of this ordinance (insert Effective Date of ordinance), including but not limited to, an approved water or sewer connection, participation in a local improvement district, or</del></li> <li><del>d. A vested development permit has been obtained for the lot.</del></li> </ul> <p><del>An owner of contiguous substandard lots may choose to aggregate (combine) lots in order to meet these requirements:</del></p> <p><u>Motion to remove proposed Design Table Footnote 39 as presented in the August 8, 2016 public hearing. Passed 6-0</u></p>
---	---

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and recommendations on reasonable measures	
#	Topic Title and Revision
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Planning Commission Recommended Draft</b></p> <p><u>17.420.060 Footnotes for tables.</u></p> <p>A. Where noted on the preceding tables, the following additional provisions apply:  <del>39. Unless otherwise stated in this title, if a lot of record which was legally created as of May 10, 1999, is smaller in total square footage than that required within the zone, or if the dimensions of the lot are less than that required within the zone, said lot may be occupied by any use allowed within that zone subject to all other requirements of the zone. Unless specifically stated within this title, where two or more contiguous lots which are nonconforming to the lot size or dimensions of the zone and are held in common ownership, said lots shall be considered separate legal nonconforming lots and each may be occupied by any use permitted within the zone subject to all other requirements of the zone. If a lot of record was lawfully occupied by two or more single-family residences (excluding accessory dwellings) as of May 10, 1999, the owner of such a lot may apply for a short plat approval in order to permit the segregated sale of such residences, even though some or all of the resulting new lots will have lot areas or dimensions less than required for the zone in which they are located. All other provisions of the Short Subdivisions Ordinance (Chapter 16.48 of this code) shall apply to the application.</del></p> <p><u>Motion to remove existing KCC 17.420.060 (A)(39): Passed 6-0</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Comments: As previously noted in the Planning Commission May 14, 2016 Findings of Fact no. 28 the planning commission has been provided insufficient analysis as to the number and location of legacy lots. The planning commission has again requested GIS information needed to evaluate the proposed options. Specifically a definition of legacy lot as applied in the 2014 Buildable Lands Report along with a map showing the pattern of development of these lots together with lot size data. For the each of the four proposed alternatives a GIS map and analysis (undeveloped legacy lots) with critical areas overlay should be prepared. Without these resources the planning commission can not make an informed recommendation.</u></p>

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
 PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Planning Commission recommendations of proposed Title 17 'Zoning' code changes and  
 recommendations on reasonable measures

#	Topic Title and Revision	Planning Commission Recommended Draft
<p>12.</p> <p><b>Topic:</b>  <b>Maximum Urban Lot Size</b></p> <p><i>Establish 9,000 square foot maximum lot size in Urban Low Residential (ULR) and Urban Cluster Residential (UCR) zones. Lot averaging does not allow development to exceed maximum lot size.</i></p>	<p>See Design Standards Table 17.420.050 (A).  <b>Maximum Lot Size:</b>            ULR: <del>NA</del> <u>9,000 sf (25)</u>            UCR: <del>NA</del> <u>9,000 sf (25)</u></p> <p><b>17.420.060 Footnotes for tables.</b>            A. Where noted on the preceding tables, the following additional provisions apply:  <u>25. RESERVED. For new building permit applications on vacant lots over 18,000 square feet located in Urban Low Residential (ULR) and Urban Cluster Residential (UCR) zones, the maximum lot size shall not exceed 9,000 square feet.</u></p>	<p><u>Motion: Passed 5-1</u>  <u>(K. Gonzales-Harless voted against measure)</u></p>

