

Table II

Requested Development Code Amendments- Proposals Not Docketed by Director (No Change)

Log #	Category	Requested Change	Requested By	Comp. Plan Comment #	Chapter	Section(s)	Title	Proposed Change	Staff Recommendation
NC-1	Density	Include density bonuses for cottages, duplexes, triplexes and other higher density housing, as long as the exteriors and scales of such projects mimic the appearances of single family construction.	Sid Kuboi- Comment received during Cottage Housing review	N/A	20.50	020(1)	Densities and Dimensions in Residential Zones	Add provision that allows for an increase in density for duplexes and triplexes in R-4, R-6, and R-8 zones where the exterior design and scale is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.	This proposed amendment was identified through comment received from Commissioner Kuboi. Staff does support the intent of the comment, but needs direction to develop an amendment that may be added to the docket. Staff also recommends devoting adequate time and resources in the careful development of such a proposal. Request proposed language from the Planning Commission.
NC-2	Dimension	Reduce building heights in R-4 and R-6 zones to no more than 2 stories and a maximum of 25 feet.	Margaret Robarge	N/A	20.50	20 & 50	Standards- Dimensional Requirements & Building Height- Standards	Reduce building heights in R-4 and R-6 zones to no more than 2 stories and a maximum of 25 feet.	This change would be very restrictive for residential development. A roof height of 25 feet would barely allow for the construction of a two story home and would promote the construction of flat rooftops that are not effective with Washington weather. Staff panel recommends no change.
NC-3	Trees	Reduce the number of trees that can be removed as an exemption from 6 to 2.	Boni Biery- Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment	50	20.50	310 & 320	Specific Activities Subject to the Provisions of this Subchapter (Clearing and Grading)	Reduce the number of trees that can be removed as an exemption from 6 to 2.	This change would be too restrictive for residential development, and for the homeowner in general. Some home owners have large numbers of trees and would like to add more light to their property. Lowering the number of trees allowed to be removed without a permit to two would impact property owners. Staff panel recommends no change.
NC-4	Trees	Reduce the number of trees that can be removed as part of a development permit from 20 and 30% retention to 30 and 45% retention.	Boni Biery- Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment	50	20.50	350 (B)	Development Standards for Clearing Activities- Minimum Retention Requirements	Reduce the number of trees that can be removed as part of a development permit from 20 and 30% retention to 30 and 45% retention. Also change the replacement standard in the exemptions section to require replacement with slightly larger stock.	This change would not be compatible with other provisions of the development code. By increasing the number of retained trees on a site, it may lead to difficulty in the placement of a building footprint if trees are sporadically placed on the lot. Instead of increasing the required percentage for retention, those provisions providing incentive for voluntary tree retention through site planning should be reinforced. Staff panel recommends no change as proposed.
NC-5	Trees	Require the number of trees on a parcel following a development action to meet a pre-defined tree to square footage ratio. All trees must be potential significant trees.	Boni Biery- Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment	50	20.50	350(B)	Development Standards for Clearing Activities- Minimum Retention Requirements	Add provision that at no time shall a development proposal or action reduce the number of potential significant trees below 3 trees per 1,000 square feet. Add definition of potential significant tree.	This is addressed in the minimum retention requirements section SMC 20.50.350, and by our replanting requirements. The removal of all trees beyond the six exempt currently requires replanting with tree stock identified in SMC 20.50.360. By creating a standard that is based on square footage it may allow some sites to remove more trees and not replant, and others to plant more than should be required based on the existing site conditions. Staff panel recommends no change.

Table II

Requested Development Code Amendments- Proposals Not Docketed by Director (No Change)

NC-6	Trees	Reduce the size of a significant tree to 6" and 9" DBH.	Boni Biery- Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment	50	20.20	48	"S" Definitions	Change the definition of significant tree to reduce the size requirements from 8" to 6" and 12" to 9" DBH, respectively.	Reducing the size requirements for significant trees would limit a property owners ability to adjust the landscaping on their property. This change may also lead to increased limitations of development and redevelopment opportunity in the City. Property owners have the option to keep all the trees on their parcel if they choose. Staff panel recommends no change.
NC-7	Noticing	Add requirement for noticing on construction of all new single family homes and add appeal period for construction of all new single family homes.	Margaret Robarge	N/A	20.30	40	Ministerial Decisions- Type A	Make a residential building permit a Type B action.	The noticing requirements of this proposed amendment would be very costly in terms of actual noticing and staff time. This would also allow for an appeal of a new single family home or remodel. Staff panel recommends no change.
NC-8	Noticing	Add requirement that if new construction is appealed, a public meeting and revision process is held to generate alternative that is acceptable to appellant.	Margaret Robarge	N/A	20.30	40	Ministerial Decisions- Type A	Add requirement under Type B permits making residential building permits subject to a design review board.	Requiring residential building permit applications that have complied with the standards established by 20.50 to a design review board would impact property owners, and would add costs both in time and fees to the residential building permit process. Staff panel recommends no change.
NC-9	Noticing	Add a public notice process for all commercial projects with any expansion of the building footprint.	Leftover from 2003 process, remanded by City Council for more research and consideration.	N/A	20.30	560	Categorical Exemptions- Minor new construction	Reduce threshold for SEPA on commercial building footprints to require noticing for a smaller addition.	Requiring SEPA noticing for commercial projects less than 4000 square feet would be a change to State SEPA regulations. A jurisdiction can raise the threshold to a certain extent (up to 12,000 square feet) but may not lower the threshold for categorical exemptions. Any additional requirements for tenant improvements, commercial additions, or commercial new constructions would impact commercial and economic redevelopment in Shoreline. Staff panel recommends no change.