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

<p><b>Topic:</b> Urban Medium Residential and Urban High Residential Use Permissibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add footnote 26 to limit ability to develop detached single family dwellings.</li> <li>• Modify footnote 37 language and application to require residential uses in conjunction with certain allowed commercial uses.</li> <li>• Modify footnote 47 for consistency with zone intent with regards to commercial and mixed use development.</li> </ul>	<p>See <u>Design Standards Table 17.410.040 (A)</u>.</p> <p><u>17.410.050 Footnotes for zoning use table.</u></p> <p>A. Where noted on the preceding use tables, the following additional restrictions apply:</p> <p>26. <del>RESERVED: Single family detached dwellings shall only be allowed when the existing parcel size as of [Insert Effective Ordinance Date] would only allow the development of one dwelling unit.</del></p> <p>37. <del>Permitted only within a mixed-use development or office complex: The overall project shall include a residential component. A mixed use project shall not be required to meet the required density for the zone in which it is located.</del></p> <p>47. As a <del>hearing examiner</del>-conditional use, UM and UH zones adjacent to a commercial zone may allow coordinated projects that include commercial uses within their boundaries. Such projects must meet the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project must include a combination of UM and/or UH and commercially zoned land;</li> <li>The overall project must meet the density required for the net acreage of the UM or UH zoned land included in the project;</li> <li>All setbacks from other residentially zoned land must be the maximum required by the zones included in the project;</li> <li>Loading areas, dumpsters and other facilities must be located away from adjacent residential zones; and</li> <li>The residential and commercial components of the project must be coordinated to maximize pedestrian connectivity and access to public transit.</li> </ol> <p><u>Motion: Passed 6-0</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Comments: The planning commission has concerns with regard to the feasibility of mixed use development if it was required to meet minimum density requirements and conversely the ability to establish a commercial use with minimal residential development in a zone with an intent to provide higher density residential development.</u></p>
--	---

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

**Chapter 17.410 ALLOWED USES**

(Formerly Chapter 17.381)

Sections:

17.410.040 Zoning use tables.

17.410.050 Footnotes for zoning use tables.

**17.410.040 Zoning use tables.**

There are three separate tables addressing the following general land use categories and zones:

A. Rural, Resource, and Urban Residential Zones.

1. Rural Residential (RR).
2. Rural Protection (RP).
3. Rural Wooded (RW).
4. Forest Resource Lands (FRL).
5. Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO).
6. Urban Restricted (UR).
7. Greenbelt (GB).
8. Urban Low Residential (UL).
9. Urban Cluster Residential (UCR).
10. Urban Medium Residential (UM).
11. Urban High Residential (UH).

**CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS**

Table 17.410.040(A) Rural, Resource, and Urban Residential Zones.

Use	Rural				Resource			Urban Residential					
	RR		RP	RW	FRL	MRO	UR	Low Density		UCR	Medium Density	High Density	
							(19)	GB (60)	UL (19)(48)	(48)	UM (30)(47) (48)	UH (19)(47) (48)	
<b>124</b>	P (43)	P (43)	P (43)	C (43)	--	P (43)	P (43)	P (43)	P (43)	P (43)	P (43) <u>(26)</u>	P (43) <u>(26)</u>	<u>ACUP</u> <u>P</u> (43) <u>(26)</u>
<b>RESIDENTIAL USES</b>													
<b>COMMERCIAL/BUSINESS USES</b>													
<b>230</b>	C	C	--	--	--	C	C	C	C	C	ACUP <u>(37)</u>	ACUP (37)	ACUP (37)
<b>232</b>	P	P	--	--	--	P	C	C	P	P	ACUP <u>(37)</u>	ACUP (37)	ACUP (37)
<b>290</b>	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	P	P	P	P	P	ACUP <u>P</u> <u>(37)</u>	ACUP <u>P</u> <u>(37)</u>	ACUP <u>P</u> <u>(37)</u>
<b>RECREATIONAL/CULTURAL USES</b>													
<b>314</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	ACUP <u>(37)</u>
<b>316</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	ACUP <u>(37)</u>
<b>INDUSTRIAL USES</b>													
<b>540</b>	--	--	--	--	--	C (40)	C (40)	C (40)	C (40)	C (40)	C (40) <u>(37)</u>	C (40) <u>(37)</u>	C (40) <u>(37)</u>



# CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

**Chapter 17.420 DENSITY, DIMENSIONS, AND DESIGN** (Formerly Chapter 17.382)

Sections:

17.420.050 Tables.

17.420.060 Footnotes for tables.

17.420.050 Tables.

There are four separate tables addressing the density, dimensions, and design standards as applied to the following general land use categories and zones:

- A. Rural, Resource, and Urban Residential Zones.
  - 1. Rural Residential (RR).
  - 2. Rural Protection (RP).
  - 3. Rural Wooded (RW).
  - 4. Forest Resource Lands (FRL).
  - 5. Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO).
  - 6. Urban Restricted (UR).
  - 7. Greenbelt (GB).
  - 8. Urban Low Residential (UL).
  - 9. Urban Cluster Residential (UCR).
  - 10. Urban Medium Residential (UM).
  - 11. Urban High Residential (UH).

**CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES  
PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS**

Table 17.420.050(A) Rural, Resource, and Urban Residential Zones Density and Dimensions Table.

Standard	Rural			Resource		Urban Low Density Residential					Urban Medium/High Density Residential	
	RR	RP	RW	FRL	MRO	UR (33)(53)	GB (33)(50)	UL (5)(33)	UCR (5)	UM (5)	UH (33)(55)	
Min. density (du/acre)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 (3) (18)	1 (3) (18)	5 (49)	5 (49)	10 (49)	19	
Max. density (du/acre)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5 (18)	4 (18)	9 (49)	9 (49)	18 (49)	30	
Min. lot size (39)(19)	5 acres	10 acres	20 acres	40 acres	20 acres (30)	5,800 sf	5,800 sf	2,400 sf	2,400 sf	None for multi-family; 2,400 sf for single-family	None	
Max. lot size (39) (19)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA <u>9,000 sf</u> (25)	NA <u>9,000 sf</u> (25)	NA	NA	
Min Lot width (feet) (19)	140	140	140	140	60 (31)	60	60	40 (20)	40	0 for multi-family; 40 for single-family	60	
Min Lot depth (feet) (19)	140	140	140	140	NA	60	60	60	60	0 for multi-family; 60 for single-family	60	
Max. height (feet) (40) (19)	35 (2)	35 (2)	35 (2)	35 (1)	NA	35	35 (50)	35	35	<del>35</del> <u>45</u> (17)	<del>35</del> <u>55</u> (17)	
Max. impervious surface coverage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	50% 55%	40%	NA	NA	85%	85%	
Max. lot coverage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	50% 55%	40%	NA	NA	85%	85%	

## CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Table 17.420.050(A) Rural, Resource, and Urban Residential Zones Density and Dimensions Table.

Standard	Rural			Resource			Urban Low Density Residential					Urban Medium/High Density Residential		
	RR	RP	RW	FRL	MRO	UR	GB	UL	UCR	UM	UH			
<b>Setbacks (34) (38)</b>														
Min. front (feet) (41)(42) (43)	50 (29)	50 (29)	50 (29)	50 (29)	NA	20 (29) 15 (54)	20 (29)	20 for garage or carport; 10 for habitable area (29)	10 for single- family, duplex & townhouse; 10 for multi-family adjacent or abutting residential, otherwise 0 (29)	Multi-family = 10 Single-family = 20 for garage or carport; 10 for habitable area (29)	20 (29)			
Max. front (feet)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Side (feet) (42)(43) (48)	20 feet; 5 feet for accessory structures (29)	20 feet; 5 feet for accessory structures (29)	20 (29)	20 (29)	NA	5 (29)	5 (29)	5 If on an alley, 10 feet for a garage or carport opening directly onto the alley or 5 feet in all other instances (29)	5 If on an alley, 10 feet for a garage or carport opening directly onto the alley or 5 feet in all other instances (28) (29)	5 If on an alley, 10 feet for a garage or carport opening directly onto the alley or 5 feet in all other instances (29)	5 (29)			
Rear (feet) (42)(43) (48)	20 feet; 5 feet for accessory structures (29)	20 feet; 5 feet for accessory structures (29)	20 (29)	20 (29)	NA	10 (29) 15 (54)	10 (29)	10 If on an alley, 20 feet for a garage or carport opening directly onto the alley. (29)	5 If on an alley, 20 feet for a garage or carport opening directly onto the alley (28) (29)	10 If on an alley, 20 feet for a garage or carport opening directly onto the alley - (29)	10 (29)			

